OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FOURTH SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

7-8 EDWARD VII., 1907-8

VOL. LXXXV

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SIXTH DAY OF APRIL TO THE ELEVENTH DAY OF MAY, INCLUSIVE.

BIBLIOTHÈQUE LÉVESQUE
JOLIETTE

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY S. E. DAWSON, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1907–8

House of Commons Debates

FOURTH SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, April 6, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

MEAT AND CANNED FOODS ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 149) to amend the Meat and Canned Foods Act. He said : This is a Bill to make some small amendments in the Meat and Canned Foods Act of last session. The amendments are slight and are intended to make the Act more workable. I do not think it worth while to go into details now.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INSPECTION AND SALE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. FISHER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 148) to amend the Inspection and Sale Act. He said : This is to make some slight amendments in the Fruit Marks Act and also with regard to the Dairy Acts, which under the revised statutes are now incorporated under the Inspection and Sale Act. I think it better to leave the details until the House has the printed Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CANNED GOODS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. FISHER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 147) to repeal the Canned Goods Act. He said : This is an old Act which has become obsolete and which is never acted upon. The Meat and Canned Foods Act provides for everything that is covered in this Canned Goods Act but there are a few details in which the two appear to conflict. Therefore, after consultation with the Justice Department, it was decided that the best course was to repeal the old Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 150) to amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act.—Mr. Oliver.

MANITOBA BOUNDARY EXTENSION.

On the orders of the day being called.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Before the orders of the day are called, I would ask the government when we may expect the Bill to provide for the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The matter is engaging the attention of the government, but in the absence of the Prime Minister I would not like to make a definite statement.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS AND REPORTS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. When may we expect the returns respecting drill sheds asked for on December 11 ?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Publis Works). I shall make inquiry and let my hon. friend know, probably to-morrow. I may say that all returns moved for are in course of preparation and are being prepared as rapidly as possible.

Mr. BERGERON. I would ask if the report of the Civil Service Commission is being translated into French and being printed concurrently with the English edition ?

Mr. FIELDING. The clerk of the House informs me that the translation does not take place until after the printing is done. I take it for granted the usual course will be pursued, as with all other public documents.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the number it is proposed to print? I noticed in a paper an intimation that 2,000 had been ordered by the Printing Committee; that would scarcely give half a dozen each. Every man's life will be made miserable if he does not get more than that. I would suggest that the Printing Committee see that a good supply is printed.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no doubt the attention of the Printing Committee will be drawn to my hon. friend's question. It is not a matter in which the government presume to give any directions. Attention was drawn to the same point on Friday, and I presume it is engaging the attention of the Printing Committee.

Mr. HAGGART. I would ask the Minister of Finance, who is leading the government, when we may expect the printed report on the Quebec bridge? It is about time.

Mr. FIELDING. Does my hon. friend mean the printing of the report?

Mr. HAGGART. The printed report, I believe, is not down.

Mr. FIELDING. The clerk of the House informs me that the usual orders were given, and he will make inquiry.

Mr. GRAHAM. As a matter of fact, a portion of that report was laid on the table I think Thursday or Friday. The appendices are very numerous, they are now at the sixteenth.

Mr. HAGGART. That is only the photographs; I mean the printed report.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not the photographs at all. Appendix 16 is a long typewritten document.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the minister going to have the photographs reproduced for us?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend means the drawings.

Mr. HAGGART. I mean the photographs.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would ask the Minister of Public Works when I may expect a return with regard to the Bayfield, Grand Père and St. Joseph piers. Also I asked for a return from the Minister of Agriculture in connection with the cattle embargo; and one on February 10 and one on March 9, respecting the inspectors of packing houses.

Mr. FISHER. The last-mentioned return has been on the table of the House for several days; three others were laid on the table to-day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. With regard to returns belonging to my department, while some of them may be short, he must bear in mind that many of the returns asked for are very lengthy, and I have not felt justified in allowing the clerks in the department for extra time in making them up. Therefore they are doing the work in the ordinary office hours. We have no provision for extra clerks. My hon. friend must be patient with me.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FORT WILLIAM TERMINAL RAILWAY AND BRIDGE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 101) respecting the Fort William Terminal Railway and Bridge Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Mr. BERGERON. What are the amendments to the previous Bill?

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The amendments are found in sections 2, 3 and 4. The first amendment is to bring this railway company under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission; the original Bill did not do that. The next amendment gives the city of Fort William power to acquire or to abolish the tolls. The fourth amendment is a question of the expenditure of money.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman explain the reason of bringing it under the jurisdiction of the Dominion government, a small road like this?

Mr. MACPHERSON. The original Act left it practically in the hands of the Railway Department, and the committee thought it wise to place it under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. There was an arbitration as to where they should place the line, and some people who were fighting the Bill thought it better to place in the hands of the Railway Commission the power to say where the line should be located.

Mr. FOSTER. Between what points does the line run?

Mr. MACPHERSON. It is an electric railway operating between some islands in the Kaministiquia river and Fort William. I may say this Bill was up for some weeks before the Railway Committee, and the promoters of the Bill and the city of Fort Willian had a long fight over it. Eventually they came together and drew up the Bill in this form. It is a railway and bridge Bill. This company has power to erect bridges over the Kaministiquia river and operate on some of the islands. I fancy it is some gentlemen interested in real estate on those islands who are really promoting the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) asked what was the reason this Bill should be brought into the Dominion parliament at all. It is a very short line, which I understand is to operate between the two towns of Fort William and Port Arthur.

Mr. MACPHERSON. No. I understand it does not run to Port Arthur. It crosses a navigable stream, and it is desired on that account to bring it under the jurisdiction of the Dominion parliament and the Railway Commission.

Mr. FOSTER. That would only make it necessary to get permission from the Dominion parliament to build a bridge across the navigable stream.

Mr. MACPHERSON. This is the renewal of a charter. I do not know what the original idea was in asking for Dominion legislation.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend know why it was called a terminal railway? It does not seem to have much chance either

to begin or to end. It is only six or seven miles long.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I was not at the christening, and I could not tell the hon. gentleman why.

Mr. GALLIHER. It connects the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is this entirely in the province of Ontario?

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes. The Fort William terminal is on an island in the Kaministiquia river, right in front of the town of Fort William.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

QUEBEC AND NEW BRUNSWICK RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 128) respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—Mr. Michaud.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has anything been done on this railway ? I see that the charter was granted originally in 1900 and that it has been renewed several times.

Mr. MICHAUD. There have been about three miles of work done on this road and the reason why the work was not continued since two or three years ago was that it was expected that the Transcontinental Railway would take over part of this line. When the line was surveyed it was found that the Transcontinental Railway would only take a short distance of it. After the line of the Transcontinental Railway was surveyed we had to make an application to parliament to have the time extended. It is the intention of the company to start the work as soon as possible.

Mr. J. D. REID. The company should have started the work in 1900 when they got the charter.

Mr. BERGERON. What will be the length of the road altogether ?

Mr. MICHAUD. 130 miles.

Mr. BERGERON. And there are three miles built ?

Mr. MICHAUD. There are three miles built. The claims for the right of way have been settled with the farmers and we are ready to go on with the work.

Mr. BERGERON. Has there been a subsidy from the government given or promised ?

Mr. MICHAUD. There were some subsidies, but I do not know whether there will be any in future or not.

Mr. J. D. REID. The company have done nothing up to the present time except grade three miles of road. Is not that practically all that has been done ?

Mr. MICHAUD. It is the intention of the company to go on with the work as soon as possible.

Mr. LENNOX. When were the three miles graded ?

Mr. MICHAUD. Between three and four years ago.

Mr. LENNOX. Before or since the last renewal ?

Mr. MICHAUD. It was since the last renewal.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that one of the lines that the Minister of Railways and Canals intends to take over as part of the Intercolonial Railway later on ?

Mr. MICHAUD. I am not aware of anything of that kind.

Mr. BERGERON. There is a scheme, I understand, in the province of New Brunswick by which the Intercolonial Railway takes over all these branch lines. Is that understood ?

Mr. MICHAUD. Not that I know of.

Mr. J. D. REID. Where does this road run to ?

Mr. MICHAUD. It runs from Connor's to Chaudière Junction.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is it going to parallel the Grand Trunk Pacific ?

Mr. MICHAUD. Only for a short distance.

Mr. J. D. REID. In what part will that be ?

Mr. MICHAUD. It will run parallel for probably three or four miles and then it branches off and runs in a different direction.

Mr. EMMERSON. It serves an entirely different country.

On section 5—agreements with other companies.

Mr. MICHAUD. I move that after the words 'railway company' the following words be added : 'or the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway or the International Railway Company of New Brunswick.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What will then be the effect of section 5 ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have had occasion to look into the matter. This is a section

which provides that the company may enter into a contract or agreement of amalgamation with certain companies and this only adds two companies to those with whom, with the consent of the Governor in Council, they may enter into an amalgamation agreement.

Mr. LENNOX. We have given them power to amalgamate with the Grand Trunk Pacific and now the hon. gentleman proposes that they shall have power to amalgamate with two more.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like to ask the promoter of this Bill what the object of the amalgamation of this railway with the International would be?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend who is promoting the Bill, will allow me, I may say that I understand that certain negotiations have been going on between the Atlantic, Quebec and Western and the International. The Atlantic, Quebec and Western are in some way interested in this charter, as I understand, and, having power to amalgamate with the Atlantic, Quebec and Western, may also think it advisable to have power to amalgamate with the International so as to get their line up to Quebec.

Mr. CROCKET. Have the Quebec and New Brunswick any power in this Bill to extend their line into the state of Maine?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only to the boundary.

Mr. CROCKET. To make connection there with a railway in the state of Maine?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That apparently has been struck out in the Railway Committee.

Mr. CROCKET. I hope the effect of this Bill will not be to divert the traffic from the northern part of New Brunswick to the state of Maine.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It could not do that.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the use of these powers unless other railways are authorized to amalgamate too? The Bill does not give you power to amalgamate with them.

Mr. MICHAUD. We will be prepared to amalgamate when they are ready.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

PACIFIC COAST FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 40) respecting the Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

On section 1,

Mr. J. D. REID. Speaking generally in regard to these private Bills, I notice that a good many of them are passed on Friday nights when many of the members are not present. I notice also that some of these companies are taking the names of long established companies in the old country. For instance, on Friday night a Bill was passed giving the title to a company of the London and Lancashire Guarantee and Accident Company of Canada. Now, the London and Lancashire Company has been established in Canada for perhaps 80 years and this company takes the same title with the exception that the words 'of Canada' are added. The government have already licensed the London and Lancashire Company to do business in Canada and this similarity of title is liable to lead to confusion and perhaps to deceive people. Of course if the Canadian company is as strong as the other it would be all right, but this might easily not be the case. I wish to draw the attention of the Finance Minister to the matter.

Mr. FIELDING. This question of the similarity of names of companies frequently engages the attention of the department and of the Committee on Banking and Commerce, and while discouraging the use of names of existing British or foreign companies doing business here, it has not been thought well that we should refuse such a name in every case as it would amount practically to a monopoly. We had that question under discussion recently with regard to an American company, and it was pointed out that a Canadian company going to the United States would not be allowed a monopoly of its own name there, but an American Company taking a Canadian name might readily be established in the United States. As a general rule, it is well to avoid a duplication of names. In the case States. As a general rule, it is well to glad to know that the London and Lancashire people are the promoters of the legislation and that it is practically that company which is doing business under a Canadian charter.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am glad to hear that; nevertheless I think it well to call the attention of the minister to the matter.

Mr. FIELDING. We are continually watching that.

Mr. HAGGART. Are the powers given under this Bill supplementary to some other powers which the company possesses under a provincial charter, or is this an entirely new charter?

Mr. FIELDING. It is a provincial company which is now being converted into a Dominion company.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, but are the powers given in this Bill supplemental to those which they have under their provincial charter?

Mr. FIELDING. The purpose of this Bill is to create a company which will take over the provincial company and then have power to extend its business throughout the Dominion.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, but we may be confirming powers which this company has in its provincial charter and which we would not give them in a Dominion charter.

Mr. MACPHERSON. At present this company cannot operate outside of British Columbia under its charter. It wishes to extend its business in other parts of Canada and it seeks for a Dominion charter. This Bill contains the model charter and they are getting no extraordinary powers from the Dominion parliament in any shape or form.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This Bill appears to create an entirely new corporation with certain new powers. I do not observe in the Bill any provision that the new company shall have all the powers now possessed by the old company, but it seems to be the scheme of the Bill that the new company shall have only such powers as are conferred by this Act. All the assets of the old company are turned over to the new company which will assume all the liabilities of the old company.

Mr. HAGGART. If it is an entirely new charter that meets the point I have raised.

On section 5—liability of new company,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The proviso is rather peculiar. I do not know exactly how the abandonment there referred to can be created.

Mr. FIELDING. The Superintendent of Insurance advises me that this follows the language of other charters of a similar character. I suppose it means that a man is not to be liable to both companies.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand the object of it perfectly. The object is this : if you propose to come upon shareholders for an amount still due upon their shares in respect of any liability of the company—in other words, if you attempt to enforce a liability of the company by proceeding against the shareholders, you shall not proceed against the shareholders of the new company, unless you abandon any claim against them as shareholders of the old company. But just take a concrete case : some person may have a claim against the new company and is unable to collect that claim; he desires to proceed against the shareholders in respect of their unpaid liability upon their shares ; the very first thing that would confront a counsel would be the necessity of abandoning in some way his client's right against the shareholders of the old company, and it seems to me it is rather difficult to know how to do that effectually.

Mr. FIELDING. This appears to follow the language of the old statutes, and I do not know that we can make it any clearer.

On section 12,

Mr. HAGGART. The provincial Act, under which this company seems to have had its charter, may provide certain limitations or restrictions. You are now taking the insured from one insurance company and putting them under another. Does that remove these restrictions?

Mr. FIELDING. It is intended that they shall become subject entirely to the provisions of the Dominion legislation.

Mr. HAGGART. But there may be contracts under the provincial Act. How are you to protect those who have contracts with the company under its provincial charter?

Mr. FIELDING. I should think that a policy under a Dominion charter would be as good as one under a provincial charter.

Mr. LENNOX. That is not the point. The point is does the company get rid of obligations that may arise under the provincial charter?

Mr. FIELDING. Sections 4 and 5 guard against that. The new company has to carry out all the contracts and liabilities of the old one.

Mr. LENNOX. Is it the policy of the government to give to insurance companies, under provincial charter, a Dominion charter when these companies wish to do business throughout the Dominion?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think we could offer any objection. If a provincial company desires a Dominion charter, it would not be our policy to offer any objection. There has been no objection to such a course in the past.

Mr. MACPHERSON. How about section 5 to which the leader of the opposition referred?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would think it might be put in a much more satisfactory form perhaps:

Provided, however, that any person who recovers under section 150 of the Company's Act in respect of any shares in the new company shall be held to have abandoned, pro tanto, his right to recover in respect of the corresponding shares in the old company.

Mr. FIELDING. That is his own Act shall constitute an abandonment in respect of the old company without his having to make any formal abandonment.

Mr. MACPHERSON. He automatically abandons it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. FIELDING. I see no objection to that, and the section might be amended accordingly.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would move to insert after the word 'company' on the fifteenth line, section 5, the words 'and its shareholders.'

Mr. FIELDING. I do not see any objection to that.

Mr. MACPHERSON. It should read, first against the new company and its shareholders and then against the old company and its shareholders.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would call the attention of the Minister of Finance to section 18, by which the bringing into force of this Act is made to depend on a vote of the shareholders. As the bringing into force of the Act might be a matter of importance I would suggest that when the vote of the shareholders has been taken, the Secretary of State should be informed and he should publish a proclamation which would bring the Bill into force and avoid the objection.

Mr. FIELDING. This was under consideration in the committee. Of course it is not desirable that the bringing into force of an Act should depend on the vote of certain shareholders and not on a proclamation. We were met, however, by the fact that this was the form used in several Acts and it seems to have worked satisfactorily; therefore it was allowed to stand. The same thought presented itself to me as has presented itself to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), but it was decided that, in view of the circumstances I have mentioned, it was not necessary to change it.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

DOMINION GUARANTEE COMPANY, LIMITED.

House in committee on Bill (No. 127) respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.—Mr. Pringle.

Mr. LENNOX. Is the Minister of Finance satisfied about the agreement referred and confirmed in this Bill ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is an ordinary mortgage agreement and has been examined by the officials of the department.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MACPHERSON.

QUESTIONS.

PORT PHYSICIAN AT NORTH SYDNEY.

Mr. SPROULE—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. What salary does Dr. Horace Rhindress receive as port physician at North Sydney?
2. How much was paid last year to boats or steamers for conveying Dr. Rhindress to steamers entering the harbour?
3. How much was paid up to date for providing apartments for Dr. Rhindress at North Sydney?
4. How much was paid within the last year for putting in grates, bath tubs, furnishings, furniture, &c., for Dr. Rhindress' rooms or offices at North Sydney, and to whom paid?
5. Who owns the building in which such offices or apartments are situated?
6. At whose request was such expenditure made?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). So far as concerns my department, the government has not expended any money in providing or fitting up or furnishing apartments, rooms or offices for Dr. Rhindress at North Sydney.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT ACTONVALE.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What was the amount of the contract for the construction of a public building at Actonvale, Quebec?
2. What is the total cost of said construction to date, including all extras?
3. What was the cost of the installation of electric lights in said building?
4. What is the total amount paid for lighting, heating and maintenance generally to date?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. $10,250.
2. Actual cost of building including extras $10,760. This does not include cost of site, fittings, heating, tower clock, wiring, superintendence, &c.
3. $425.
4. $2,106.23.

IMPORTATIONS OF BRASS

Mr. STAPLES—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked :

1. How much plate and rod brass, respectively, was imported into Canada during the years 1905, 1906 and 1907?
2. What was the quality of said plate and rods?
3. What was the amount of duty collected?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The importations of the above mentioned articles during the fiscal years 1905, 1906 and the nine months ending March 31, 1907, have been as follows :

Fiscal years.	Brass in rods, bars, in coil or otherwise, not less than 6 feet in length.			Brass in strips, sheets or plates not polished, planished or coated.		
	Cwt.	Value. $	Duty.	Cwt.	Value. $	Duty.
1905	7,784	116,874	Free.	11,010	169,562	Free.
1906	10,589	183,861	Free.	10,912	200,265	Free.
*1907	4,258	29,918	Free.	4,974	98,521	Free.
	3,167	66,255	6,505 15	6,544	122,074	$12,191 80

* These articles placed on dutiable list since November 29, 1906.

Mr. FOSTER. Is 1907 for the nine months.

Mr. PATERSON. I am not quite sure, I suppose it is the fiscal year.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—TRURO BUILDINGS.

Mr. STANFIELD asked :

1. What were the names of the tenderers and the prices of tenders received for car cleaners' building and sand house at Truro?
2. What were the different prices per cubic yard, brook work, for the removal of gravel, concrete abutment and stone masonry?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I understand in my department that my hon. friend has got a reply to that question and was going to move that it be discharged.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

RIFLE RANGE AT CHARLOTTETOWN.

Mr. DANIEL asked :

1. From whom did the government recently purchase land for the rifle range at Charlottetown?
2. What was the purchase price paid each owner and when paid?
3. What is the extent of the land purchased for the range proper?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for Minister of Militia and Defence) :

1 and 2. Land has been purchased from the following for the purposes of a rifle range at Charlottetown, P.E.I.: Alex. B. and Isabel Warburton, 26 acres—purchase price $13,035, paid May 21, 1906. John F. Curtis, 14 8-10 acres—purchase price $740, paid December 13, 1906. The Beazley Estate, 75 9-10 acres—purchase price $4,527, paid December 13,1906.

3. Answered by the above.

STATIONERY SUPPLIES FOR MILITIA AND MARINE DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. NORTHRUP—by Mr. Blain—asked :

What sum has been paid to, or is owing to, or charged by, (a) any person, firm or company, (b) the King's Printer, or any other department, for the books, stationery and other supplies ordered for the Department of Militia and Defence and Marine and Fisheries, respectively, in consequence of the investigations and recommendations of Mr. Falconer and his associations?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

(a) $2,659.04 has been paid by the Department of Marine and Fisheries through the Government Printing Bureau to Messrs. Beauchemin Co., Ltd., of Montreal, for loose leaf book supplies ; and

(b) $257.13 to the Government Stationery Office for books, stationery and other supplies, in consequence of the investigations and recommendations of Mr. Falconer and his associates.

The Department of Marine and Fisheries does not owe to, nor has been charged anything else by (a) any person, firm or company, (b) the King's Printer or any other department, in this matter.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for Minister of Militia). As far as the Militia Department is concerned, nothing has been paid.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC—CONTRACTS.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What contracts and for what mileage, and the price at which each have been let, upon the eastern and western sections of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway?
2. What is the date of each contract, and the period set for completion?
3. What is the estimated cost of the unlet portions?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). May I ask my hon. friend if he means the mountain or prairie section of the Grand Trunk Pacific proper or the Transcontinental Railway from Moncton ?

Mr. FOSTER. I mean the whole thing.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will get all the information. We define one as the Grand Trunk and the other as the Transcontinental Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. I will remember that in future.

GOVERNMENT SECURITY FOR DOMINION NOTE CIRCULATION AND SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS.

Mr. MARSHALL—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. What sums have the government on deposit in gold as security for the Dominion notes issued by them for circulation in this country?
2. What sums have the government on deposit in Imperial Guaranteed Bonds as security for Dominion notes issued by them for circulation in this country?
3. Have the government any gold or Imperial Guaranteed Bonds on deposit as security for the money deposited in the Government Savings Banks and the Post Office Saving Banks?
4. If so, how much of each kind?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1. $33,571,375 in gold.
2. £400,000 Imperial guaranteed debenture.
3. Yes, gold.
4. $6,100,204 in gold.

BAYONETS FOR THE ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

1. Has a contract been made by the Department of Militia and Defence for the supplying of bayonets for the Ross rifle?
2. If so, with whom has the contract been made?
3. Has a contract, agreement, or order for bayonets been submitted to council by the Minister of Militia and Defence?
4. On what date was the recommendation to council submitted?
5. What is the date of the minute in council?
6. Has an order in council been passed? If so, on what date?
7. What is the price the Department of Militia and Defence proposes to pay for the bayonets?
8. Are payments to be made on delivery or on progress estimates?
9. How many bayonets will be contracted for, what will be the terms of delivery, and where will the bayonets be manufactured?
10. Has the company with whom the contract is to be made a factory or building in which the bayonets are to be manufactured?
11. If not, will one be built, and how long a time will be required for construction?
12. Has the site been acquired for this factory? If so, where and under what terms or conditions?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for Minister of Militia and Defence). The matter is under consideration.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—QUESTIONS IN DISPUTE.

Mr. BARKER—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Are there any matters in dispute or question between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the government, or the National Transcontinental Railway Commission, respecting the route or the right of way or the works of construction, or cost thereof, upon the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway?
2. What is the nature of such disputes or questions, if any?
3. Has the consideration or settlement of any such disputes or questions been postponed or suspended? If so, at whose request, and until what time or event?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

There is no matter in dispute or question between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the National Transcontinental Railway Company respecting the route, or the right-of-way, or the works of construction, or the cost thereof, upon the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway.

SHIPMENT OF STORES TO LIGHTHOUSES.

Mr. J. D. REID—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Did the Department of Marine and Fisheries, during the summer of 1907, arrange with Messrs. Halliday Bros., of Quebec, for the shipment by steamship ' Restigouche,' of stores, to certain lighthouses on the lower St. Lawrence?
2. If so, on what date or dates were said stores taken on at Quebec?
3. What was the rate paid per ton, and upon how many tons was freight paid?
4. Who vouched for the full quantity being placed on board?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes.
2. August 21 to 23.
3. $5 per ton for freight ; $2 per ton for landing ; Heath Point, 314 tons ; Bird Rocks, 23 tons ; Cape Anguille, 150 tons.
4. P. E. Parent, the resident engineer at Quebec for the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

DREDGING AT WIARTON.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Was any dredging performed at Wiarton in the year 1907?
2. If so, how much was paid therefor, and were tenders invited for the work?
3. How many persons tendered therefor, who performed the work, what was the price paid and the material dredged ?
4. Was any formal request made for said work ? If so, by whom ?
5. Who was the inspector of work, and on whose recommendation was he appointed?

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. Yes.
2. (a) $25,026.60 ; (b) Yes.
3. (a) Two ; (b) A. F. Bowman ; (c) 20 cents per cubic yard ; (d) 124,200 cubic yards of clay, sand and boulders.
4. Yes, the municipal council of Wiarton.
5. Thos. Dargarvel. I am unable to state what recommendations were made to the then minister, but am informed that Mr. John Tolmie, M.P., was one of those who ad-

vised the minister as to the experience and integrity of Mr. Dargarvel, and I presume it was either wholly or largely upon Mr. Tolmie's advice that he was appointed inspector.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the other tenderer's name ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman did not ask for the other tenderer's name and I have not the information here.

THE COASTING TRADE.

Mr. STANFIELD asked :

1. Under existing legislation can Norwegian ships which are British built change their flags and engage in coastwise trade in Canada?
2. After January 1, 1909, is there any existing legislation which will prevent Norwegian ships, which are British built, changing their flags and engaging in coastwise trade in Canadian waters?
3. Under existing legislation can foreign-built ships which are British-owned engage in coastwise trade in Canadian waters, by obtaining a license from the Minister of Customs without reference to the Governor in Council?
4. After January 1, 1909, is there any existing legislation which will prevent foreign-built ships British-owned from obtaining a license from the Minister of Customs without reference to the Governor in Council, permitting such ships engaging in coastwise trade in Canadian waters?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1 and 2. Under existing legislation Norwegian ships which are British built may become British registered ships and may then engage in coastwise trade in Canada, both prior to and after 1st January, 1909.

3 and 4. Under the law respecting the coasting trade of Canada, foreign built ships which have been British registered since 1st September, 1902, are required to pay 25 per cent duty before obtaining a license to engage in the coasting trade. Such license may be issued by the Minister of Customs under authority of statute without order in council. There is no legislation changing these provisions as to payment of duty and issue of license after 1st January, 1909.

BELLEVILLE HARBOUR.

Mr. PORTER—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Has the government authorized or permitted in any way the commissioners of Belleville harbour to issue bonds or debentures or any other form of security upon the harbour or revenue thereof? If so, in what form, for what amount, and when?
2. How were such bonds, debentures, or other securities, if any, disposed of, to whom, upon what terms, for what purpose, and what rate of interest do they bear?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes, approval by the Governor General in Council on August 16, 1906. $12,000 at 5 per cent. 15 years.
2. Twelve debentures of $1,000 each dated October 1, 1906. Interest payable each year October 1. Principal payable October 1, 1921. Sold to Mrs. M. N. McKenna, 6 debentures, No. 1 to 6; Rev. R. N. Adams, 2 debentures, Nos. 7 and 8 ; W. J. Andrews, 2 debentures, Nos. 9 and 10 ; Quinlan & Robertson, 2 debentures, Nos. 11 and 12. Interest, 5 per cent. Sold for cash and at par. They were issued for the purpose of paying balance due for building the revetment wall.

HOMESTEAD LOCATION OF FRED HINTZ.

Mr. PORTER—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Has the person appointed to investigate the location of Fred. Hintz for the northeast quarter of section 32, township 36, range 16, west second meridian, and the alleged purchase by him or some one for him, of the rights of Peter Sorenson as a homesteader of said lands, yet made a report thereon?
2. Will such report be brought down, and when?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Homestead Inspector Gibson was instructed on the 6th of March, 1908 to investigate and report. The report has not yet come to hand.
2. The report will be brought down without delay after it reaches the department.

IMPORTATION OF REGISTERED CATTLE FROM THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. CHRISTIE asked :

1. How many registered cattle were imported from the United States to Canada duty free during the years 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907, respectively?
2. How many registered horses were imported from the United States to Canada duty free during the years 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907, respectively?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. Cattle for improvement of stock imported into Canada from the United States (as per home consumption entries) :

Fiscal year ending 30th June,		1904, 765
" " " "		1905, 478
" " " "		1906, 423
Nine months ending March 31,		1907, 151

2. Horses for improvement of stock imported into Canada from the United States, registered or found on inspection to have the properties and qualifications essential to improvement of breed (as per home consumption entries) :

Fiscal year ending 30th June,		1904 551
" " " "		1905, 606
" " " "		1906, 631
Nine months ending March 31,		1907, 538

COUNCIL OF SIX NATIONS.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. Has the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs refused an interview to a deputation of the chiefs of the council of the Six Nations? If so, on what grounds has this refusal been based?

2. Has the government refused to the Six Nations an inspection of or a copy of certain petitions or memorials from an association known as the Indian Rights Association or Warriors' Association?

3. What are the matters in negotiation or difference between the council of the Six Nations and the Department of Indian Affairs?

4. Why does not the Department of Indian Affairs assent to or recognize the request of the Six Nations for an inspection or copy of certain petitions or memorials?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The Superintendent General has not refused to receive a deputation of the chiefs of the council of the Six Nations, but has signified his willingness to receive them at any time it might suit them to come to Ottawa.

2. The department did not refuse to send the Six Nations council a copy of the petition or memorial from the Indian Rights Association ; it refused to send a copy of the names of the subscribers, as these were very numerous and it was not understood that there would be any use in doing so.

3. (a) The loan system. They state that the present loan of $20,000 is insufficient, as they desire to improve the sanitary conditions and build a better class of houses.

(b) Investigations. They are not satisfied with the present system of holding investigations, especially as regards the cost of witnesses.

(c) Hereditary council. Some of the chiefs are in favour of simply improving present council, but others favour elective system.

(d) Independence of council. They think their liberties restricted by the department.

(e) Provincial grants. They derive no benefit from either the Dominion or provincial grants to the county of Brant.

4. As stated in answer to question No. 2, the department did not refuse to send a copy of a certain petition from the Indian Rights Association, but said that it did not see any use in sending a list of the subscribers. This list is 13 feet, 7 inches long, and contains some 380 names.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

A copy of all correspondence, telegrams, reports and recommendations in possession of the government, or any member or official thereof, with respect to improved railway service on the Belfast and Murray Harbour Branch Railway.—Mr. A. Martin (Queens).

A copy of reports and correspondence relating to Aurel Mercier, carboneur, on the Soulanges canal, who was killed in the performance of his duties in the summer of 1907; also a copy of the report and correspondence relating to an accident which happened to Madame Rock Bradley in attempting to cross the canal on the canal bridges in the summer of 1907.—Mr. Boyer.

Copy of all the correspondence exchanged between the government and Messrs. T. B. Mongenais, Hugh McMillan and others, relating to dredging work done in the River Rigaud, formerly the River Graisse, up to the year 1890. A copy of the reports and correspondence relating to the construction or purchase of the Graham wharf. A copy of the report and correspondence relating to the dredging done at Como up to 1900. A copy of the reports and correspondence relating to the dredging done at Vaudreuil Village, and also relating to the construction and repair of the wharf situated in that village since 1867. And also, a copy of the report and correspondence relaing to the deepening of the River St. Louis at Beauharnois.—Mr. Boyer.

Return showing the number of locomotives on the Intercolonial Railway out of service on the 31st December, 1907, and the date of purchase of each engine out of service, from whom purchased, type of engine, passenger or freight, haulage capacity, when in efficient state of repair, when put out of service, and when last used.—Mr. J. D. Reid—by Mr. Foster.

Return showing the number of locomotives in service on the Intercolonial Railway on the several Sundays in the months of October, November and December, 1907, hauling freight trains.—Mr. J. D. Reid—by Mr. Foster.

Return showing the number of trains, both freight and passenger, on the Intercolonial Railway breaking down or detained from defects in engines during the months of October, November and December, 1907, and the causes of such defects.—Mr. J. D. Reid—by Mr. Foster.

Return showing the number of tons of new steel rails lying along the line of the Intercolonial Railway unused, date when purchased, if required, and when to be used.—Mr. J. D. Reid—by Mr. Foster.

Copy of all correspondence, reports, telegrams, resolutions, petitions, &c., in possession of the government or any member or official thereof, respecting the demand of the Charlottetown Board of Trade or any person in Prince Edward Island, for federal legislation to give sailing vessels and steamers equal rights in their proper loading turns at the coal ports in Nova Scotia and Cape Breton.—Mr. A. Martin (Queens).

Copy of the report of the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, and the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries in reference to their meeting with delegates of the boards of trade of Prince Edward Island at Charlottetown in June last, to take into consideration, the removal of the heavy freight and passenger rates on the Prince Edward Island Railway and the Intercolonial Railway, and on freight and passengers to and from Prince Edward Island. Also all correspondence, telegrams, &c., in possession of the govern-

ment or any member or official relating thereto, and other questions discussed at said meeting.—Mr. A. Martin (Queens).

Return showing how many persons have been employed by the government since 1896 who are or were residents of Brome county, province of Quebec, giving their names and the salaries received.—Mr. Clements—by Mr. Blain.

Return showing: 1. The number of men taken into the service of the Intercolonial Railway in the province of New Brunswick during the month of January, 1908.

2. The number of men taken into the service of the Intercolonial Railway in the province of New Brunswick during the month of February, 1908.

3. The names of the persons so taken into the service, where were they employed, and the nature of the work assigned to them.

4. What positions were filled, and by whom these duties had been previously performed.

5. The number taken into the service during the corresponding months of 1907.

6. The total number of employees on the Moncton pay-roll for the month of January, 1908.

7. The total number of employees on the Moncton pay-roll for the month of February, 1908.—Mr. Daniel.

Copy of all letters, telegrams, memoranda and correspondence of every kind between the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or any officer of his department, and any person or persons, respecting the purchase of supplies for the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Quebec, St. John, New Brunswick, and Halifax, during the years 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895 and 1896.—Mr. Johnston.

Return showing: 1. Any government lands near New Westminster, British Columbia, sold to one J. W. Patterson, and, if sold, by what department of the government.

2. Whether they were Indian or military reserve lands, or either of them.

3. The prices Mr. Patterson paid for said lands, if any were sold to him.

4. The date of such sale or sales.—Mr. J. D. Reid—by Mr R. L. Borden.

Return showing what coal lands were granted to sundry persons through the agency of P. E. Lessard, of Edmonton, together with copies of all letters, papers and documents relating to the application, sale, lease or cancellation of the same. All from the general file for the group of claims, and not the special file for each section.—Mr. Ames.

Return showing what coal lands in townships 41 and 42, ranges 17 and 18, west of the fifth meridian, were granted through the agency of McGiverin & Haydon, of Ottawa, together with a copy of all letters, documents and papers relating to the application, sale, lease or cancellation of same. All from the general file for the group of claims, and not the special file for each section.—Mr. Ames.

Return to bring up to date the information contained in sessional paper, No. 207 of 1906-7, presented to the House on the 12th April, 1907, in respect of certain fishing leases.—Mr. Ames.

Return showing what coal lands are now or have been at any any time owned, controlled, leased or operated in townships 53 and 54, range 7, west of the fifth meridian, by the Alberta Development Company, Limited, together with a copy of all applications, correspondence, deeds of sale and other documents in connection therewith.—Mr. Ames.

Return showing what coal lands in townships 9 and 10, ranges 21, 22 and 23, west of the fourth meridian, were granted through the agency of J. W. Bettes (or his firm), of Winnipeg, Manitoba, together with a copy of all letters, documents and papers relating to the application, sale, lease or cancellation of the same. All from the general file for the group of claims, and not the special file for each section.—Mr. Ames.

A copy of all petitions, memorials, documents, correspondence and papers touching any matters, transactions or negotiations between the Department of Indian Affairs and the council of the Six Nations Reserve, or the chief or chiefs of the said council or the Indian Rights Association or Warriors' Association, from the 1st day of January, 1906, to the present time.—Mr. Lake.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—TRAIN SERVICE.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville)—by Mr. Foster—moved for:

Return showing the number of hours late arriving, and explanation of the District Superintendent in each case, of express trains Nos. 33 and 34 between Halifax and Montreal, and Nos. 19, 20, 85 and 86 between Halifax and Sydney, for the months of October, November and December, 1907, on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. I agreed with the hon. member for Grenville to let some of those motions go through without discussion, and some I said I would ask to stand. In his absence I do not know which are to stand.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Grenville thought perhaps I might persuade the Minister of Railways to let them all through.

Mr. GRAHAM. Let this motion stand.

Mr. FOSTER. We will have to drop it and serve notice that before the estimates go through we will ask for the information.

Mr. GRAHAM. It has been asked for in an indirect way in other places.

Motion dropped.

THE CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM.

On the notice of motion:

That the Civil Service System of Canada should be based on merit and character alone, and the appointments thereto should be made only from candidates whose competency has been established through open competitive examinations, conducted under a non-partisan Civil Service Commission.

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to drop this, inasmuch as the report of the Civil Service

Commission has not yet been printed; but I will bring it up in a different way.

Motion dropped.

On the notice of motion:

That in the interests of political morality and good government it is desirable that party patronage should be eliminated from the administration of all federal departments in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. The same remark that I have made with reference to the other resolution applies to this.

Motion dropped.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.) moved:

That in the opinion of this House the names 'Intercolonial Railway' and 'Prince Edward Island Railway' should be dropped, and the name 'Interprovincial Railway' substituted therefor.

That the government system of railways should be considered as one entity in the keeping of accounts and in all other respects.

That the ferry service across the Straits of Northumberland should be owned and managed by the railway department, winter and summer, as the ferry service across the Straits of Canso is now, and as the ferry service across the Gulf of Georgia between Vancouver and Victoria is owned and managed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the resolution practically explains itself to those who know the objects I have in view and are acquainted with the local conditions; but as you, Mr. Speaker, are not familiar with those conditions, I think a few explanations will be in order.

The first paragraph relates to the name of the government railway. While it is not very important by what name a thing shall be known so long as the name is fairly descriptive of the thing, and so long as there is no danger of confounding it with something else that is similar, yet I think everybody will admit that the name Intercolonial applied to a railway that extends across three provinces, and will, if it is built, of which there is some probability, to the great lakes, and perhaps finally reach the Pacific ocean, is certainly not a suitable name. We are no longer a group of colonies; we are a federation of provinces, and the name of our one government railway should not, I think, be a misnomer that belies our actual status. Whether Interprovincial would be a better name or not I do not know. Perhaps Canadian Government Railway would be the correct name. There is a real business reason why the present name should be changed. The fact that the initials are the same as those of the Illinois Central Railway has resulted in cars going astray and being used by other railways, and thus becoming lost to the government of Canada. In consequence of that I think the department is at present making some change in the lettering of the cars. This goes to show that there is a necessity for a change of name.

If the other two paragraphs of the resolution, which are of more importance from my point of view, should commend themselves to the House and the government, it would be more important still that the name should be changed. Since Prince Edward Island joined the confederation and became a part of the Dominion of Canada, it has been customary to consider the two railways, the Prince Edward Island Railway and the Intercolonial Railway, not only as two separate systems, but as antagonistic systems in some respects. I do not think that is a proper condition of affairs. In my judgment the Prince Edward Island Railway ought to be an integral portion, a branch, a feeder, of the Intercolonial Railway, and not be considered in any respect a foreign road. This works to the disadvantage of the Island railway. There has grown up in the public mind for some years the opinion that the Intercolonial Railway should at least pay operating expenses. This opinion has been given voice to in parliament, in the press, and throughout the country, and I have no doubt that it has impressed itself upon the management of that road. At the same time, there appears to be an idea that the Prince Edward Island Railway never did pay, never was expected to pay, and never will pay its operating expenses. The result of that is, so far as I can ascertain, that the management has diverted traffic that would naturally go to the Island railway, to the Intercolonial at the expense of the Island railway. I do not know whether that is the reason this discrimination takes place; but that there is real discrimination I think I can prove to the House. Freight originating on the Intercolonial Railway at Lévis and at Montreal to come over the Intercolonial Railway, and destined for Prince Edward Island, is hauled to Pictou for the same rate that it is hauled to Point du Chêne, although the distance to Pictou is 160 miles greater. There might be some reason for that from a railway point of view, because Pictou is a distributing point, and railway men make very little extra charge for a considerably greater distance so long as the freight is loaded on the cars, and other cars are going in the same direction. For all points on the Prince Edward Island Railway, if the freight crossed at Poine du Chêne and Summerside, the haulage would be very considerably less. But owing to the freight going by Pictou, the Intercolonial gets nearly all the hauling, the Prince Edward Island Railway very little. Consequently the earnings of the Island railway are smaller than they otherwise would be. I have the figures here, and I will submit just a few. The rates from Lévis and Montreal to Charlotte-

town via Pictou are exactly the same as they are to Summerside via Point du Chêne; but freight for Charlottetown going by way of Point du Chêne is charged considerably more. The rates from Montreal to Charlottetown via Point du Chêne are: First class, 64 cents per 100 lbs.; second class, 56 cents ; third class, 45 cents; fourth class, 34 cents; fifth class, 30 cents; sixth class, 28 cents. The same goods going by Pictou pay: First class, 56 cents; second class, 49 cents; third class, 39 cents; fourth class, 29 cents; fifth class, 26 cents; sixth class, 24 cents per 100 pounds. The difference would be on the first class 8 cents; second class, 7 cents; third class, 6 cents; fourth class, 5 cents; fifth class, 4 cents; sixth class, 4 cents, although the distance is 112 miles less.

From points west of Montreal, for instance, from Toronto, the discrimination would be still greater. From Toronto to Charlottetown via Point Deschênes and Summerside, the rates are on first class 86 cents ; second class 75 cents ; third class 64 cents ; fourth class 54 cents ; fifth class 44 cents ; sixth class 42 cents ; seventh class 33 cents ; eighth class 33 cents. And from Toronto to Charlottetown via Pictou, first class 74 cents ; second class 64 cents ; third class 55 cents ; fourth class 46 cents ; fifth class 38 cents ; sixth class 36 cents ; seventh class 28 cents ; and eighth class 28 cents. The difference against the Island road is therefore on first class goods 12 cents ; second class 11 cents ; third class 9 cents ; fourth class 8 cents ; fifth class 6 cents ; sixth class 6 cents ; seventh class 5 cents ; and eighth class 5 cents.

It may be said by railway and business men that freight destined for Charlottetown going via Pictou would save one handling and that if it went by Summerside it would have to be loaded on the cars, which would have to be taken into consideration. But that would not account for the large difference in the rates I have pointed out. Take freight destined for other points where the handling is just the same. On freight destined for Georgetown and Souris there is still a large discrimination although the handling is exactly the same. Let me just quote the figures. From Toronto to Georgetown via Point Deschênes and Summerside, on first class 92 cents ; second class 80 cents ; third class 69 cents ; fourth class 57 cents ; fifth class 47 cents ; sixth class 44 cents ; seventh class 35 cents ; and eighth class 36 cents. From Toronto to Georgetown via Pictou and Charlottetown, on first class 86 cents ; second class 75 cents ; third class 64 cents ; fourth class 54 cents ; fifth class 44 cents ; sixth class 42 cents ; seventh class 33 cents ; and eighth class 33 cents ; per 100 pounds. Or a difference against the Prince Edward Island Railway, with the same handling and labour, as follows : First class 6 cents ; second class 5 cents ; third class 5 cents ; fourth class 3 cents ; fifth class 3 cents ; sixth class 2 cents ; seventh class 2 cents ; eighth class 3 cents, while the distance from Toronto to Georgetown via Point Deschênes and Summerside is 122 miles less than via Pictou. And the difference to Souris is from one to two cents per 100 pounds greater still.

The only reason I can see for routing freight in such cases via Pictou is to give the Intercolonial Railway practically all the earnings and to give the Island road as little as possible. That is not fair to the Island road. While it makes no difference to the public purse, it certainly tells against the Island road since the accounts are kept separate, so that when we come to the government and ask for any concessions we are met, in one form or another, by this deficit on the Island railway. It may not be brought up in all cases but you have to face it. In speaking to ministers, and very often to private members of the House this deficit is a thing of which all complain, and I would rather explain it in this general way than try to explain it to every member of the House or minister. This is one of the reasons why I think the Prince Edward Island Railway ought to be an integral portion of the government system both in the keeping of accounts and in all other respects. That would relieve the Intercolonial Railway officials from the necessity of making this discrimination, and I presume it must take some of their time and attention to make these changes in the routing of freight. But while the accounts are kept separate, this discrimination is absolutely unfair to the Island railway.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand by the hon. gentleman's motion that he would change the letters which to-day designate the Intercolonial Railway. Instead of Intercolonial Railway he would call it interprovincial or some other name.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Or the Canadian government railway.

Mr. BERGERON. Has my hon. friend ever examined what would be the cost of making that change?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I have not, but I understand that the department are under the necessity of making some change in order that the Intercolonial cars may not get mixed up with the cars of the Illinois Central Railway. I understand they are making some change now, and perhaps the loss of a few cars would be sufficient to pay for the change. The next paragraph in the resolution I propose reads in this way :

That the ferry service across the Straits of Northumberland should be owned and managed by the Railway Department, winter and summer, as the ferry service across the Straits of Canso is now, and as the ferry service across the Gulf of Georgia between Vancouver and Victoria is owned and managed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

We have a rather peculiar system of transportation to and from Prince Edward Island. I do not think such an anomalous system would be established if we had to establish it to-day. It grew up little by little from the time of confederation. The Railway Department owns and operates some 1,500 miles of railway on one side of the Straits, on the mainland and some 270 miles on the other side on the Island. The Marine and Fisheries Department own and operate a ferry service during the winter season, when the service is most difficult and least profitable. The steam navigation company owns and operates a ferry service during the summer when it is least expensive and most profitable and does the work well. Two departments of the government and a private company are called in to do this work ; it is a tripartite system. If we were about to establish a system I am sure that we would not adopt that plan to-day. No board of business men having to control and operate a railway on both sides of the straits and having to maintain the ferry—because that is in the terms of confederation—would continue the present system any longer than they could possibly avoid it. If the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Northern were placed in such a position and had to maintain the ferry service according to their charter, I am quite satisfied that if they maintained and operated it in the winter, they would also maintain and operate it in the summer, and the reasons which would lead a railway corporation to do that would certainly, in my judgment, be sufficient to cause the government to do it.

Another reason is that the Marine and Fisheries Department is not, and never will be a carrying or transportation department ; that is not its business. On the other hand the Railway Department was established for that very purpose, is pre-eminently a carrying department and is in a better position to carry on that business than any other department of the government service. If one department of the government service maintained and operated this ferry service throughout the year, it would simplify matters greatly. For instance, the captains and crews could be transferred immediately from one set of boats to the other, there would be no interregnum and no delay. As it is now the Marine Department has to keep its captains and principal officers on hand while the boats of the Steam Navigation Company are in service, in order to have them when its boats resume, and the Steam Navigation Company has also to maintain its staff during the winter. This necessarily means increased cost which the country or the business men in the end have to pay.

Again there is the very serious disadvantage that it is now practically impossible in shipping between the mainland and Prince Edward Island points to obtain through bills of lading from the point of origin to the point of destination, and to know in advance exactly what the freight will be. There are nearly always more or less back charges and that hampers business and is very annoying. Again it is almost impossible in case of loss or damage to goods in transit, to fix responsibility upon either department or upon the company, as they throw the blame one upon the other so that business men who have had experience, having found it nearly impossible to obtain redress, would rather not take up a claim, unless it is a large one, owing to the difficulty and delay in securing an adjustment. If one department of the government service had charge of the whole transportation system there, this serious difficulty would be obviated and we would like to see this under the Railway Department.

Freight rates are much higher to and from the island than they are in other sections of the country, sometimes more than double, and under present conditions we find it very difficult to compete with more favoured shippers. We feel that simply because we are an island we should not be treated in that way. We contribute our share towards the upbuilding of the transportation facilities of the whole country, towards the upbuilding of the great ocean ports on the Atlantic and on the Pacific and yet when we come to use these transportation facilities and ports we have to pay more than any other persons in the Dominion of Canada. As a matter of fact the business men of the maritime provinces, of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, who know the conditions, when they have come together and considered this matter, have expressed as strong views on it as we do on the island. Perhaps I could not do better than read the resolution of the maritime board of trade, passed at its thirteenth meeting in the city of St. John last summer in regard to this matter. As I have said, these are men who know the conditions exactly and who certainly have no reason, beyond the desire to see fair-play to all Canadians, to express an opinion. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the trade of Prince Edward Island has been seriously handicapped for many years past, owing to the difficulties of navigation and the excessive freight rates demanded by reason of three short-haul freight rates between points on Prince Edward Island and points on the mainland;

And whereas, the freight rates prevailing to and from Prince Edward Island are altogether disproportionate with those prevailing from Montreal eastward, as will be seen from the following:

From Montreal to St. John, 9 cents per 100 pounds, plus 1½ cents for elevation; distance, 735 miles.

From Montreal to Halifax, 9 cents per 100 pounds, plus 1½ cents; distance, 832 miles.

From Montreal to Sydney, 16½ cents per 100 pounds: distance, 977 miles.

Regulation rates on grain in carloads from Tignish to St. John, 26 cents per 100 pounds; distance, 428 miles.

From Tignish to Halifax, 23 cents per 100 pounds; distance, 309 miles.

From Tignish to Sydney, 26 per 100 pounds; distance, 380 miles.

And whereas, the province of Prince Edward Island, being a part of the Dominion of Canada, has to contribute its full share of the cost of maintenance of all government-owned and subsidized railways and steamers, should, therefore, be entitled to equal privileges, mile per mile, with the upper provinces, over all such railways and steamers, due allowance being made for extra handling of freight from cars to and from steamers;

Resolved, that in the opinion of this board, the government be and is hereby requested to so equalize the three short-hauls system of transportation of Prince Edward Island with the continuous haul of the other provinces, with which it is in competition;

And further resolved, that Prince Edward Island be placed on the same basis as to import and export rates to and from ports outside of Canada as are accorded to the other provinces of the Dominion.

That is all we ask for, Mr. Speaker, and what we ask for appears to us to be a fair deal, and it appears to the businessmen of the maritime provinces to be a fair deal. I do not think it is too much to ask. I do not know why the Intercolonial should not maintain the ferries and these highways. Perhaps there would be a deficit. The earnings might not be so great as they are now if the rates were reduced; and again they might be, because in all probability a greater amount of freight would go over the Island Railway and over the Intercolonial. But even if there were not a greater amount of freight, I do not think we should be placed at a disadvantage. Cape Breton is an island also, and it has exactly the same rates, mile for mile, as they have on the mainland. Of course the straits of Canso are not as wide as the straits of Northumberland, but I presume that should not make any difference. But if it does, I find that the island of Vancouver, separated from the mainland by the gulf of Georgia, is placed on exactly the same footing as the mainland in regard to transportation rates, and that is done by the Canadian Pacific Railway, said to be a soulless corporation. It is said that corporations are not doing business for fun, so it must appear to them to be fair, and I suppose they do it from a business point of view. Now if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company gives people living on the island of Vancouver the same passenger and freight rates as they do to people on the mainland east of the Rocky Mountains, as far east as Winnipeg at all events, I can see no good reason why the government operating a transportation line on Prince Edward Island and on the mainland, should not place Prince Edward Island on an equality with the mainland.

Now, Sir, I have given my reasons why I think a change of name of the road would be advantageous. We are no longer, I repeat, a mere colony, we are a confederation of provinces, and our government railway should not by its name belie our actual, our geographical and our historical existence. I have given reasons why I think there should not be a separate accounting for the Prince Edward Island Railway and the Intercolonial; at all events, if there is to be a separate accounting there should not be discrimination. All freight destined for points on Prince Edward Island should go over the island road, and the island road should have all the earnings that are coming to it. when the distance by the island road is shorter than by the Intercolonial via Pictou. Further, I say that we should have one branch of the government service owning, operating and maintaining the ferry service on the straits of Northumberland. For the reasons I have pointed out, it would simplify matters and reduce the cost. I am satisfied that a board of business men considering this matter would recommend it, and would bring it into operation just as soon as it could be done.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queen's, P.E.I.) I am sorry there is not a fuller House on this occasion when my hon. friend from Kings, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Hughes) has brought up this important question. I am sorry that so few ministers are in their places ; I am sorry the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not here, and that the Prime Minister is absent. This is a question of great importance, both to Prince Edward Island and to the whole of Canada. I have no criticism to make of the manner in which the hon. gentleman has treated the subject, but I doubt if the resolution he has proposed would have the desired effect, or would carry out the tenor of his speech. I do not see why changing the name of the Intercolonial would cheapen the rates down to Prince Edward Island. I suppose this government has lots of money to spend, and I think on mature consideration it would involve an expenditure of a quarter of a million dollars to change the name on all the cars from the Intercolonial to the Interprovincial Railway. Even when they had accomplished that great feat of calling the Intercolonial the Interprovincial Railway, I wonder what effect it would have on those exhorbitant freight rates which I am proud to see my hon. friend now realizes. It took him a long time to see them. I never heard him say a word of criticism on the government in keeping these freights up, but now he has obtained new light. He has always been very quiet in this House, and I am proud that he is now waking up. I do not think he has overdrawn the picture, in fact I do not think he has drawn it quite so dark as it is. I have some figures before

me similar to those the hon. gentleman has quoted. I have a letter here written a year or two ago which I will read :

Office of the General Traffic Manager,
Moncton, New Brunswick, May 15, 1906.

D. Pottinger, Esq.,
General Manager, Moncton, New Brunswick.

Dear Sir,—Referring to your letter under date of May 12, asking for some information called for by the House:

I inclose you herewith freight tariffs of the Prince Edward Island Railway, one the maximum general freight tariff in effect prior to January 1, 1906, and the other the maximum freight mileage tariff applicable after January 1, 1906. I also give you the rates on grain for export last winter.

The House is rather thin, but I am sure there are some hon. members here who will appreciate these figures and who will see the position in which the province is placed with regard to freight rates. This is the statement that was sent to Mr. Pottinger by Mr. Tiffin :

From Montreal to St. John, 9 cents per 100 pounds, plus 1½ cents per 100 pounds for elevation; distance 735 miles.

That is, you could take 100 pounds from Montreal to St. John, a distance of 735 miles, for 9 cents.

From Montreal to Halifax, 9 cents per 100 pounds, plus 1½ cents per 100 pounds for elevation; distance 832 miles.

From Montreal to Sydney, 16½ cents per 100 pounds; distance 977 miles.

I might add, however, that there would be no grain for export via Sydney.

In very sharp contrast to that, this letter quotes the rates in my province :

Regular rates on grain in carloads from Tignish to St. John, 26 cents per 100 pounds; distance 432 miles.

Regular rates on grain in carloads from Tignish to Halifax, 23 cents per 100 pounds; distance 309 miles.

Regular rates on grain in carloads from Tignish to Sydney, 26 cents per 100 pounds; distance 380 miles.

I want the Minister of Railways to take note of this. You can take from Montreal to St. John, 735 miles, 100 pounds for 9 cents, but from my province, from Tignish to St. John, only half the distance, you charge 26 cents per 100 pounds. Those are your railway rates. Do you suppose that the people of that province do not feel the injustice under which they labour in having to pay these very exorbitant rates? They are not only excessive; they are exorbitant, and I do not think the Minister of Railways, a gentleman for whom we have great respect and who is new in his position, would like to tyrannize over that small province the way it has been tyrannized over for years. I think it behooves him to do something to remove that great injustice. From Tignish to Halifax, a distance of 309 miles, the rate is 23 cents. How fair is that to the island province? You pay 23 cents for 309 miles when you only pay 9 cents for over 800 miles on the Intercolonial Railway. From Tignish to Sydney it is 26 cents for 380 miles. I do not think that this condition exists for want of bringing it to the attention of the government. Time and time again it has been brought to the attention of the government by the representatives in parliament, by the boards of trade in Prince Edward Island and by the maritime board of trade which meets in Halifax, but no remedy has been provided. It would be useless to quote figures at any greater length here, because if these figures which I have quoted are not sufficient to convince any hon. member or any member of the government I think I might as well give it up. I asked some questions in regard to this matter in the early part of the session and they told me it was under consideration. Well, it has been under consideration for ten years, perhaps twenty years, and we want to know how long that consideration is going to last. Give some decision. I am glad to see that my colleagues are here. I did not know that the question was to be brought up for discussion to-day. I have piles of figures, but I do not think it is necessary to go any further because I have proved my case up to the hilt and I hope at last, now that the hon. member for Kings, P.E.I., (Mr. Hughes) has wakened up that he will impress this matter upon the government and do what he can to assist us in securing the removal of this injustice.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.). Like my colleague I did not know that this matter was coming up this afternoon, and I am therefore quite unprepared to discuss it. It is a matter that has engaged the attention of every farmer and of every business man not only of Prince Edward Island, but of the maritime provinces. It is a matter which has engaged the attention of the people of Prince Edward Island and those who deal with them. My colleague (Mr. A. Martin) has stated that the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Hughes) had wakened up to the fact that this was a matter of some importance, because every time that the matter of transportation has been brought up in the House he has either ridiculed members on this side of the House coming from that province or he has pointed out to the government that it was simply a grievance they were using for political purposes. Now, he has come out of his shell and he sees, with the rest of the province, that it is a very important matter and one which should receive the immediate attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) and of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur). Last year a commission including, I think, the deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, the deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries and

certain other gentlemen, visited Prince Edward Island, and when they went to meet the board of trade and other business men in the city of Charlottetown, they promised that the matter would receive the immediate attention of the government. But nothing has been done. I want to direct the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to an answer which was given to me by himself a few days ago in this House, and I would ask him to compare the rates for transportation in force on the rest of the Intercolonial Railway, because I take it that the Prince Edward Island Railway is still a part of the Intercolonial Railway, with those charged on freight shipped from Prince Edward Island. A return was brought down a few days ago showing that it costs 11 cents to take 100 pounds of freight from Charlottetown to Pictou, and in the summer time it costs from Halifax to Pictou 20 cents. But when the summer boats went off the Intercolonial Railway increased the tariff to 24 cents per 100 pounds. Why is this? Why are the people of Prince Edward Island asked to pay 4 cents per 100 pounds more in the winter than in the summer? To-day if you wish to take 100 pounds of freight from Charlottetown to Halifax, you pay 35 cents for it when you can ship from Montreal to St. John 100 pounds for 9 cents.

Just imagine that it costs for less than 120 miles from Charlottetown to Halifax 35 cents per 100 pounds and for the 735 miles from Montreal to St. John it costs only 9 cents per 100 pounds. Here is a matter which the Minister of Railways, although he is new to his office, should take under his immediate consideration. According to this return which the minister brought down the first class summer and winter rate from Truro to Pictou is 16 cents and Truro is distant about 50 miles from Pictou and about 100 miles from Charlottetown. But for the distance between Truro and Charlottetown you pay 27 cents per 100 pounds. Then, from Amherst the rate is the same both summer and winter. In summer the business for the Island via Moncton goes entirely by way of Pointe du Chêne and when the Pointe du Chêne route is closed it goes by Pictou. The summer rate from Moncton to Charlottetown by way of Pointe du Chêne is 32 cents, and the rate from Moncton to Charlottetown by way of Pictou in the winter time, 197 miles, is enormously high. When navigation closes at Pointe du Chêne the cost by way of Georgetown is 52 cents per 100 pounds to Charlottetown. Just imagine at this date in the history of transportation paying 52 cents for 100 pounds of freight from Moncton to Charlottetown when you can bring that same 100 pounds of freight from Montreal to Sydney, a distance of 977 miles for 16½ cents. Is that a condition of affairs which should exist? Is it any wonder that the population of the maritime provinces is being depleted? Is it any wonder that our population is leaving us when the greater portion almost, of the profit which the farmers of Prince Edward Island should have in their pockets for their products, goes either into the government railways or the government steamboats. This resolution states that the government transportation system down there should be under the control of one department. To-day it is under the control jointly of the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the Department of Railways, but would it make any difference who controls it when they charge 41 cents for 100 pounds of freight for 147 miles from Moncton to Pictou and 11 cents from Pictou to Charlottetown, making 52 cents in all? Is there any use in changing the name of the Intercolonial if these rates are allowed to continue in force? What benefit would it be to the people to change the name and still charge these high rates? There is not the slightest doubt that the Intercolonial is to-day charging more for freight that goes to Prince Edward Island, than any other railway in Canada. You can take goods for almost one-fourth less from Montreal to Sydney over the Canadian Pacific Railway than you can take them from Moncton, N.B., to Charlottetown, P.E.I. Here is a matter which should receive the immediate attention of the government. The hon. gentleman who introduced the resolution states that the government system of railways should be considered as one entity in the keeping of accounts and all other respects. He does not say what the 'all other respects' are. Perhaps it might be beneficial to the government of Canada to have the railway under one system for the keeping of accounts, but what benefit would that be to the people of the province which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) represents? In my opinion there is only one way in which this grievance can be remedied and that is by the government giving their immediate attention to the building of a tunnel between Cape Tormentine, N.B., and Cape Traverse, P.E.I. Then we would have the fulfilment of the terms of the union and we would have one continuous haul, one entity as the member for Kings calls it. We would then have one railway, and you may call it the Interprovincial or the Intercolonial, or anything you like so long as the people of my province receive fair treatment at the hands of the government of Canada. We may be told now that the tunnel question has been brought up here from time to time for a number of years and that justice was not done by previous governments, but the time has come now to do something. If the people did not press for a settlement of this grievance long ago it was their own fault, and as a matter of fact the question of excessive freight rates has never been prominently brought before the government until within the last three or four years. And

since it has been brought to their attention I understand that the officials who went to the Island are treating the Board of Trade and the other gentlemen who are pressing this matter in the province, with almost contempt. Resolutions were passed by the board of trade and were brought before these commissioners who went down there last summer, and notwithstanding the fact that there was a shorthand report of what was said at that meeting by the members of the board of trade and by the commissioners, still a contention exists as to what was said, and also as to what the resolutions were. But we have these resolutions here and they were read in the House not only by the member for Kings but by Mr. Martin, the member for Queens, and they were plain and distinct, and the government have received copies of these resolutions because it was directed that copies should be sent to the government. But in this case as in almost every other case that has come before them, the government are neglecting this question. I hope the present Minister of Railways will do his duty a little better than his predecessors did, and that he will at once take this matter into his consideration. I do not see the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the House just now, but I know that when his deputy was down in Charlottetown a year ago with reference to this matter, he gave great promises that he would place the matter before the minister and before the government. But nothing has been done. The people of Prince Edward Island are under this great handicap which no free people should endure any longer. I think we have endured this grievance long enough, and it is high time that the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the government should give this matter their immediate attention. They are attending to the wants of the great west, they are looking after the building of the Transcontinental Railway, but they are neglecting the descendants of the men who settled in eastern Canada many years ago and hewed homes for themselves out of the forest, and they are sending every young man in the east who grows up to manhood away to gain his livelihood in the United States or in the great west where this government is spending millions and millions of dollars to develop. I say it and I say it advisedly that the east is neglected by this government. Not only is that the opinion of men who live in the east, but one of the ablest journalists in western Canada has endorsed that view, and has stated that the government is neglecting the wants and requirements of Eastern Canada. And when the people of Eastern Canada come here and ask the government plainly and distinctly to meet their wants, they are turned down and the transportation question in Prince Edward Island and the maritime provinces has no attention paid to it by the government. So far as the proposal to change the name of the Intercolonial Railway is concerned, I have very little sympathy with it. I think the government can do this without changing the name. If it is not done in a very short time, the same feeling which exists in British Columbia to-day with reference to certain matters engaging the attention of this government may assert itself more forcibly than they think in the east.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a good deal of interest to our hon. friends from Prince Edward Island who have discussed the questions involved in this motion. While careful attention should be paid to the adjustment of rates on the Intercolonial Railway, our hon. friends seem to overlook the natural conditions arising from the fact that the province of Prince Edward Island is an island, and that its communication with the mainland must necessarily be maintained by water service, winter and summer, and as a consequence higher rates must be paid for transportation across the Northumberland Straits than are paid on the mainland. It is of very little advantage, in arguing this question, for our hon. friends to compare the rates charged from Montreal to St. John or Halifax, on all-rail routes, with the rates charged on transportation that involves, first a rail haul, then a steamer haul, not under the control of the Railway Department, and then another rail haul. I am glad to hear our hon. friends speak of the rates being somewhat high, because one of the theories sometimes put forward in this House in support of government operation of railways is that people get the advantage of low rates, particularly those who live along the line of the Intercolonial which is not enjoyed by people living along the lines of company railways. I ventured to make the statement in this House not long ago that usually a low rate was charged by the Intercolonial Railway on long hauls of certain staple products, while it did not give its patrons any advantage in regard to short hauls; and I pointed out that our hon. friends who live in the province of Ontario are sometimes inclined to argue that the government administration of the Intercolonial Railway is a poor one, because it is purely for the benefit of the people who live in the provinces through which the railway runs.

Mr. BLAIN. The Hon. Mr. Blair stated that the freight rates on the Intercolonial Railway were 50 per cent lower than those of any other railway in Canada.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. If Mr. Blair ever said that, my hon. friend and his friends on the other side of the House have frequently made the same statement. One of their arguments used in the province of Ontario is that this government has admin-

istered the Intercolonial Railway purely and solely for the benefit of the people who live along the line of the railway and for political purposes, giving them low rates; and I say that I am very glad that our hon. friends from Prince Edward Island have shown to-day that no such condition of affairs exists. They have proven that certain staple products of the western portion of Canada are hauled to the maritime provinces at low rates, the Intercolonial Railway thus serving the interchange of products between the different provinces at the extremes of the railway. But when some of our hon. friends speak in this way, they overlook the difference in the rates charged on long hauls and on short hauls. We have the same difference in various portions of the maritime provinces. The percentage charged on certain classifications of goods for hauling them fifty miles is very much higher than it is for hauling the same goods 200 or 300 miles. These differences are bound to exist.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY. How about the case I cited a short time ago, in which the rate for a long haul from Prince Edward Island to a few miles east of Toronto was four or five times the rate charged from Montreal to Halifax or Sydney, and that was a long haul rate? It does not work both ways apparently.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friend has forgotten to take into consideration the fact that that freight had to be delivered in Montreal to some other railway, which, under the arbitrary division of freight earnings, no doubt made the extra charge. This question of freight earnings is one of the most complicated known in railway administration. I do not think our hon. friends will seriously assert that there is any intention on the part of the government or of the Railway Department to discriminate against the province of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The proof of the pudding is in the eating.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. All over the maritime provinces we have the same condition in regard to freight charges on goods from points west of Montreal, with other railways sharing in the transportation. In regard to my hon. friend's motion for the change of name, there does not seem to be any particular objection to the Intercolonial Railway being called, as it should be, the Interprovincial Railway, except the fact that after some thirty years of operation, and after all the rolling stock has been provided, such a change would be attended with a great deal of expense and difficulty. That is a matter which should not be overlooked by any responsible department in considering the question. In this connection I want to refer to a remark made by my hon. friend from Kings (Mr. J. J. Hughes) to the effect that the Railway Department had been criticised for charging the same rates on goods consigned to Prince Edward Island, whether they went via Pictou or Pointe du Chêne.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Referring to the second clause of my hon. friend's resolution, in which he proposes that the government system of railways should be considered as one entity in the keeping of accounts and all other respects, my hon. friend seemed to consider it a grievance that the same rates were charged on the Intercolonial Railway for goods going to Prince Edward Island via Pointe du Chêne as via Pictou, although Pictou was 100 miles or so further away from the point of shipment than Pointe du Chêne might be. I do not think my hon. friend had any good grounds for his argument. This arrangement as to similarity of charges between these two points was made purely on behalf of the people of Prince Edward Island. The whole of the eastern portion of that island, from Charlottetown to Souris, receive their freight by the Intercolonial Railway through the port of Pictou. If all these people, who import these goods, were compelled to pay an additional impost because of the extra mileage betwen Moncton and Pictou, that would only mean that the people of Prince Edward Island would have to pay so much more for their goods. But a great deal of my hon. friends' complaint would be relieved if they would join with me in urging on the Railway Department the necessity and advantage of treating the port of Pictou as entitled to the same low rates as are granted the ports of St. John and Halifax. Pictou is a point of distribution which covers the whole of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Not only are there steamers from there plying to Charlottetown and Murray Harbour, which is an important point of the island, being the terminus of the new branch of railway constructed a few years ago, and in addition continuous steam communication with Georgetown, which is the capital of Kings county, and Souris, an important mercantile point on the extreme east of the island, but in addition it is a distributing point for the Magdalen islands and the greater portion of the eastern part of Cape Breton. Yet I was surprised to find, not long ago, when inquiring regarding certain products which came to Nova Scotia from the west, that the ports of St. John and Halifax were the only ones which received the advantage of what is called an export rate. If the port of Pictou were given the same favourable treatment

as these other ports, my hon. friends in the island would be able to receive their imports at much lower rates of freight than at present; but that is a difficulty which cannot be urged by my hon. friends as one peculiar to Prince Edward Island, because those who live in the eastern portion of Nova Scotia experience that same difficulty as do all the other points which are served from the port of Pictou. So far as I am concerned I am particularly anxious to support any proposition to obtain for the island the cheapest possible rates of freight, but they should bear in mind that in consequence of only St. John and Halifax enjoying the advantage of the export rate, we in the eastern portion of Nova Scotia are practically in the same condition as our hon. friends on the island, with this exception that they have the Straits of Northumberland to cross and the additional impost which will always result where you break bulk and have to use different methods of transportation. There is this trouble in obtaining this export rate, and that is the difficulty in adjusting rates with the Grand Trunk Railway or Canadian Pacific Railway, where either controls the export. To a very large degree the railway which produces the freight controls this matter, and I understand from the Intercolonial Railway officials that the difficulty to which I am referring is very largely due to freight which originates with either of these two companies and to the fact that they control the situation. But so far as the difference in rates is concerned, the answer which the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) gave the other day to a question put by my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. Martin) shows that the charges of which these gentlemen complain do not arise in many respects on account of the charges made on the Intercolonial Railway. Thus out of a freight rate of 52 cents paid from Moncton to Charlottetown, 28 cents is only paid to the Intercolonial Railway, 10 cents is paid for transportation across the straits and 14 cents to the Island Railway. So that while the Prince Edward Island Railway has the advantage of having the 14 cents earning upon these products, the party who imports has to pay that rate on account of the rule which obtains with regard to transportation everywhere namely that where you have a short haul, the short haul must pay. To say therefore that the difficulties suggested by my hon. friend and his colleague would disappear if the government were to consider the Prince Edward Island Railway and the Intercolonial Railway as one entity in the keeping of accounts and in all other respects, is to say what the facts do not bear out. To call a railway by another name or to keep the one set of books for the two railways will not do away with the necessity of making such charges as have to be made in order to meet the cost of transportation ; and where you have goods placed at the point of shipment so as to cross the straits at the lowest possible rate, you get a condition which is the best you can hope for because you will always have to contend with the cost of transportation by steamer across the straits.

The last part of my hon. friend's resolution proposes that the ferry service should be owned and managed by the Railway Department in summer as well as in winter. This much is well known, that the company which transports freight and passengers across the straits during the summer months has been a great dividend payer and is owned and controlled entirely by men from the island. Every cent of stock in that company is owned by men on the island, and the company have been earning handsome returns—so handsome that they are rather reticent about telling us how much they do earn. They do not seem public spirited as they might be, but the fact that they have earned dividends is one which should be taken into consideration when considering the feasibility of the proposal of my hon. friend. On the other hand the cost of transportation in winter must necessarily be very great and it could hardly be expected that products can ever be transported across the straits except at a loss. At the same time I think the Railway Department should deal with the whole question, and that the management of the steamers across the straits, summer and winter, should be in the hands of that department. It would not, of course, add to the surplus of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, and possibly our friends opposite would sometimes complain because the surplus was not as large as it might otherwise have been; yet notwithstanding that fact I think that the Intercolonial Railway or the Interprovincial Railway, should have charge of the transportation of freight across the Straits of Northumberland, and that any loss which might be occasioned by this service would be willingly borne by the people of Canada, as it would be simply carrying out the terms of confederation under which Prince Edward Island entered the Dominion. This step would, of course, involve a large expenditure in taking over the steamers of the company now operating there in summer and also in assuming the management of the government steamers employed in the winter service. This portion of the resolution I regard as well worth the consideration of the government and a step which, if carried into effect, would greatly improve the means of transportation of freight to and from the island province.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. Is all the transportation in summer done by a private corporation?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. And in the winter when the loss is heavy is it all done by the government?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. A nice state of affairs, is it not?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. As my hon. friend is one of those gentlemen who are perfectly willing to build a tunnel that will be operated all the year around at a heavy cost, I presume he will not object to this. We must always remember that the maintaining of this service both in summer and in winter by the Dominion is one of the terms of confederation, and whether the loss is small or great the service must be carried on by the government. The only point under discussion is whether the management of that service should be under the Railway or the Marine Department. It seems to me that it would be very much more satisfactory to have the whole system of transportation there under the management of one department. There would, of course, be difficulties but it would appear that the greatest difficulties complained of would be overcome by the step proposed. Owing to the division of authority between the two departments claims cannot be readily adjusted, but I would point out to my hon. friends from the island that the difficulty of securing the adjustment of claims by business men is not confined to Prince Edward Island, but is common to the entire Intercolonial system, as it must be from the nature of the case where you have government ownership of railways, and it is not possible to recover damages for torts against the railway but have to proceed by the tortuous process of application for petition of right and trial in the Exchequer Court. If a cow is injured in transportation or a box is broken open then this tortuous process must be resorted to in order to secure redress and this is a cause of serious inconvenience and complaint among business men throughout the maritime provinces. I hope that the minister will look into this question of claims so that the business men of the maritime provinces may have some safe, sure and ready method by which to have their claims adjusted. I do not know whether under any system of government operation the difficulty could be obviated ; under such a system it must always exist in some degree, but I hope that the minister will rearrange the claims department of the Intercolonial Railway so as to afford more prompt readjustment of claims. My hon. friend's remarks on this subject deserve as much attention from the minister as any other portion of the resolution. The portion of the resolution which involves the placing of the service across the Straits of Northumberland under the control of the Railway Department receives my strongest support.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (Prince, P.E.I.). I am very pleased to note the change that is coming over the spirit of the dreams of the hon. gentlemen opposite—for they have been dreaming for a long time—in regard to the resolution before us. For the past seven or eight years members on this side of the House have time and again brought up the important matter of transportation across the Straits of Northumberland and the excessive rates under which we suffer. Members on the other side of the House have had ample opportunity to put forth their views, and some of them, I am glad to find, are waking up and telling us what they think. The mover of this resolution has had several occasions during the present session to bring up this question of freight rates, for instance, when the Railway Commission was being discussed and when the tunnel resolution of my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. A. Martin) was before the House, but upon those occasions he took the opportunity to apologize for the government. Now, however, I am glad to see that he has awakened from his dream, and sees at last that the government have not used all the means in their power to endeavour to overcome the wrongs under which the people of my province have been suffering for a great number of years. But after all, Mr. Speaker, the solution of this whole question is to be found in giving us an up to date means of transportation, such as was promised to us thirty odd years ago, and which we have been fighting for ever since in this House. We have urged upon the government to go forward and fulfil the promise that the leader of this House made when he was in opposition, and give the people of the island a tunnel. That is after all the only solution that will end our complaints. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) said that we must not overlook natural conditions. Well, that is why we are discussing this question in the House, it is because the government have been overlooking natural conditions. We realized these natural conditions when we came into confederation, and it was the realization of these natural conditions that brought Prince Edward Island into the confederation, with a promise from the Dominion that they would be overcome. And how were they to be overcome? By bringing the island system of railways into connection with the mainland system. Now, that is the whole solution of this excessive rate question. The hon. member for Pictou says we have got to overcome these natural conditions. That was the promise made at confederation, and in the meantime, while the government is not using the means at hand to overcome them, is not prepared to put before this House surveys and estimates for a tunnel, our shippers to and from the island should not be put under the obligation to pay the piper on these short hauls, but the loss should be made up to them by the government by equalization of rates. Instead of that we find from an answer made the other day to my hon. friend from Queens (Mr.

McLean) that the government instead of equalizing the summer rate with the winter rate, have increased the winter rate and during the period when they have control of the whole service. Now, I want to say that the government have certainly broken their pledge and are continually breaking their pledge to the people of Prince Edward Island and are perpetrating a gross injustice in increasing the winter rate between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. It is all under the control of the government, and the people have to pay higher rates in winter than they do in summer when a private company is operating. As regards overlooking natural conditions, we still have the natural conditions, and successive governments have not used bona fides with the people of Prince Edward Island in attempting to overcome them. The clause in the terms of confederation required the Dominion to give us this connecting link, and it does not matter to us whether they fulfil that promise in one way or the other so long as the government justify themselves by using every effort to overcome these difficulties.

Now, the hon. member for Pictou has also referred to the long and short hauls, and he has been the apologist of the government for the fact that the long haul is not as reasonable to the province of Prince Edward Island on goods going to the west as it is on goods coming from the west. As has been pointed out by hon. members on this side of the House, rates from Montreal to Halifax, St. John and Sydney are only about one-third of the rates between Tignish and Sydney, Halifax or St. John ; while the distance in the former case is from two to three miles as great. Now, I want to call the attention of the hon. member for Pictou to the difference in the long haul rate from Prince Edward Island to a point called Myrtle, about 400 miles east of Toronto, and which is only 300 odd miles further than from Montreal to Halifax. The rate from Montreal to Halifax is 9 cents per hundred pounds, while the rate over this long haul from Prince Edward Island to Myrtle is 40 cents per hundred pounds. So there must be something radically wrong in a situation where you can get a long haul rate going from the east to the west of 40 cents per hundred pounds, and a long haul rate coming from Montreal to our ports, into competition with our natural markets, of 9 cents per hundred pounds. The hon. gentleman says you cannot get over a lot of these troubles with a government-owned road. But we have offered a solution of them several times on this side of the House, we have proposed to put the Intercolonial under a commission, and then possibly we could get some justice in the adjustment of these rates. We have asked several times during this session that the government road should be put under the control of the Board of Railway Commissioners. That seems to many members on this side of the House to be a condition under which these rates could be adjusted, in conjunction with the rates on all the other lines that are under the control of this board.

Now, when I take up the resolution of the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Hughes) I find, as I said, that there is nothing new in the gist of the resolution at all; nothing but what we have been advocating year after year before this House, and nothing more than what the boards of trade all over the maritime provinces have been petitioning the government for by sending up resolutions. With regard to the first part of it, that the name of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railway should be changed to the Interprovincial Railway, I do not see that is going to help the people of Prince Edward Island; I do not see how that is going to adjust our freight rates, or how it is going to do away with the grievance under which we have been suffering for many years. As regards the system of keeping accounts, it seems to me that makes no difference at all. If the Prince Edward Island Railway were put into physical connection by a tunnel with the mainland, the Prince Edward Island portion would not suffer by comparison with any part of the Intercolonial, because she would be the greatest feeder to the Intercolonial. Products from all points of the island would converge to a centre, the rolling stock of the Prince Edward Island Railway would be constantly in use, and it would be distributed from the central point on the main line to the Intercolonial. Prince Edward Island would be an immense feeder; she would have a very long service in the additional amount of work that would be borne over the line and the Intercolonial would benefit immensely by such a programme being carried out. So as regards the system of accounting between the Intercolonial and the Prince Edward Island Railway, I do not think we need be at loggerheads on that point.

The last question, and the most important part of the hon. gentleman's resolution, that the ferry service across the Northumberland straits should be put under the control of the Railway Department, is a good idea, but not a new idea. Year after year we have advocated that. We have known of the bungling of the different departments, the Marine and Fisheries Department, the Railway Department and the Post Office Department. It has been a byword in this House and throughout that province for the last fifteen or twenty years. There is nothing new in it. We have advocated and asked for it. The answer which the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave to a little question that I put the other day, shows how this subject is looked after by the department. I asked the minister if he knew that the Summerside harbour was practically open and that the steamer 'Stanley' could

readily go in there and open up transportation between Summerside and Cape Tormentine instead of letting her run between Georgetown and Pictou involving the transportation of our stuff from Tignish to Georgetown on the Prince Edward Island side and a haul of a couple of hundred miles on the Intercolonial Railway on the mainland side, whereas, with a little attention and foresight on the part of the department you could go almost straight across. The answer of the minister was that the control of these boats and the discretion as to their movements were left entirely in the hands of the captains. Is not that a nice state of affairs? It is no wonder that you have such a report brought in by the Civil Service Commission when you have such a haphazard way of doing the business of the country as leaving this most important feature of the work of the department entirely at the discretion of the captains. We have a marine agent in Charlottetown who represents the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Why is he not made the responsible party and why is he not given authority to report the conditions which exist there? The idea of leaving it to the two captains of the boats who are away from the western end of the island and who know nothing about the conditions to be found in different parts of the island because they are crossing from Georgetown to Pictou, is something that would not occur to the mind of any one who desired to carry on the affairs of the department in a businesslike way. It is high time that the responsibility for the transportation facilities between Prince Edward Island and the mainland was put upon one department to which we could carry our grievances and which would be responstible for the service. The Department of Marine and Fisheries puts the blame for the unsatisfactory condition of the mail and passenger service upon the Department of Railways and Canals. The Department of Railways and Canals attributes the fault to the Post Office Department and the Post Office Department throws it back again to the Department of Railways and Canals, and that is the sort of humbugging and nonsense that have been going on year after year. I think there is some merit in the last part of the hon. gentleman's resolution, but from our experience in the past I do not have any hope that this government will take any active measures to attempt to remedy the unsatisfactory conditions which exist at the present time. If they have not given it a trial before this or if they have not realized the position of this service I have very little faith in them doing anything except that they may try to drag a red herring across the trail because elections may be coming on next fall. However, there is some merit in this part of the resolution and I hope at any rate that the ministry will get together and put the service under the control of the Department of Railways and Canals so that we will have some department responsible for the whole service.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to inquire of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) what it would cost to carry into effect the first part of this resolution. Has he any idea of what it would cost?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think it is very unfortunate that a resolution of this character should be discussed——

Mr. TAYLOR. I was making an inquiry of the minister.

Mr. EMMERSON. I assume that the minister will perhaps later on say something in answer to your inquiry.

Mr. TAYLOR. I intended to say something more when I got an answer to my inquiry.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have never made any estimate of what it would cost. If it were going to be done I imagine it would be very much cheaper to do it gradually than to do it all at once. It would cost a good deal of money.

Mr. TAYLOR. How much?

Mr. GRAHAM. I would not like to give an estimate.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am of opinion that it would cost $100,000 or $200,000 to make the change. You would have to change all your books and stamps in connection with the whole system besides repainting and lettering all your cars.

Mr. EMMERSON. You are very moderate in your estimate.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think it could be done for that. I think that if the change were brought about at all the simplest method would be to change the Prince Edward Island system and make it part of the Intercolonial Railway. That would not cost so very much. Then, all the book-keeping could be done at one headquarters. It would cut off a good deal of expense and I think that would be the business way of doing it. I think, with my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Lefurgey), that you should have the system, including the steamboat service, under one management instead of having two or three different bodies controlling the Prince Edward Island, the Intercolonial Railway, the mail service and the ferry. That would give you an opportunity of conducting it in a business manner. But, to change the whole system, unless the government have $100,000 or $200,000 to throw away, would do no good. The Intercolonial Railway is now known the world over and if you changed it to the Interprovincial Railway it would take people years to understand what it meant. I think it would be a great mistake.

Mr. EMMERSON. I was about to say that it was very unfortunate that a resolution of this character could not be discussed from other than a petty partisan standpoint. My hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Lefurgey), who is one of the modern Jeremiahs from the island, has spoken in a complaining way as usual, setting forth the grievances which he has repeated year after year. He speaks very indefinitely with respect to the call which has been made upon the government for a number of years. He seemingly forgets the fact that Prince Edward Island entered this confederation in the early seventies, that it entered it under the government of Sir John Macdonald, that the conditions which exist to-day, existed then, and that from 1878, when Sir John Macdonald resumed the helm of state in Canada, down in 1896, the conditions of which he complains to-day existed. He points to the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries as a sinner with respect to the management of the boats. He points to the present Minister of Railways and Canals and to his predecessors since 1896 as guilty sinners, forgetting perhaps that there were Ministers of Railways and Ministers of Marine during the period between 1878 and 1896. These conditions existed then and they exist to-day. It is a problem not easy of solution. As to changing the name of the government railway system we must remember that when the Intercolonial was established under a clause of the British North America Act to connect the city of Halifax with the city of Quebec, it was given its present designation which has become so to speak historic, and I would protest in the strongest possible way against changing the name and calling it the Interprovincial Railway. It must also be borne in mind that the Prince Edward Island Railway is a narrow gauge, and that as such it can never form part of a great railway system. Whether you have a tunnel or whether you have a modern ferry service such as we have at Canso, the Prince Edward Island Railway can never be part of a great railway system while it continues to be narrow gauge, and if you had a tunnel or a transfer car service the very first thing you would have to do would be to widen the gauge of that railway. Now, there could be no improvement by transferring the present steamboat service from one department to the other because that would not in itself lessen the rates. Anyway, it would be absurd to call it a ferry service because a ferry service such as you have at Canso would mean that the cars would be taken on to the ferry at the mainland, transferred to the island, and then they would be supposed to run over the Prince Edward Island Railway, but the moment they touched the shores of the island they are met by a narrow gauge system.

My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has referred to claims against the Intercolonial Railway and he has asked that there should be a reorganization of the claims department. In my opinion no reorganization of that department will improve the conditions in favour of claimants against the railway. It must be borne in mind that claimants have always two strings to their bow, and even if you give them the widest latitude to appeal to the courts of the country, having failed to obtain there what they thought was their due, they would still turn to their representatives in parliament and political influence would be sought. If there is a reorganization of the claims department it can only be properly conducted when the Intercolonial is placed under a commission. My own experience is that where claims have been presented against the railway, after full inquiry by the claims department and after it had been determined by the Department of Justice that there was no liability, and when the Auditor General would not pay the claim even if the department were willing, notwithstanding all that a claim never dies. It rises phoenix-like from year to year and the ghost of its former self appears sometimes increased in amount and sometimes intensified in details so far as the grievance is concerned. How this difficulty in connection with a government railway could be removed I cannot see, unless it were that the railway were put under a commission. In my opinion until the Intercolonial is placed in such a position that it is not directly managed by the Crown there can be no reorganization of the claims department such as has been suggested by my hon. friend from Pictou. It has been stated that the summer service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland is under the control of a private corporation which has paid very large dividends; a corporation so strong that when a few years ago it was proposed in this parliament to have a ferry system by which the cars could be transferrd, and there could be a crossing two or three times a day during the greater part of the year and during most of the winter months, that proposition was opposed by the gentlemen from Prince Edward Island. And at whose instance? At the instance of this very strong corporation which now and for the last 40 years has controlled the navigation of the straits during the summer season. They are not in a position and do not place themselves in a position to do the winter business. What is the result? The government are obliged to take these steamers, a part of the marine fleet, and pursuant to the terms of confederation utilize them for providing winter crossing. To place them under the Department of Railways and Canals will not improve the situation. It will not, in any way alter the conditions which exist to-day and which have existed for many years. There is no

clause in this resolution which I can support.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). Mr. Speaker, I estimate that it would cost nearly a quarter of a million dollars to make the necessary changes involved in carrying out the first part of this resolution. I am not opposed to anything that would be in the interests of the province of Prince Edward Island; but I think it is well to keep the accounts of the two railways separate, as they are now. I do not think any one on either side of the House makes any complaint even if this railway shows a loss in its operation. With no connections with any other railway, it is pretty hard to expect it to make a profit. I do not see that changing the name to Interprovincial would make any material difference. The name Intercolonial has been well known since confederation, and I am in favour of retaining it. To change the name would be simply to incur an unnecessary expenditure of $200,000 or $300,000. It would necessitate changing the whole book-keeping system of the railway. As to the ferry service between the island and the mainland, I think this government should do everything possible to make it efficient. I for one am in favour of doing everything necessary to provide the best possible communication between the island and the mainland. For many years I have heard members from the island on both sides of the House urging the government to build a tunnel. I would like to see an estimate of what such a work would cost laid on the table of the House. With the latest improvements in making tunnels, I think it might possibly be shown that it would cost less to build this tunnel than it now costs to maintain and operate the steamers between the island and the mainland. I suppose it is impossible to obtain such an estimate this session, but I hope it will be obtained and laid on the table of the House at the earliest possible moment. I believe the time will come when that tunnel will be built. The people of this country are in favour of providing the best possible communication between the mainland and Prince Edward Island, and there is certainly nothing that would give such a complete and satisfactory connection as a tunnel. At the present time, with the facilities that exist a tunnel could be built for perhaps one-half of what it could twenty or twenty-five years ago. I for one hope that an estimate of the cost of a tunnel will be laid before the House at no distant date, so that the matter may be thoroughly settled once and for all. In the meantime, unless the Minister of Railways can advance some good reason why the name should be changed, I think that the first part of the resolution should be dropped. The other parts of the resolution I would support.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I am entirely opposed to the proposal to change the name of the railway. We have not always had the most satisfactory conditions in the operation of the Intercolonial Railway, but it has been recognized as a great public work, and I hope the time will come when it will be operated on a more satisfactory basis than it has been in the past. With reference to the loss of cars, it would be easy to prevent that by having the word 'Canada' painted on each car. I do not experience the same difficulty that some hon. gentlemen do from the fact that we are referred to as colonists or Canada as a colony; and the term Intercolonial is quite satisfactory to me. However, I did not rise for the purpose of discussing that question so much as to submit a matter of very much more importance, and that is the question of the tunnel between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. I think the time has come when the government should take some definite and serious step to ascertain whether that scheme is feasible or not. I am not at all afraid of the expense provided it is gone into in a fair and businesslike way. In my opinion we ought not to treat this matter any longer, as it has been, as a perennial joke, but should treat it as one that ought to receive the most serious consideration.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the cost?

Mr. LENNOX. I do not know how much it would cost, but I would not be inclined to plunge into the scheme, as we did into the transcontinental project, without having the fullest preliminary investigation. What we require to do is to find out what it will cost and whether the project is a feasible one or not. As one of the members representing Ontario, I am fully prepared to take the responsibility of advocating a reasonable expenditure for the purpose of finding out whether we can remedy the present condition of Prince Edward Island by constructing a tunnel between the mainland and the island. I am not in favour of going into it at any cost, but I am inclined to think that the work can be carried out on terms beneficial to the Dominion, and I am disposed to advocate a proper investigation with the view of ascertaining whether it would not be in the interests of Canada as a whole, as well as of Prince Edward Island, to have this work carried out within a reasonable time.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT (South Renfrew). You may think that a person coming from the province of Ontario has no interest directly with the people of the maritime provinces. Will you allow me to give you one instance out of many which have come under my own notice? For example, for a great many years we bought a large quantity of potatoes from

Prince Edward Island, but gradually difficulties arose so that we could not get them there because we could not get transportation the year around. The consequence was we had to go to New Brunswick for our potatoes, and will you allow me to tell you that to-day and the whole year round, there are hundreds of carloads going from New Brunswick to Toronto which are sold there every day for 10 cents a bushel more than the potatoes grown right around Toronto.

Mr. EMMERSON. They are worth it.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. Certainly; if not, we would not give 10 cents a bushel more for them. I do not know whether they have better facilities or give greater care, but they give us better potatoes and all of one quality. If you want to get a carload of any one kind, you can go to New Brunswick and get them. We cannot get them from the island because they have not the facilities for shipping them. I need only give you that one instance to show you that we are directly connected with the maritime provinces. I have listened many years to the complaints made by our friends from the island, and it seems to me that the Dominion government has done everything it could under the circumstances to carry out the compact made with the provinces. The difficulties to be contended with in going across the straits in winter are simply enormous, and no human skill apparently can overcome them. I am willing to bear my share, as far as Ontario is concerned, in giving these people every facility winter and summer to get to the outside world. I have thoroughly considered this tunnel question. One hon. gentleman, when he spoke to me with reference to my advocating the building of the tunnel some time ago, said I did not know what I was talking about and had no business to say anything on the subject. Well, I consider it a national question and I have as good a right to speak on it as any other person in the country. I believe that this government has been doing everything it could; but if our friends in the island are in difficulty and we can relieve them, I do not see why we should not do it. When Prince Edward Island came into confederation and took her seat around our national fireside, she became part of our national family, and if she is in distress it is our business to come to her relief. When a fire took place in Hull we gave liberally to help the sufferers; and this year, when our friends in the western provinces were in trouble about seed grain, we voted $2,000,000 to help them. If then the people in Prince Edward Island are in difficulty why should we not help them in like manner? It may be that the building of this tunnel is not written in the bond, but I care not. If it is necessary, why should we not build it? And I do not think the cost would be prohibitive. Take the cost of the Simplon tunnel under the Alps, where they encountered a lake of hot water. Nevertheless they built it and without enormous cost, and I am satisfied that with modern appliances this tunnel can be built without very much expenditure of money. If it can be built for $10,000,000, I am prepared to pay my share of the amount, but I am thoroughly convinced it will never cost anything like that. The only way is to face the difficulty like men. Let us see what the tunnel will cost; and if not too much, we should grapple with it at once and put an end to all this clatter we hear every year. I am sick and tired of it, and if anything can be done to relieve the House of it I for one am satisfied to do it.

Mr. J. BARR (Dufferin). I cannot agree with my hon. friend when he says that this government has done all it can to relieve the situation of Prince Edward Island and carry out the compact of confederation. On looking through the record, I cannot find anything substantial that they have done. I cannot find any reliable report in connection with this tunnel. Having agreed to give Prince Edward Island continuous communication with the mainland in return for her joining confederation, it was the duty of this government and of preceding governments to have had a thorough investigation into the matter and have laid before the House plans and specifications so that the country might know exactly what it would cost to carry out the compact of confederation. It seems to me that Prince Edward Island has just reason to complain that an honest effort has not been made by either this or previous governments to carry out the terms of confederation. It is true that steps along that line were taken by the late government and an estimate was prepared. That estimate I think was about $10,000,000. If it cost twice that amount, it would be worth it to the Dominion and particularly to Prince Edward Island. As a people, as a nation, we should fulfil our obligations to the different provinces. As the last speaker said, it is not a provincial but a national question and one which this House and this country must solve if it is practicable. We have not before us the data to enable us to say whether it is practicable or not, but we can say that it is the duty of the government to secure estimates and all possible information from the best engineers obtainable.

I do not think any relief will come from changing the name of the Intercolonial Railway. From all we can gather it would seem that there has been discrimination and I hope the new Minister of Railways will see that even if the tunnel is not built the service will be improved and rendered as efficient as possible. Such a policy will meet with general approval and so I think would the building of a tunnel as soon as that is practicable.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The discussion on the

resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. J. J. Hughes) has not only been interesting, but has produced considerable information on tunnel building as well as on other points. I submit that the discussion of the tunnel is a little beside the spirit of the resolution, but this information is, of course, always welcome, even if it be in this instance 30 years behind the times. The hon. gentleman from Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) made a suggestion that the building of tunnels was getting cheaper. To that extent it has paid us to wait and the longer we wait perhaps the cheaper the building of tunnels may become.

Mr. J. D. REID. If we do not wait too long.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend of course does not like to have the argument extended. However, it is a question of serious importance not only to Prince Edward Island, but to all Canada. It is not a matter for the people of any one portion of the Dominion, because I decline to discuss these matters on that basis; that is not the best way to bring about the results or to bring about that unity of citizenship which we desire. I do not for a moment admit that the people of any portion of the Dominion have been ill-used by the others ; I do not admit that the people on any part of the government railway system have been discriminated against by this or the previous government. The question of freight rates is an intricate one and the making of these traffic sheets and running arrangements has become a science. Although I have devoted some study to it, I admit frankly that I am not in a position to discuss it in detail and to give the reasons for making rates in one part of the country along certain lines and in another along certain other lines. There has been no discrimination in the making of rates against Prince Edward Island; there has been no desire to give one part of the people undue advantage in rates on the government railway. Speaking in a broad sense I may say that the framers of confederation had no desire whatever to discriminate whatever against any section of Canada. They did come to an arrangement at the time Prince Edward Island entered confederation by which it was agreed that the Dominion government would give continuous steam communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. That has been the understanding, no person has ever attempted to deny that part of the contract. The advisability of constructing a tunnel is a question that has arisen only during the last few years.

Sir, has the government kept that part of the compact of confederation? I think that reasonably speaking it has. My hon. friend has suggested the running of a ferry from year end to year end under government control or government management. Possibly that is worth considering, but at the present moment has the compact of confederation been kept? I say it has, perhaps not with the result that hon. gentlemen would desire or that the framers of confederation would have desired had they lived at the present time and seen the state of affairs to-day, but under existing conditions I have no hesitation in saying that the governments of Canada have endeavoured to carry out the terms of confederation from the east of Canada to the west, regardless of the part of the country affected. Steam communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland did not of necessity mean a railway. I believe I can go further and say it did not mean a railway at all; that the framers of confederation had not an idea of a tunnel in their minds. Then we have the question of communication by steamer. Has that been kept ? It has, and it has been kept too at a great cost to the Dominion of Canada. The other evening I had occasion to refer to the cost—I am not complaining, of the maintaining of a government system of railways on Prince Edward Island. Last year I think, approximately speaking, we paid something like $60,000 over and above the income. It was perfectly right for the government of Canada to do that, but it shows that Prince Edward Island has not been neglected. Then take the part of the compact which relates to maintaining communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. You would think to hear the hon. member for Prince and the hon. member for Queens that the government of Canada had done nothing, was doing nothing, had never done anything and that the island had been greatly neglected in this respect. I do not for a moment admit that. It has cost the Dominion of Canada an annual subsidy of $84,000 to keep up communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. As I understand our communication last year cost $100,000 and the revenue from that service was $16,000, leaving an annual charge of $84,000 a year to run a ferry between Prince Edward Island and the mainland during the winter. It is proper to make that expenditure, but the fact remains that the expenditure has been made.

Coming to the question of complaints, I would say that so long as the government owns and operates a railway so long will it have a greater number of complaints than if a company owned and operated the railway. I think I am safe in making that statement. I think I can go further and say that it is easier for a company to settle complaints or claims than for a government to settle complaints arising from various causes. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) explained the position clearly. A government railway is the property of the people; the representatives of the people are looked upon by those who own the railway as the medium through

which to bring before the powers that be their complaints, and naturally so, and every representative of the people thinks it his duty to his constituents to urge the claims made to him. Now the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) stated correctly that there are claims made to the Department of Railways and Canals that it has no power to settle, even if the minister and every member of the government wanted to settle them. The question is : Are we liable under the Act governing the running of the government railway? And if we are not, and it is referred to the Justice Department, as it must be, then the Justice Department must, under the Act, say that we have no right to pay; and if all these conditions were waived, the Auditor General would not let us pay. The members of this House, if they understood this thoroughly, would not have so many grievances against the Department of Railways and Canals as to the non-settlement of claims, which in many cases the department has no possible power to settle, no matter how willing it might be. During the present session an amendment has been made to the law by which the government railway is brought so far as possible under the provisions of the ordinary Railway Act as to the settlement of claims. Perhaps this will reduce the difficulty to a certain extent, but I imagine these claims will still have to go before the Exchequer Court as they do to-day, although the causes of complaint will be easier to be got at in a way. When cattle are killed on the track, for instance, the owners of them will find a settlement easier on account of the fact that the law is so changed that the conditions under which cattle may not go on the track are not the same as they were previously. I agree without hesitation that that is a weakness. I do not mean a weakness in the manning of the branch at all, but in existing conditions under the law, and under the Act governing government owned railways, it has been impossible to do even what the minister might want to do in the way of settling claims. I am in hopes that the new condition of affairs will remove some of the difficulties, because I want to say to the members of the House that so far as the department is concerned it has no desire whatever to shirk responsibility in paying claims that ought to be paid, even if, under the Act as it has been constituted, there might be no legal liability. There are cases that have come under my attention when I would gladly have made a settlement, cases of bodily injury where death has ensued, but there has been no legal liability; and the House need not be startled if I ask them before this session closes to vote money to pay some of these claims for which there is no legal liability, but which I think as matter of equity and of humanity ought to receive recognition at the hands of this parliament. Now, taking up the resolution and the statement:

That in the opinion of this House the names 'Intercolonial Railway' and 'Prince Edward Island Railway' should be dropped, and the name 'Interprovincial Railway' substituted therefor.

Without going into the question of the cost of transferring the rolling stock from Intercolonial to Interprovincial, let me say this, that there may not seem to be much in names, but if you take any business in the Dominion of Canada or elsewhere, the name of the company or the name of the firm is considered one of the most valuable assets in that business. It is a trade mark, it is the name which stands for certain things; and long years after the men who first formed the company or the partnership are gone, their names are still retained in the business in order that the standing the business had may be kept up under the original name. It is so with the Intercolonial. This is a government-owned railway, the world knows the Canadian government railway under the name of the Intercolonial. Wherever you go and discuss with railway men, they know that Canada owns a railway, they know the name of it, it stands for something. Leaving out the consideration of the cost, I would hesitate very much before I would consent to allow the name of the Intercolonial to be removed from the rolling stock of the government railway and be replaced by any other name, modern or otherwise. I believe we had better retain the name Intercolonial for what it stands for and what it has stood for. I may say in passing that I think hon. gentlemen will agree with we that the Intercolonial at present stands for a good roadbed, and a good service at minimum cost. We do not want to change the name, we do not want to change these conditions, but to make them better if possible. Take the next section:

That the government system of railways should be considered as one entity in the keeping of accounts and in all other respects.

On the face of it that looks very easy, but under present conditions the Department of Railways and Canals requires every railway in the Dominion of Canada to make a return along certain conditions. You have to give the number of cars, what they cost, the mileage, what it cost to build, you have to go along certain lines in making out the original cost, the expenses, and all that kind of thing. It would be impossible for a narrow gauge road and a standard gauge road to unite in this return to parliament. So long as the road on Prince Edward Island is maintained as a narrow gauge road, so long the railway itself must be considered as an entity by itself, and it cannot be reported upon in connection with a standard gauge railway. Then there is another thing I will point

out. The Intercolonial has a certain business, it runs to certain points, it does not connect in any way with the Prince Edward Island road at present. Business on the Prince Edward Island Railway is kept by itself, and we do not begrudge the loss. But it would not be fair to the Intercolonial that is doing its through business, making connection with every railroad on this continent, either by itself or through other roads, that it should have the Prince Edward Island Railway attached to it. It must be run on different lines, run on different standards, run at a different cost. I do not think the change would be advisable, I think it would not be practical and would not attain any good result; particularly as the people of Canada are willing to pay a certain amount each year to provide the people of Prince Edward Island with railway facilities, and they can be accommodated as thoroughly with a narrow gauge railway as with a wider gauge railway.

That the ferry service across the Straits of Northumberland should be owned and managed by the Railway Department, winter and summer.

I take that as complimentary to the Railways and Canals Department. I know that my hon. friend from Queens and my hon. friend from Prince will not again say anything about the Railways and Canals Department being badly managed, because here they come and ask, in order that the service may be benefited, in order that the island may be better served, in order that the transportation between the mainland and the island may be carried on properly, that it be placed under the management of the Railways and Canals Department. I thank my hon. friends for the compliment. Now, should the Railways and Canals Department assume this responsibility? That is a question that is debatable, I say at once. If it is thought by parliament and by the country that we ought to make it part of the transportation problem from the west clear to the island, then that is a debatable point and one that should be discussed with a good deal of attention. I am not going to condemn it, but I am going to say that I do not think for a moment that running merely a winter service by the Railway Department would have any advantage over running the winter service by the Marine and Fisheries Department. The government, in order to carry out the compact of confederation, spends $84,000 a year over and above its receipts in order to keep up winter communication.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Is not that $84,000 a portion of the expenditure on the boat while engaged in the summer service ? You have not yet eliminated the expenditure of the summer from the winter, and how can you tell that the expenditure of $84,000 in winter was over and above what was expended in summer ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Is it not only in winter that the government undertakes the service ?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Yes, but in the summer time the government spend large sums of money, last year some thousands of dollars, in running that boat for the fishery protection service and they gave the Governor General a trip which cost $10,000 or $12,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is getting away from the point. The Marine Department have given me the figures. My hon. friend can reduce them by $10,000 if he likes but it makes no difference to my argument.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. The figures are incorrect.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman may reduce the amount by $10,000 if he likes.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. They should be reduced by $30,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is extravagant in that as in other things, but we will let that go. We come back to this question of the ferry service. It is a matter for serious consideration whether the ferry service should not be made part of the transportation system. Possibly it is a service which ought to be placed under the control of the Department of Railways and Canals which deals with the transportation problems of the country, but I would not like to undertake the winter service if the summer service should not be placed under the same management. If we proposed to go exclusively into a ferry service winter and summer we would be confronted by the hon. gentlemen who are urging the construction of a tunnel, if it would be wise at the present time, that the government should incur another large expenditure in securing steamers while perhaps in a few years they would have to be discarded for the construction of a tunnel ? It opens up the question as to the advisability of making a thorough investigation with reference to the matter. I had hoped before this session is over, and I still hope, to lay upon the table of the House a report in connection with it. I am not prepared to say how much information it contains. I have had a considerable amount of discussion on this question with the chief engineer of the department, Mr. Butler, and as I stated in a previous debate, he promised to send down some information with reference to the construction of a tunnel. I had hoped to have had it on the table of the House, or in my hands, before this debate came on, but in that I have been disappointed. There is another question involved in this and it is the question of a car ferry. Sometimes it is suggested that the whole difficulty can be solved by the construction of a ferry service across the straits that will carry cars

as they are carried at Detroit. Of course the distance is much greater but that would not make any difference except that the cost of transportation would be greater and the capital involved would be locked up during the longer time that it took to carry cars across the strait. That would involve the necessity of changing the gauge of the Prince Edward Island Railway from a narrow gauge to a standard gauge and it would involve the changing of the rolling stock from narrow to standard gauge and the expenditure would be very heavy. In connection with that it will at once be perceived that the project would be increased in cost to the extent of changing the Prince Edward Island Railway from a narrow gauge to a standard gauge. The connection cannot be made by rail without always taking into consideration the question of the different gauges of the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway. The two roads must be made one, that is the Prince Edward Island Railway must be brought up to the standard and in figuring up the cost of making the connection, either by a ferry or a tunnel, this must always be taken into consideration. I am not prepared to say that the government ought to plunge into this without giving it the most serious consideration. The connection between the Canadian Pacific Railway at Vancouver and at Victoria has been referred to. But, the conditions there are altogether different. The Canadian Pacific Railroad boats leave Vancouver outward bound and call at Victoria ; on the inward passage they call at Victoria and then proceed to Vancouver. These are two ocean ports, more to be compared with St. John and Halifax, although they are scarcely in that position, at which the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers stop. The Canadian Pacific Railway have worked out that part of their transportation problem and it is not probable that they will make any change in it. But, if we were confronted by a transportation problem of smaller magnitude such as we have down at Prince Edward Island, I think that the management, even of the Canadian Pacific Railway, would possibly charge as high a price for that accommodation. I am willing to make a comparison between the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway rates, having reference to the accommodation afforded, at any place on the continent. This is not a question to be brushed aside lightly as being of no importance. I do not look upon it, as an hon. gentleman has suggested, as a joke ; I look upon it seriously. I do not know of anything having been done or said to affect elections. It is a matter of business and not of politics. It is in the interest of Canada, looking to the compact of confederation, looking to the interest of the people of Prince Edward Island as being part of the Dominion of Canada, that we should endeavour to provide good transportation facilities and better connection between the island and the mainland. I think, however, that it is the duty of the government, or any other government, even though this question has stood on the Order Paper for years, to look into the matter, and I feel assured that no government has any idea of treating this matter lightly, but, believing that this is a matter for serious consideration, I would suggest to my hon. friend, that, having secured the object of his motion in bringing this matter to the attention of the House and having had it discussed and ventilated, he should withdraw it for the present, leaving it in the hands of the government to make further inquiry.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I desire to say a word or two. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) has referred to the very great advantage which has accrued to the country from the delay in constructing the tunnel. The tunnel, he says, can be constructed now much more cheaply than if it had been undertaken ten, or twelve or fifteen years ago. I suppose that if my hon. friend carried that argument to its legitimate conclusion he would point out that in the course of time, by geological changes, Prince Edward Island would be joined to the mainland and that the otherwise large expenditure involved in constructing the tunnel would be saved to the country altogether. I do not think that an argument of that kind would be very satisfactory to the people of Prince Edward Island and perhaps the noteworthy inaction of the government in regard to the tunnel may possibly lead to the delay to which I have just now alluded.

The minister referred to the large amount that has been expended by the government, the sum of $84,000, in maintaining one of these steamers in commission, during the winter, but as I understand it that amount would include the cost of maintaining the steamer in commission not only during the winter service but during the summer as well. And if one looks at the record of that expenditure on these steamers one finds, for example, that the 'Montcalm' is charged with an expenditure of $93,741.56 gross, or $85,110.88 net, although that steamer was not engaged in the winter service between the island and the mainland at all.

After all it does not matter very much whether it was $84,000 or $54,000. The government have made an effort to carry on this service so far as it can be carried on by steamboat, but that effort during portions of the time at least has not been very successful. It remains to be considered in the end that the country is pledged, under the terms of confederation, to an efficient steam service winter and summer between the island and the mainland. It may be that the framers of confederation did not have a tunnel in their mind when they used the language quoted by the Minister of Rail-

ways, but it is the meaning of the words which they used and not the intention which was in their minds that eventually controls. If the intention that was in the minds of the framers of confederation had governed, there is not much doubt but that Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island would be entitled to-day to the same representation in this House which they had when they entered confederation. However, in the judgment of the court, the language of the statute did not bear that meaning, and, therefore, the representation of these provinces has been reduced. To take the converse, although it may not have been in the minds of the framers of confederation that a tunnel should be built for the carrying out of this service, nevertheless if the words actually used could be made to include that meaning upon a reasonable interpretation we are not to go back and consider what was in the minds of men who used these words ; we are confined to a consideration of what the meaning of these words is when construed from a reasonable standpoint.

There is just one other consideration that it does not seem to me the Minister of Railways and Canals has had sufficiently in mind. When I visited Prince Edward Island some years ago I found one grievance to which I have repeatedly referred in the House and which it seemed to me it would be easy to remedy. That was the grievance that the Post Office Department, the Department of Railways and Canals and the Department of Marine and Fisheries have different offices and different work and different responsibility in connection with the winter service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. I have repeatedly pointed out to the House during the last two or three sessions that it would seem a comparatively simple matter to place the management of that winter service under the control of some one department, so that we would not have the unnecessary and irritating delays which have taken place in the transmission of mails and passengers. I have never been able to imagine any particular reason why we should have the Intercolonial Railway service on the mainland and on the island under the control of the Railway Department and that the connecting steamship link between these two railways should be under the control of another department. It does not seem to me there is any necessity for that. Although the steamship service between the island and mainland may not be a ferry in the same sense as the service at the straits at Canso, nevertheless it is a ferry in one sense and it is a part of the transportation system between the two railways. It would be a step in the right direction if the views expressed by my hon. friends from Prince Edward Island were given effect to and the entire system placed under the control of one department of government. If you had united management and united action it would tend to a great degree towards the avoidance of these delays which are so irritating and exasperating to the people of Prince Edward Island. Something of that kind should be done in the meantime until the tunnel is built, or at least until the government, after the lapse we hope of a few more months which will bring the total delay up to about twelve years, shall have placed upon the table of the House that information upon this subject which ought to have been afforded to us long ago.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). In reply to the remarks of the leader of the opposition I may say that in my opinion it is advisable that the winter steamboat service should be under the control of the Department of Marine on the general principle that all government steamers should be under the one department because it requires special organization and special management. Although there are some exceptions I believe that generally speaking that is the proper principle to follow, and that in the public interest it will be better to have all our steamers under the one department.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman would not suggest that the ferry at the straits at Canso should be put under his department?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is purely a railway ferry service which is directly connected with the railway and which transfers the cars from the mainland to Cape Breton.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is true, but even when that ferry did not transfer the cars, but merely transferred the passengers and baggage—it was then analogous to the service to Prince Edward Island—it was under the control of the Railway Department.

Mr. BRODEUR. It must be remembered that the steamers which ply between Prince Edward Island and the mainland are only used in that service during the winter months and that in summer both the 'Stanley' and the 'Minto' are used for lighthouse and buoy service and for carrying supplies.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But my hon. friend, I understand, is charging all this up against Prince Edward Island.

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh, no. My hon. friend mentioned the 'Montcalm.' I suppose he made a mistake in the name. The 'Montcalm' is not used in the Prince Edward Island service.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I said it was not.

Mr. BRODEUR. The boats used in that service are the 'Stanley' and the 'Minto.' The expenditures for the 'Minto' are set out

at page P—20 of the Auditor General's Report. The total expenditure for the year ending 31st March, 1907, is $60,118.90. Of this $52,483.90 was taken from the vote for Dominion steamers, $2,635 from the vote for winter mail service and $5,000 from the vote for construction of lights. It is fair to deduct from that the expenditure, which is detailed there, amounting to $5,939.66.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queen's). Does the minister deduct from that the expenditure for the Governor General's tour?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is what I am deducting. This leaves a balance to be charged to the winter service of a little over $54,000. For the 'Stanley' the expenditure is to be found at page P—27. This amounts to $45,504, making a total of $100,000 outside of the expenditure made for the Governor General's tour. These are the figures which have been given by my colleague, the Minister of Railways and Canals. The receipts are to be found at page 201: the 'Minto' gave a revenue of $9,075.23 and the 'Stanley' $7,793.65, making a total of nearly $17,000. So that the figures given by the Minister of Railways and Canals are absolutely correct.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens). Do you not credit something for the use of the steamers in the summer season by the government of Canada?

Mr. BRODEUR. The service that is rendered by the 'Minto' during the summer is detailed under the Governor General's tour.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queen's). The 'Stanley' was engaged in that work too.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not remember that the 'Stanley' was so engaged; I think she was undergoing repairs, though I may be mistaken in that. There is no doubt that the amount expended on the winter service is far in excess of the amount of the receipts. It is suggested by my hon. friend that the government should also take the summer service. I cannot accede to that proposition, because I think the service now given by the company engaged in it is giving general satisfaction. Moreover, the government is so often criticised for the winter service that I am afraid we could not give as good a service as that given by the company. It is well known that public utilities are better administered by private companies than by governments. It is suggested by my hon. friend from Prince that we should adopt a different policy with regard to the use of these boats. The principle adopted by the department is this: When the summer service of the private company is ended, it is taken up by the government between Charlottetown and Pictou. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lefurgey) proposes that the boats shall go first to Summerside, then to Charlottetown and then to Georgetown. I am not in favour of changing ports so often; I think it is in the interest of the island that the service should be as much as possible concentrated at one place. Summerside is not so central as Charlottetown, and I think it is in the interest of the whole island for the boats to begin running from Charlottetown to Pictou, and that any change should be made on the advice of the captains, who are very efficient and cautious men, and whose judgment in that respect can be relied upon. I know that they have sometimes been accused of not being as bold as they should be; but it must be borne in mind that they have to assume a serious responsibility, and so far they have not got their vessels into any serious dfficulty. Instead of condemning their action, I think we should commend it. It is the policy of the department, in all cases, so far as a change of route is concerned, to base our action on the advice of the captains; and in that respect I am sure that we shall be sustained by the public opinion of the island. But the idea of changing about—one day at one place and another day at another—is not a practical one, and I do not at all agree with my hon. friend from Prince. I do not want to offer any more criticisms on the proposition which has been made. As far as the Department of Marine and Fisheries is concerned, we have given this year a very good service, and it is our intention to have an ice breaker built which will be strong enough to cope with the situation.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. The discussion on the resolution I have submitted has taken a wider range than I expected, most of which had reference to the transportation question, and I am very pleased that it has taken such a range. As I had to leave the chamber shortly after the close of my remarks, I regret that I had not the advantage of hearing what fell from the hon. the senior member for Queens (Mr. Martin) and the junior member for that county (Mr. A. A. McLean). I heard, however, all that my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) said. It is much to be regretted that our friends from the island do not seem able to discuss any question affecting it except from a partisan standpoint. I am sorry they cannot discuss such matters as they are debated by our friends from the other provinces. If they would, much better results would be obtained than by this proceeding of bringing up party politics on every possible occasion. My hon. friend the senior member from Queens (Mr. Martin) was a little facetious regarding my remarks. He did not see how a change of name could reduce the freight rates. In that I agree with him, but I suggested nothing of the kind. My hon. friend from Prince said that this resolution was not original on my part. Well, I did not claim it was. I dare say that Columbus when he started out

to discover America got many of his ideas from my hon. friend, because nothing has yet ever been taken up which he did not, in his mind, consider at some time or other. As regards the tunnel, although that does not properly come under this resolution at all, I was much pleased to hear the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) say that very shortly he hoped to be able to lay on the table the report made by his deputy minister, and when that report is brought down the tunnel question can be more intelligently discussed. I have taken the ground for many years that the government should proceed as quickly as possible with a thorough investigation into the question of constructing a tunnel. Let us know as nearly as possible what it will cost so that it need not be kept before the people of Prince Edward Island and Canada continually. If its construction be found practicable, let it be taken up and disposed of in a business way. If it be not practicable, let us take up the next best method. But in any event it will take several years to construct the tunnel and some time to obtain the preliminary information, and in the meantime we must improve the methods we have. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) said that the fact that the routing of freight via Pictou did not cost any more than by Pointe du Chêne and Summerside was no injury to the people of the island. I am aware of that, but it is to the detriment of the Prince Edward Island Railway and to the advantage of the Intercolonial Railway, because by that means the deficit on the Prince Edward Island Railway is larger than it ought to be. The putting of the service across the straits under the Railway Department appeals to me from a business standpoint, as it would simplify matters very much. It would reduce the cost, although I believe that the estimate of the cost given by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is too large. He did not give credit enough to the winter service. You must take into account the fact that the government is compelled practically to find some use for the winter boats in the summer and has to retain in its service during the summer season the staff employed on the winter boats. We have no fault to find with the government on this account, because they must necessarily retain the whole year around the officials whom they are bound to employ on the winter service. I do not know that these are the most suitable steamers for taking the Governor General and his party on excursion trips. They are very expensive for that purpose ; they are large consumers of coal and every time they are used for this purpose alterations and repairs have to be made to them ; the staterooms have to be changed and bathrooms put in just for these trips, and when the steamers are put in their regular service this has all to be changed again. This expense was not deducted by the Minister of Marine.

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh, yes.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. It is not given in the report of the Governor General's trip at page 20 of the Auditor General's Report, only the actual provisions consumed are given, all the rest are charged to the winter service. These steamers may be suitable for lighthouse service along the Labrador, lower Quebec and Newfoundland coasts, but I am not sure that they are the best boats even for that purpose. As I suggested this afternoon, if these boats were kept for the winter service entirely and were put out of commission during the summer, the crews of the winter and summer steamers being interchanged, there would be a material saving.

We have no special fault to find with the management of these boats by the Marine Department except, as I have stated, that that department was not established as a carrying or transportation department, and should not have control of work of that kind, while the Railway Department was established for that purpose and is conversant with all details of transportation questions. I have already suggested that a railway corporation situated as the government is situated here, with portions of its railway on the island and on the mainland would also control the connecting link.

Inasmuch as my object in making this motion has been attained by this discussion and the minister has suggested that it be withdrawn for the present and that it would be taken under consideration by the government, I see no reason for not acceding to his wishes. I am glad to see the matter has been fully discussed by the Minister of Railways, the leader of the opposition, the Minister of Marine and others and I am sure good will come of this discussion. I have pointed out the serious handicap under which the people of my province rest in the shipping of their products in competition with the people of the other provinces of Canada. That is the real point I had in view in bringing up this motion. We should be on an equality with our neighbours on the mainland, with the rest of the people of the Dominion, in regard to freight and passenger rates, or at least we should have a nearer approach to equality than we have now. This matter deserves the immediate consideration of the government, and I am convinced that if it were all under one department we would be nearer an equalization of rates with the rest of Canada, than will be possible with the service under two departments. So long as the existing conditions continue, we will not have attained the object we had in view in entering confederation. Mr. Speaker, under these conditions I will agree to withdraw the motion for the present.

Motion withdrawn.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FIELDING. I understand that the next motion in order is one which, if entered upon, will lead to a protracted debate. It has been suggested that we do not enter upon it to-night and I would move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. When will the correspondence between the Prime Minister and Mr. Justice Cassels, promised for to-day, be brought down ?

Mr. FIELDING. If the Prime Minister is not here to-morrow I shall make inquiry for it. I have no doubt it will be brought down to-morrow.

Mr. TAYLOR. What business will be taken up to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. A motion for Supply will be made. I understand the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles) desires to discuss the Hudson's Bay Railway and this motion for Supply will be made to afford an opportunity to discuss that subject as well as to go into Supply later.

Motion (Mr. Fielding) agreed to and House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, April 7, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 151) respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—Mr. Crawford.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That from this date to the end of the session, government orders have precedence on Mondays immediately after questions to be put by members.

Mr. SPROULE. As there are some sixty-five orders on the Order Paper, Public Bills and Orders, and as this will preclude the possibility of dealing with any of these without the consent of the government, I would ask if I could not have an opportunity of passing the motion which I ineffectually endeavoured to have passed some time ago, when the First Minister moved the adjournment of the debate. I submit that the motion is a reasonable one ; a similar motion was moved on a previous occasion in this House without opposition and I hold the printed copy of it here. This motion really goes farther than my motion. As the matter is of importance not only to myself but to both parties as the return would do no injustice I would ask the First Minister to consent to the passing of my motion.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I am sorry to say that there are several members who have motions or Bills which they would like to have an opportunity to bring to the attention of the House. However, we have come to the period of the session when this motion taking Monday for government business is usually passed. If my hon. friend will allow the matter to stand, perhaps he and I can settle it.

Motion (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) agreed to.

THOMAS D'ARCY McGEE.

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM. As this is the 40th anniversary of the death of Thomas D'Arcy McGee, I would like to know what steps the government are likely to take in regard to the fulfilment of a promise made by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) on the 25th April last year in respect to the erection of a monument to his memory?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The matter will receive the consideration of the government in connection with the coming estimates.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When may I expect the return for which I moved in connection with the cost to date and the estimated future cost of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I asked my department to rush that return and also directed them to comply with the request of my hon. friend to include in the return anything that was embraced in the question which he withdrew.

Mr. PORTER. When may I expect the return ordered on January 15, with reference to royal commissions appointed by the government since 1896 ?

Mr. CROCKET. When may I expect a return moved for on December 18 for a statement showing the post office services in the different counties of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I have the returns for several counties ready and expect that the remainder will be ready in a few days. Probably next week I shall be able to lay the papers on the table of the House.

Mr. MONK. I beg to renew a notice which I gave some time last month that on the first opportunity when the House should

be moved into Committee of Supply, I would move an amendment having for its object the abolition of the bonus system.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). If my hon. friend will agree with me I will arrange a date privately with him if he wants to have an opportunity of discussing this matter.

Mr. MONK. There would be no difficulty in so far as I am personally concerned, but knowing that the House was going to be moved into Committee of Supply to-day I informed a number of hon. members who wish to speak upon this subject that the discussion would take place to-day. It seems to be an inconvenient custom to introduce into this House that supporters of the government, without giving notice, should be able to arrange for a discussion, presumably of an amicable character, just at the stage when the House is moved into Committee of Supply. It is the proper moment, as I understand it, to air grievances, and it is for that reason that I would be rather disposed to insist upon what appears to be my right.

Mr. FIELDING. I think there have been several motions for Supply since my hon. friend gave that intimation, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. MONK. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I think there was only one motion to go into Supply which was made in order to vote a certain amount of Supply to meet the pressing needs of the fiscal year ending on the 31st March.

Mr. FIELDING. I have not turned up the dates and I cannot contradict my hon. friend, but my impression is that there have been several motions to go into Supply. Therefore, the hon. gentleman has had an opportunity to bring this matter up. In regard to the motion to-day all that happened was what very often happens; if an hon. gentleman desires to deal with any given question he asks when the House is going to be moved into Committee of Supply and he intimates that he will bring the matter up. This question was mentioned last night in connection with the business of the House. I would suggest that unless the hon. gentleman wishes to speak on this question he can bring forward his motion after the earlier discussion has taken place.

Mr. MONK. I do not think that any motion to go into Committee of Supply has been moved since I gave this notice except the one to which I have just referred.

Mr. FIELDING. I have not looked up the dates, but I am under that impression. However, my hon. friend may be right.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend here beside me informs me that the hon. gentleman who intends to discuss this question has a notice of motion on the paper.

Mr. FIELDING. In his absence yesterday another hon. gentleman struck it off at his request in order that he might be able to bring it up on the motion to go into Supply.

Mr. SPROULE. And before it was struck off the paper my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Monk) gave notice that the first time the House was moved into Committee of Supply he would bring his motion forward.

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. SPROULE. That is my understanding.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) did not say the first time that the House was moved into Committee of Supply; he said that upon a future occasion when the House was moved into Committee of Supply he would bring the matter up. He simply intimated an intention to bring forward his motion but he did not say that he would do so on the first motion to go into committee.

Mr. MONK. I have just been looking over 'Hansard' and I cannot find it, but my recollection is that I gave notice that the first time the House was moved into Committee of Supply, if I could conveniently present this motion, I would do so.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. MONK. My impression is that the motion to go into Supply has only been made on one occasion.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not attach enough importance to it to look it up, but I remember that the hon. gentleman gave notice that if the House was going to be moved into Supply on a particular evening he preferred not to go on.

Mr. MONK. But it was not moved.

Mr. FIELDING. If the House should be moved into Supply on that evening.

Mr. MONK. It was not moved into Supply on that occasion. I think it is a very inconvenient custom which does not exist in England to arrange for the discussion, at the moment when the House is moved into Committee of Supply, of some question chosen by a supporter of the government upon which there is some extente cordiale. It removes from members on the opposition side of the House the opportunity of engaging in the discussion of grievances.

Mr. FIELDING. I can only say that in so far as an arrangement being made with an hon. gentleman supporting the government is concerned, it is a common occurrence for an hon. gentleman on either side of this House to come to a minister and ask when the motion for Supply will next be made, as he desires to avail himself of the opportunity to call attention to a particular sub-

ject. I have had such suggestions made to me frequently and I have said that on such and such a day Supply would be moved; as to the rest it was in the judgment of the House.

SUPPLY—RAILWAY TO HUDSON BAY.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (West Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, as has been said by an hon. gentleman opposite this afternoon the notice of this motion has been on the Order Paper since the commencement of this session asking that the government should take into their serious consideration the question of transportation in reference to the Canadian west and especially in regard to the construction in the very near future of the Hudson Bay Railway. It had been my purpose to go on with that motion on the first available opportunity, and I have been watching for such an opportunity for weeks, but upon any occasion upon which I have been present it has not presented itself. Yesterday it was dropped that I might have the privilege which is open to every hon. member of this House of presenting views upon this and similar subjects on the occasion of our going into Committee of Supply.

The proposition which I desire to bring before the House is one which my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. McCraney) seconded last year and one which I believe he will still endorse. Over a year ago I brought to the attention of this House this same problem. On that occasion I had a very strong case to make before the House in view of the very congested condition of the transportation facilities in the west. The House will recall that a year ago there was a very much more serious congestion than there is during this present year. Happily this year we have not had the vicissitudes in regard to weather conditions to cause a repetition of the very serious condition of affairs which prevailed a year ago, but I am sorry to have to say again this session that notwithstanding the condition of the season, the favourable weather we have had and the unfortunately small crop, there has still been a great deal of congestion. I have seen at different points in the elevator towns in the Northwest a condition of affairs where men were not able to ship the grain which they had raised for weeks this last fall because of the repetition of this congested condition of affairs, and I must say that I cannot too forcibly impress upon the members of this House the seriousness of a condition of that kind. When we find that men have worked their farms through the summer to the end that they may have the product of the soil to sell, and when we find that when they have that product ready for market they are not able to move it, they are not able to find a purchaser for their grain, it is indeed a most serious condition of affairs. I myself have stood at many elevator points along the different railway lines and I have seen farmers standing with their hands in their pockets looking up at the elevators and entirely helpless to raise one dollar upon their grain.

However, the condition of affairs this season was not nearly so serious as in the season before. But that does not in any way make me hesitate in my desire to bring this question again before the House during the present session, for I think it would be the utmost folly if we were to say that because last year we had something of a failure in our crop, and because this winter has been so favourable in weather conditions there has not been the congestion that otherwise would prevail and therefore, we have considered the transportation problem solved. That would be a most foolish policy. I desire on the contrary to say that under these circumstances, while they ensure against a repetition this year of the serious condition of affairs that we had a year ago, at the same time instead of making us less anxious they should make us more anxious, because it is no exaggeration to say that as each succeeding year comes upon us there will always be a greater problem to solve than there was in the year before. The country is filling up by leaps and bounds, and unless there is something undertaken by the government of Canada in the very near future I am at a loss to know how we will solve this great problem of transportation. We have had during the last few seasons an abnormal increase of our population by immigration. During the year 1906 there came into our country from Great Britain, 97,757 immigrants; from the United States, 63,782 immigrants and from continental Europe, 54,373; making a total of immigrants in 1906 of 215,912. In the year 1907 we had a total immigration of 277,376, a very material increase over the number of immigrants in 1906. And, I am happy to say that the class of immigrants which we have been receiving in recent years belong to the very best class of people we could expect to bring to this country. I might cite as an instance of this that the settlers from the United States in 1906 brought with them settlers, effects to the value of 49 million dollars, and in 1907 they brought with them settlers, effects to the value of 52 million dollars. And, I may say to those gentlemen who are prone to talk about the balance of trade being against us, that if they consider such an item as this in their calculations it would go a long way to explain how it is that our imports are greater than our exports. If we take 52 million dollars worth of settlers effects brought from the United States alone, it will give us an average per capita for each immigrant of over $800. We are all aware that the immigration during the present year has been larger than it was last year,

and that during January and February of this year (1908) there has been an increase of 61 per cent over the immigration in January and February of the year 1907.

It is reliably figured that the lands in the provinces of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan which are not yet tilled, will when brought under cultivation result in the reaping of the harvest of almost inconceivable magnitude; that if we take the grain land which as yet is not settled and if we figure that on the basis of it producing only one half of what the present cultivated acreage does, even on that basis there will be 2,000,000,000 bushels of grain raised in the three new west provinces. It is therefore no exaggeration to say that the outlook in that country is very bright, and that for the moment we are justified in passing on to this very urgent matter of attempting to solve the great transportation problem in preference to taking up the subject which the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) wished to discuss this afternoon. I might also remind my hon. friends on both sides of the House that the facilities for handling the grain in the way of transportation accommodation are very little better than they were twenty-three years ago when the last spike was driven on the Canadian Pacific Railway. I fail to see how any hon. gentlemen on either side of the House can say that the government is going too fast, as they sometimes say when they talk about the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific. These hon. gentlemen may express themselves similarly with regard to this proposition that I have the honour to bring before the House this afternoon, and they may say that Canada can afford to go slowly, but I say that in view of the fact that we have very little more facilities for transportation than we had twenty-five years ago, the criticism is, in all fairness and justice, not properly advanced that the government of Canada has gone too fast in making provision along the line of transportation facilities. It comes to this, that with regard to the production of grain just as with regard to the production of any other staple you may have for the world's market, if you cannot find a reasonable and convenient market for the thing you are producing the rules of trade and commerce very soon cause the production to cease. You cannot for ever expect farmers in the Northwest to be producing grain they cannot sell. You cannot expect they will go on producing that for which they cannot find a ready market any more than you can expect the man who runs a factory to keep on producing goods when he is not able to find a convenient market for the product of his factory. And with regard to the Northwest Territories, Providence has cast our lot along agricultural lines just as in Ontario, to a very large extent, the lot of that province is cast along manufacturing lines. The wealth of Ontario is largely bound up in the great cities where the manufacturing industries are centralized, while just as truly are our lines cast for us along agricultural pursuits. That is so ordained by nature and it is only by developing our resources along that natural line that we will be able to attain the true destiny for which the great fertile prairies were created. After all, without the slightest comparison that may be odious, I leave it to any hon. gentleman present if it is not a fair proposition to make, that if there must be any industry encouraged first in the Dominion of Canada, we first should encourage the agricultural industry. I recall reading in a recent life of Peel that he said: We would no doubt rather have corn fields than cotton factories; we no doubt would rather have an agricultural population than a population engaged in manufacturing industries, but Providence has decreed otherwise and statesmen are powerless to prevail against it. So I may say with regard to the Northwest Territories, that it is always going to be for the blessing of Canada that Providence has ordained that that country shall be a great agricultural country and the supporter of a great agricultural population which in morals, in intelligence, in industry, and in every desirable feature you like to speak of, is always recognized throughout the world as the best and most desirable population that any nation may aspire to possess. And, when we speak about solving the problem of the agricultural community the words can scarcely be out of our mouth before we learn that it is the transportation problem we have to solve, and that when we talk about agricultural problems in that country of great distance it amounts to the same thing as referring to the transportation problem. I must remark here that I read, very carefully the platform of the leader of the opposition announced in the city of Halifax, and it was with regret I found that for us in the west he had no utterance to make with regard to how we were going to solve that great problem. I should have been very pleased had he on that occasion taken hold of the great national question of the Hudson Bay Railway, or the great national question of transportation for the movement of our grain in the west, and if he had presented to us in definite words that we could have understood some solution by which he thought we could address ourselves to the carrying out of this great task which lies upon us as a nation. I say it was with regret, that in the platform of the leader of the opposition announced in the city of Halifax, I was not able to find any treatment of this important subject.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would ask my hon. friend whether he has found out what

the government platform is on the question ?

Mr. KNOWLES. I am trying to find that out this afternoon. However, since the Hudson Bay Railway became a great national question, the government as far as I am aware has not undertaken to consolidate and present their policy in the clear and well defined words which we find for example in the Halifax platform.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Hear, hear.

Mr. KNOWLES. I have not said that I am altogether satisfied with the way in which the government have addressed themselves to the transportation problem of the west : I would like to have seen them move a little more quickly.

Coming to the specific matter about which I wish to speak this afternoon, I wish again briefly to give the distances from various settled points in the Northwest by way of the proposed Hudson Bay Railway, in order that the figures may be again placed on 'Hansard.' Generally speaking, the use of the Hudson Bay Railway will save about the distance from Fort William to the sea ; that is to say, the distance from the centre of the wheat country to Fort Churchill is about the same as the distance from the centre of the wheat country to Fort William, and the distance from Fort Churchill to Liverpool is about the same as the distance from Montreal to Liverpool, which means that the distance from Fort William to Montreal will be saved. The various distances are as follows :

From	To Montreal.	To Fort Churchill.	Difference
	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
Winnipeg.....	1,422	945	477
Brandon	1,555	940	615
Moosejaw.....	1,823	817	1,006
Medicine Hat.....	2,082	1,076	1,006

The distance from Fort Churchill to Liverpool is 2,946 miles and the distance from Montreal to Liverpool is 2,927 miles, being practically the same. The distance from New York to Liverpool by the northern route is 3,079 miles. Thus there will be, generally speaking, a saving of distance by the Hudson Bay route, as proposed between 950 and 1,000 miles. This saving in distance will be of course a great advantage in every direction. It will mean a saving in time and in charges, while the route will afford, what is very important, another outlet for the products of the west. The number of miles of railway that will require to be constructed is at present only 470 or 475 miles, just about one and a half the distance from Toronto to Montreal. That seems a small matter when we consider the importance of moving the wheat harvested in the western country every year. With regard to the saving of charges, I wish to refer to the treatise on the subject compiled by Mr. J. A. McKenna under instructions of the hon. Minister of the Interior, and published by the Department of the Interior. This treatise is regarded as an authority on the subject. At page 51, Mr. McKenna says, with regard to the saving on wheat :

The freight upon grain from the wheat belt to Hudson bay would approximate ten cents a bushel, the same as to Port Arthur; the additional 15 cents from there to the Atlantic sea-board would be saved to the farmer, and this, of itself, represents a fair profit to the wheat-grower. Assuming an export trade of 20,000,000 of bushels, which can easily be handled in two months of the season by the proposed railway the saving of 15 cents a bushel, being the difference in cost of freight from Port Arthur to the Atlantic sea-board, would amount to $3,000,000.

That is with regard to wheat alone. Now let me read what Mr. McKenna has to say with regard to the saving and profit in the transportation of cattle :

A very important feature in connection with a railway which secures quick access to the sea is with relation to the shipping of cattle to the European markets; this great industry is at present seriously handicapped in consequence of the long journey to be endured under present conditions. It is admitted as a well recognized fact, that cattle shipped to the Atlantic coast arrive at the shipping port in poor condition, emaciated by long days of rail travel. It is also admitted that on the sea journey they gain rather than lose in flesh, if put on board in good condition. Experience proves that after three days of rail travel cattle will deteriorate; that three days is about the limit of the time during which they can travel and maintain the condition in which they are placed on board. This being so, cattle could be transported to Fort Churchill without loss in flesh, and the voyage to Liverpool would improve this condition rather than the contrary. Therefore, this great industry alone would find in the Fort Churchill route a solution of the difficulty under which those engaged in the business of cattle shipping now labour.

Mr. F. W. Peters, assistant freight traffic manager of the Canadian Pacific at Winnipeg, states that up to the end of October over 72,000 head of cattle had been shipped to Liverpool from western Canada, and he expected a further 10,000 head to be shipped that season. The freight rate on these cattle would be about 60 cents a hundred pounds in car lots from Winnipeg to Montreal. The rate from Calgary to Fort Churchill would be about the same as to Winnipeg, and the distance about equal, so that this 60 cents a hundred pounds could be saved to the shipper if he could put the cattle on board at Hudson bay, and he would also prevent the shrinkage which would otherwise occur, by reason of the additional rail journey from Winnipeg to Montreal.

Upon the 82,000 head of cattle shipped to Montreal from the west during the past sea-

son, the saving in freight alone, $6 a head, or in round figures $650,000, would be equal to about 20 per cent of the selling price.

That has reference to the saving in freight charges alone; and it is said by experienced cattlemen that to these you can add $2 a head for the saving of shrinkage in the cattle from making the rail journey so much shorter.

We now come to the question of the land through which this railway will have to pass. In my speech of last session I went into this subject more fully than I propose to do to-day, because the character of the land is not something that has now to be proved, but is generally accepted. We have had expert evidence given on this subject before different committees of the House during this session and last session, and I think that not only to hon. members of this House but to the whole country it is no longer a debatable question whether or not the country through which it is proposed to build this railway is of such a nature that the railway is feasible. It is recognized to be a country through which the building of a railway would not be difficult. A great deal of the country is of limestone formation, which is the ideal kind of land upon which to lay rails. There is sufficient timber to furnish ties in abundance. And there are resources which would bring a great deal of profitable traffic to the railway. Besides the short distance over which a railway has to be constructed, 470 miles, surely justifies me in saying that the construction is from every point of view, feasible, and one which would bring such profit to the farmers of the Northwest Territories that there can be no excuse for delaying the work any longer.

I beg to refer to a document published by the Senate entitled 'Our Fertile North Lands.' On page 89 you will find particulars regarding the nature of the country. I have had the pleasure of discussing this question with different engineers who have been over that territory, and they tell me—especially Mr. Thibaudeau, an engineer who has recently been out there—that in every way it is an ideal country for railway building. There are great stretches in it of first-class agricultural land. For an extent of 200 miles north and south and an indefinite distance east and west there are great resources which would yield profitable traffic. There are timber, mineral and agricultural lands, and when we get to the bay itself we find good fisheries such as cod, salmon and lake trout. As regards Fort Churchill, it is one of the best natural harbours in the world. It is deep, well sheltered, easily kept open during nine months of the year, and there would be very little cost in fitting it up beyond the building of elevators and wharfs. On pages 45 and 46 of this book to which I have referred, I find that the writer, Mr. McKenna, quoting from Mr. Thibaudeau, thus describes some of the advantages of Fort Churchill harbour:

It can be kept open all the year by the employment of ice-breakers. Last year, 1906, the harbour closed between December 5 and December 10. The conditions in January, 1907, were as follows: In the bay at Fort Churchill the ice was 11 inches thick. It extended for a third of a mile from the shore into the bay. Ice was much thinner in the bay than in the harbour. There was some floating ice about a quarter of a mile from the edge of the bay ice. This is sent in by a northerly wind; should the prevailing winds blow from any other direction, there would be no floating ice. Beyond this floating ice there was clear open water straight away into the bay and beyond. This was the general condition up to and including January 2, 1907. An ice-breaker similar to either the north or south now in use between Quebec and Levis would, by making two trips a week, keep the harbour open the year round.

The entrance to the harbour is about 2,000 feet wide, with a minimum depth of water of ten fathoms. Vessels drawing 36 feet draft could enter the harbour and anchor within 200 yards of the west division, to a point 3,500 feet south of Fort Prince of Wales. The bay outside the harbour also affords good anchorage; there is ample depth of water.

A vessel drawing 24 feet of water can come within 150 yards of the east side of the harbour, from its mouth to a point 150 yards south of Battery beacon. There is also good anchorage south of the point east alluded to (150 yards south of Battery beacon) for 2,000 feet by 800 feet in width for vessels drawing 24 feet of water. Opposite Battery beacon for a distance of 2,500 feet across the harbour there is a minimum depth of 24 feet of water.

He then goes on to speak of other places in and outside the harbour where there is splendid anchorage. The great question, of course, occurs to us at this point, and that is the navigability of the straits. This is also dealt with in the treatise to which I have referred. I shall not take up time by going into the details, but there seems to be no doubt that the straits are safely navigable at least four months in the year. A great many of the old Hudson bay navigators put a much longer period of time during which the straits are open to shipping. We have data on this subject dating back about one hundred and fifty years, for ships have gone into the bay as many and even more years back. And when we reflect that in this present age we have our ice-breakers, our modern steamships which can break the ice themselves, and with the aids to navigation such as telegraph stations, lighthouses and other facilities, there does not seem the slightest doubt that the Hudson bay straits could easily be open for shipping at least four months in the year. My own opinion is that they may be kept open much longer.

So far I have discussed the question from the view point of the west. Let me point out that it would also be profitable for the eastern provinces. In the territories, in the next fifteen or twenty or a hundred years,

we shall require great quantities of steel. This is called the steel age, and in the construction of our buildings and bridges and other works of development, including railways, we shall require no doubt immense quantities of that product. Is it not very advisable, therefore, that ships should come direct from the steel plants in Sydney, laden with their products, and discharge in Fort Churchill, which is but a few hundred miles away from the centre of the Northwest Territories? Not only does this apply to steel but to all those other products which are placed upon the market by our fellow citizens in Nova Scotia, Cape Breton or even Prince Edward Island. Take, for instance, fish and other products raised in these provinces, they could be laid down at Fort Churchill very cheaply and in that way help not only the west but the east.

I now come to deal for a few minutes with the question of who should pay for the Hudson Bay Railway. My hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) seemed to lay it down as a foregone conclusion, that the money should not come out of the exchequer of Canada. I wish to be the last to raise the question of the east against the west or the west against the east. There is no profit in that kind of discussion, but I would be wanting in my duty to my constituents, if I did not say very frankly that, in my humble opinion, the people of the west are contributing very much to the exchequer of the Dominion and are not receiving one scintilla of profit in return except what they get back in the shape of expended revenue. It would not be unreasonable therefore to ask our friends in the east to seriously consider this question, whether it would not, in some way, tend to equalize the burdens of this nation we are trying together to build up if a return were made to the west by undertaking some great national enterprise such as this. It is very seldom that this matter is touched upon in this House, but this afternoon I am going to speak for a moment or two frankly along that line. When I spoke last session on the subject of the Hudson Bay Railway, I said that we of the west were willing to pay a certain amount of revenue and, incidentally—as there is no use denying—a certain amount of protection, that we might help our sister provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and the rest to develop their resources and build up their industries to the end that we might, together, eventually make a great nation in Canada. But I wish to recall what this House does not often hear, and that is that we are agriculturists, and while there are many agriculturists in Ontario and Quebec and the other older provinces, yet our people do not profit from the building up of manufacturing centres as do the agricultrists in the eastern provinces. The agriculturist in Ontario may find the burden of the tariff bear somewhat heavily upon him as a consumer, but he always has the consoling thought that he is building up at his very doors, a great market—in Toronto it may be, London, or Hamilton, or Halifax, or Sydney, or Quebec or Montreal—building up a great market to which he may bring his produce. But there is no such consolation for us, there is no such compensation for us. We have to find our market on Liverpool prices, and anything that we contribute for the building up of Canada—I want to say here and I say it without fear of contradiction—we are paying for the purpose of building up the nation and there is no selfish advantage whatever. In view of that fact, would it be a very unreasonable principle to lay down, that, in the administration of the affairs of this country, the west should be more generously dealt with than she is, and that in the administration of the affairs of the country there should be a freer hand in dealing with the west because she has no such compensation as that of which I have spoken in the case of the people who live in the east? Of course this is not necessarily to be applied toward the building of the Hudson Bay Railway, but I contend that it is not an unreasonable principle to lay down.

My hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) suggests—and I confess that I have nearly made up my mind that there is something in the idea—that the Hudson Bay Railway is not to be built out of the exchequer of Canada. The hon. gentleman suggests an arrangement which he outlined. He said: Let us keep one-tenth of the lands and wait until they are worth $10 and $12 an acre, and then sell them and reimburse the exchequer of Canada for the cost of building the road. To me it is a very unwelcome task to differ from such an eminent and hon. gentleman as the member from Brandon; still, in my humble way, I do differ from the position he laid down, and I will tell you why. For one thing, I am against tying up ten per cent of the land. We have had such a curse upon us from tying up lands for the Canadian Pacific Railway that not ten per cent, or even one per cent, would I favour tying up for the days to come. I can show you school districts, Mr. Speaker, that have to close the doors of their schools and could not educate their children because of the tying up the lands of the Canadian Pacific Railway as these lands could not be taxed. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) went further, and took advantage of the opportunity to say that, in his opinion, the odd-numbered sections which had been tied up as being in the railway belt, should be thrown open for settlement without the preemption. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman in his expression of opinion on that point either. The governmnet has already announced itself—the announcement having been made last session that it was in

favour of the pre-emption clause in the Consolidated Land Bill which was brought down, and I have no reason to believe that the government has changed on that point. For my part, I was a supporter of that feature, and am still in favour of it. That Bill provides that the present settler in the Northwest shall be given opportunity to become possessed of a farm of not only 160 acres but 320 acres. Let me give, very briefly, my reasons for favouring this plan. In the first place, we must admit that the best land, speaking generally, is gone. Of course, there is a great deal of good land left, and not homesteaded? I am not trying to give a black eye to the land not taken up—but there is no denying that, generally speaking, the choice land has been taken, as is only natural. Therefore, it is to be considered whether there is not an arrangement to be made by which a man, if he cannot get as good land as the homesteader of the past got, many receive more of the land that is not so valuable. And we say that it is to be given on residence duties as proposed, with the payment of $3 an acre, that removes any objection that may be raised that the land is going to the speculator. As I am on that subject, I wish to say what my opinion is in reference to the pre-emption clause. My hon. friend from Brandon brought this subject up. I have no hesitation in saying, as a western man, and one in touch with western conditions, that the opposition to this provision of the measure comes from the great land speculators of the west. Let me read an article from the Regina 'Standard,' which hon. gentlemen opposite, no doubt, will listen to with great respect—and, on the point referred to I think the 'Standard' is right. I read from the issue of March 5:

Hon. Frank Oliver's new land measure, which was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne in the House of Commons——

I am not sure they are right about that.

—and which is shortly to be up for consideration, was the subject of discussion, it is learned, at a meeting of a number of business men at the city hall yesterday afternoon, at which John Ridington, formerly of the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' but now representing the corporations interested, and attached to the staff of the Pearson Land Company, dealt with the pre-emption provisions of the Bill and endeavoured to work up a feeling against these pre-emption clauses with a view to having pressure brought to bear on Mr. Oliver, through letters to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, to break the determination of the Minister of the Interior to have the pre-emption clauses inserted. Mr. Ridington's mission was not crowned with much success, apparently, for the meeting broke up without any action being taken and the whole question was referred to the business men's committee of the board of trade.

It is gathered that Mr. Ridington's main objection was to the pre-emption clauses of the Oliver Land Bill.

I could read you other reports and items from the public press which go to show that this opposition comes from the great land speculators. I myself was waited upon by a gentleman, who, I think, is the largest land dealer in Winnipeg, and he asked me to give my opposition to these Bills. He said: With all our thousands and tens of thousands of acres of land, if the Dominion government is going to throw open the odd-numbered sections to enable men to get their quarter-section by means of pre-emption, it would ruin our market. I remember his saying to me: If the government must give the settler another 160 acres, don't talk about $3 an acre; we want $15 an acre for our land, and when you talk about $3 an acre it makes people say our price is ridiculous. I could cite many cases of men identified with the land interest in the west, having taken a similar view to that of my hon. friend from Brandon, that the pre-emption feature should not be carried out, but that the land should be kept only for the individual homesteader. There is this also to be remembered that previously when homesteaders went into that country they had the privilege of purchasing another quarter-section in addition to their homestead from the railway company or the Hudson Bay Company. That privilege is now gone. The railway lands are nearly all sold, the Hudson Bay lands are virtually all sold, so I have no hesitation in saying, speaking only for myself, that for these reasons, the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) to the contrary notwithstanding, the pre-emption clause should stand.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the pre-emption clause of $3 an acre?

Mr. KNOWLES. Yes, with settlement duties in connection. I am in favour of that and wish to be judged accordingly. In the administration of lands in the Northwest the government, I think, should not be too afraid of exercising generosity to the settlers. It is a matter of pride to me personally, without wishing to bring politics into this discussion that this government has never given away an acre of land to a railway company, or any other company except in the case of that bargain, which in my opinion was a good bargain, with the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, under which that company undertook to settle lands that before that time had been barren. Apart from that they have sold no land to any land company or for that matter have sold no land at all.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the land they gave to ranching companies at a dollar an acre, one-fifth of all their holdings?

Mr. KNOWLES. My hon. friend is mistaken. No land was sold to a ranching company at $1 an acre.

Mr. SPROULE. If it was not, the information given to the House was incorrect. Three companies had the option of taking one-fifth of their holdings at $1 an acre and they bought over 10,000 acres at this price.

Mr. KNOWLES. My hon. friend no doubt is quite sincere in what he says, but he is altogether mistaken.

Mr. SPROULE. If there is any mistake it comes from the government because they gave the information to the House.

Mr. KNOWLES. I wish to get along with my speech.

Mr. FOSTER. Will he say that McGregor & Hitchcock did not buy 9,450 acres, one-tenth of their holdings of grazing lands at $1 an acre and pay for it?

Mr. KNOWLES. That is two against one, anybody else? My hon. friend will have to admit that, I am right when I say that these people did not go on the market and buy land at $1 an acre. I will admit that under the grazing lease the holder can buy a small amount of land for home and corral purposes, but that is different from going on the market and buying outright. I am glad my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) spoke with reference to that McGregor & Hitchcock lease. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) spoke of the Robbins Irrigation Company.

Mr. SPROULE. No, I spoke of the cattle ranching company.

Mr. KNOWLES. I will therefore qualify my remarks by saying that the government has sold semi-arid lands under the Irrigation Act at $3 an acre, $2 to be spent in improving the land. This is quite different from saying that it is sold at $1 an acre.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not the land I spoke of.

Mr. KNOWLES. No, the hon. member refers to lands sold under the home and corral provisions of the grazing regulations.

Mr. FOSTER. But not for corral purposes?

Mr. KNOWLES. Doctors differ.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not take 9,000 acres to make a corral.

Mr. KNOWLES. I am of the opinion that any land sold in that way was sold under that clause, but I am sure that the hon. gentleman is not right in his figures about the 9,000 acres.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman admit that under the terms of the leases of these three companies they are entitled to purchase, if they have not already purchased, 35,000 acres for $1 an acre, that is one-tenth of their holdings? Is that not in accordance with the terms of the lease?

Mr. KNOWLES. I am not aware that it is, no I do not think so,——

Mr. SPROULE. It would be well for the hon. member to inform himself.

Mr. KNOWLES. Unless it is under regulations that were in force long before I became familiar with the regulations. If there were such regulations they were made by the Conservative government. I never knew of such regulations, and am confident that no such regulations have been in force since I have had anything to do with parliament. I think the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) are both mistaken.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all, your leader is there within a few feet of you, ask him.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is all wrong.

Mr. KNOWLES. The hon. member will at least have to listen to me when I say that this government stands in a very favourable light compared with the previous government in regard to the alienation of land?

Mr. FOSTER. In what way ?

Mr. KNOWLES. In every way.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will substantiate that there is a fine chance for him.

Mr. KNOWLES. I have made a great many statements this afternoon and I can give the book for every statement. I have heard the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) make a great many statements which I could have stopped by asking him to substantiate them, but we are so used to him and his statements that we do not question him.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the hon. member substantiate this one? It is his own assertion.

Mr. KNOWLES. I would have to take about half of all the 'Hansard' of this session.

Mr. FOSTER. We will give you all you want so that you substantiate it.

Mr. KNOWLES. Because my hon. friend has undoubtedly occupied a great deal more than his share of the time of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not touch the question; will the hon. gentleman substantiate his statement?

Mr. KNOWLES. It is too much to go over all my hon. friend's speeches, you must remember that he spoke five hours and twenty minutes a few days ago and I do not know that he said anything worth listening to.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend does not substantiate his statement.

Mr. KNOWLES. At any rate if this government has sold and is selling land in large quantities I wish to say that they have not my support in that.

Mr. FOSTER. That is plain enough.

Mr. KNOWLES. But I am quite sure my hon. friend is away out in the number of acres he has given. We need only look at the records to see that the previous government sold and gave away millions of acres of land. This government has certainly not alienated any such quantity of land as that. Since I am speaking in regard to the alienation of land by pre-emption, I wish to emphasize what I am saying when I was interrupted that there is every need for the government to exercise a policy of generosity towards the settler. He is going into that country to stay, to raise his family; and if there is to be an error made on any side, let it be made on the side of giving him a few acres too many rather than restricting him unduly. Any one familiar with the lands which have not already been taken up will agree that 160 acres are not sufficient for a man to make his home on permanently. Even if 320 acres should be a small number of acres more than he requires, I say it is wise to err on that side, for as time goes on and his family grows up he will want to expand his farm, he will want land on which to put his sons. If you tied him down to a very limited number of acres you will cause the separation of his family which we should avoid as long as possible.

I remember on the occasion of the inauguration of the new provinces, when His Excellency and the Prime Minister and other ministers of the Crown were in Edmonton, the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) made a speech which was extremely popular. Before him were lined up wagon after wagon filled with little children. On each of these wagons there was a motto, 'they will grow.' The Minister of Customs took that motto as the text of his address, and he spoke of the manner in which all through that country growth was manifest on every hand. He spoke of the way the country had grown in the past and was going to expand in the future and as that voice of his carried out over the prairie and across the Saskatchewan river, the people enjoyed his speech extremely and almost forgave him for the very large amount of money he takes from them in customs year after year. I say that the same motto may be applied to our families in regard to making provision for them by giving them a generous supply of land. If you are going to tie men down to 160 acres of land, not the best kind of land even, you should make provision for the development of that country and for the growth of their families. I wish to place myself on record not as holding the views of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), but rather as holding the views which were embodied in the Bill of the government last session.

There are one or two objections that have been raised against the Hudson Bay Railway that I wish to refer to. The objection is raised that the equipment of this railway will be used only three or four months, or, at the most, five months in the year. I do not think that is correct. I think, Mr. Speaker, that there will be the hauling of wheat to the elevators at Fort Churchill month after month and then, taking it at its very worst, whatever railway company operates the Hudson Bay Railway, the Canadian Northern, the Canadian Pacific Railway, or the Grand Trunk Pacific, it will in twenty-four hours, at any time, be able to take its rolling stock off that new railway and place it on its main line. Therefore, I say it is impossible for people to contend that the equipment would lie idle during seven or eight months in the year. We have also to remember that even at this present day they are carrying to Fort William and Port Arthur many million bushels of grain; there is storage accommodation at the head of the lakes for about 15,000,000 bushels. Why should not the same be done at Fort Churchill?

So, Mr. Speaker, without desiring to detain the House further, I wish simply to close by saying that the people of the west, of my own constituency, and I think I can speak for the residents of the province of Saskatchewan, are desirous that this government should take into its immediate consideration the solution of this problem by which they may have readier access to the markets, and by which they will be afforded relief from that great inconvenience which has lain upon them like a burden for the last few years. They ask that the government will come to their assistance by providing greater facilities for the transportation of their grain. I have endeavoured to point out that the scheme which is embodied in this proposition is feasible, that a demand has come from the farmers of the west for a solution of this problem, that it is nothing which will stagger this government, that the west has great claims upon the Dominion government because of the great contribution it is making towards the development of the natural industries of Canada, and I trust that these considerations will weigh with the government and with hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, so that this question may receive the favourable consideration of the House and of the government.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris). Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House for a short time this afternoon while I place myself on record on this important question that so much affects our western country. During the twenty-five years that

I have been a resident of that western country we have had very many questions which have occupied the attention of government, both federal and provincial. We have had the question of education, and it has not been without its difficulties, we have had the question of immigration, we have had the question of the administration of justice over so vast an area, we have had the question of the autonomy of the various provinces that go to make up that great country the last west, but in my opinion we have had no question which has caused so much anxiety or which has engaged the attention of the people more than this question of the transportation of the products which that country is capable of producing to the markets of the world. The transportation of our wheat, of our cattle, of our hogs and of many other of the products of that country, has, as I have said, engaged the attention of the very best statesmen and financiers. Yet to-day this House and the country will have to admit that the transportation question is not solved. It is still in a very unsatisfactory condition. As everybody knows, and as our experience shows, our annual blockades are continually increasing in intensity. Although the transportation question is not solved I am prepared to admit perhaps that the railways that already exist in the country have made a fair effort to meet the demands which have been made upon them. I may have something to say about that a little later. However, this fact absolutely faces us to-day that the transportation question is not solved. If we look in the light of the present day at the opposition that is manifested against any improvement in the transportation facilities of that country we wonder why there should be this opposition and ignorance existing. I am prepared to admit that those who have opposed the extension of the railway facilities in that country may have been honest in their opposition, but I believe that the opposition was one that came from those who were absolutely ignorant of the actual conditions. I do not refer to this matter for any political purpose at all because as far as anything I have to say this afternoon is concerned I hope it will be absolutely free from party politics. The opposition that was offered to the Canadian Pacific Railway when the railway first went into that country was put up by men like Mr. Blake and in fact by the Liberal party of that day and I believe it was made because of their ignorance of the actual condition of affairs. Let us look for a moment at the transportation facilities we have in the west. We have the Canadian Pacific Railway and I am not prepared to say to-day that that road has done all it should have done considering the very large amount of money it received from this country. Neither am I here to say that it has not made a fairly honest effort to meet the demands of transportation in that country. As I said a few days ago, speaking on this question, two years ago the Canadian Pacific Railway and all other railways were up against an exceedingly hard proposition. With the storms and snow which existed in that country it was absolutely impossible for any railway company to meet the demands, and the agitation which has been going on for a long time against the railways reached its climax that year. So much for the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, we have the Canadian Northern, and although some of our friends on the other side of the House have manifested a great deal of opposition to the Canadian Northern Railway, I do not know but what I am prepared to say to-day that this is the first railway that gave us competition. A great deal has been said against the Roblin government, but one of the best things that ever happened the Canadian Northwest was when the Roblin government made the contract they did with the Canadian Northern Railway. We know very well that other governments had been offered a million dollars for a ten cent rate from Winnipeg to Port Arthur and we know that this road has given us the competition, that it has given us a ten cent rate to Port Arthur without costing the country one farthing. We claim that this is a very great benefit to the coutnry. We will soon have, and we cannot have too soon to please me, the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Whatever may be our opinions, political or otherwise, as to how that railroad should have been built, and while a great many feel to-day that a mistake has been made in the manner of its building and would prefer that the Intercolonial should be extended to the great lakes, still the fact is that the contracts are let for the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and I for one hope that in a very short time that road will be carrying our wheat and other products out of the country. Besides these three railroads I have mentioned, we have coming from the south the Great Northern, which has already tapped Manitoba at three places crossing the boundary line, and has gone so far north as Brandon, Portage la Prairie and into the town of Morden. The agriculturists and all classes of people in that country hail with delight the coming of these roads to the Territory, and why? Perhaps some of our people in the east who are engaged in industries in their own part of the country think that we in the west have all the transportation that we need. But the best way to convince the House and the country that such is not the case is to give an idea of the extent of the natural products which that country is capable of producing. We have often heard, and perhaps some members of the House may be tired of hearing of that great country and what its possibilities are, but I think it is generally admitted to-day that as Canada becomes a great nation its greatness will in no small

part be attributed to what the western country is and what it should be. That being the case, we should take into consideration everything that will tend to the progress and development of the west. Let us for a moment consider how much of that country is under cultivation and how much of the land it is estimated can be cultivated. In 1906 Manitoba had in grain 4,700,000 acres, and her land area was estimated at 41,169,089 acres, and it is believed that 20,000,000 acres of this 41,000,000 acres is suitable for cultivation. The land surface of Saskatchewan is 244,960 square miles or about 116,774,400 acres. Granting the one-half of this land is suitable for cultivation, we have, therefore, 58,387,700 acres of land in Saskatchewan which will produce wheat or other grain. In 1905 there was under crop in Saskatchewan 1,639,563 acres. Alberta, I am told, has more land than has Saskatchewan, but take it as being the same and take half of it as being fit for cultivation, here again in Alberta we have 58,387,700 acres of land fit for the production of grain and less than 1,000,000 acres of it under cultivation to-day. We have, therefore, in the three provinces at least 136,775,400 acres of land suitable for cultivation with only 8,000,000 acres as yet utilized, or, in other words, only about one-seventeenth of the productive area of that country is now cultivated. And although there is only one-seventeenth of this area under cultivation, and although we have the existing railways there and the others which will soon be brought into operation, I still contend that the transportation facilities are not sufficient to cope with the production of that country. A great deal has been said in the west about the existing railways not being properly equipped, but in my opinion you can equip the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian Northern Railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Great Northern with the very best possible equipment imaginable and still they will be absolutely inadequate to solve this great transportation question. I have only taken into my calculation so far the three provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, but it is now a well established fact that the great Peace river country is capable of producing millions of bushels of wheat. And already at Fort Providence, away up on the Mackenzie river, they have grown splendid wheat which took only 90 days from the day it was sown until it matured, that result being brought about by the long hours of daylight which they have in that northern country. We, therefore, find that these provinces are capable of producing as much wheat as the whole world produces to-day, The wheat crop of the world in 1905 was 3,337,400,000 bushels, and I have shown that our own western territory is capable of producing 3,200,000,000 bushels of wheat and grain.

So far I have only referred to the transportation of wheat practically, but in addition to that we find that in 1906, 130,0000 head of cattle were sent to market from that country. I claim that the railroads running east and west, no matter how well they may be equipped, are absolutely insufficient to carry the products of that great country to the markets of the world. The question then comes: What are we to do; what is the most reasonable and the most successful way of increasing our transportation facilities in the west? I say: Utilize the road to the Hudson bay and provide steamers on Hudson strait and Hudson bay; build elevators at Fort Churchill, which is said to be one of the best harbours in the world, and it seems to me that you will have solved the problem beyond any doubt. I might remark here that it would be well were these elevators owned and operated by some government. We have heard a good deal during the last week about grain matters in the west and there have been representatives here from the different interests in conference, and the result of these deliberations will be perhaps more far reaching than we have now any idea of. We had the grain growers who came with their grievances, and the representatives of the grain association of that western country meeting here to consider what was in their interest and in the interest of the trade generally. There seemed to be something wrong in connection with the industry and apparently from their own statements they have at least come to a conclusion as to where the difficulty lies. We had the grain growers, and the grain buyers, and the elevator men, and the representatives of the grain exchange of Winnipeg who complained that they had been badly used, assembled in the office of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The seats in that exchange, which brought $4,000 before the Manitoba government legislated in regard to it, are to-day bringing only about $2,500; hence the members think they have a tremendous grievance. I saw a cartoon yesterday showing grass growing on the streets of Winnipeg nearly as high as the Union Bank, which is fourteen stories high. This was represented as the result of bringing to time the Winnipeg grain exchange. I think hon. members will agree with me that the evidence produced in that committee showed that the producers were not receiving their fair share for the work they were doing. I have an extract here which may seem rather forcible, but I may be excused for reading it. It is from the 'Eye Opener,' an interesting paper published in the great and thriving town of Calgary. Here is what it says about the grain interests:

> We confess pretty dense ignorance on this subject, but we have always been impressed with the fact that there was something rotten about the game when we observe the men who sell wheat always wearing diamonds, driving fast horses and living at swell clubs;

and the men who produce the grain always struggling like the devil to stand off the banks. When a man takes the long end of a government offer which bets him 160 acres of homestead land against $10 that he can't stay on it three years necessary to prove up and get title, and then makes good and raises a crop of grain, it would seem that he ought to get a fair share of the proceeds of his work.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman consider that a reputable authority?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The hon. gentleman can judge of that for himself. I am not vouching for the authority ; but it probably tells a good deal of truth sometimes. I lay it down that the character of that western country to-day demands the building of the Hudson Bay Railway. I believe that the opening of the Hudson Bay route, while it may not accomplish all that is desired, will go a very long way in solving the great transportation problem. I go further. A great deal of the opposition to this project has come from eastern Canada, largely from the great corporations ; but I say that the east would be more than compensated for any apparent loss it would sustain by the building of this road. I claim that the trade that would be created by that route is one which the St. Lawrence route could not handle in any case. I do not think it has ever been suggested that the opening of Galveston as an ocean port in the south-west worked any injury to the eastern states, while on the other hand it certainly aided very materially the manufacturing interests of the eastern states. We have heard a great deal of the proposed canalization of the Mississippi and its connection with Chicago. While the difficulties and the initial cost of that project are so much greater than those of the Hudson Bay Railway, we should remember this fact, that after you canalize the Mississippi and connect it with Chicago, the products carried by the canal to the sea-board would be 1,000 miles further from the markets of the world than they were when they started, whereas the products carried by the Hudson Bay Railway will be brought 1,000 miles nearer to the markets of the world. This is a fact that is worthy of consideration. The opening of the Hudson Bay route is a matter of great importance not only to the west, but also to the east. Eastern Canada has for a long time opposed the building of this road, just as some people in the United States opposed the building of the Panama canal. If the great corporations and others in eastern Canada oppose the building of the Hudson Bay Railway, the result will be that the responsibility of building it will fall upon the people of the west. Such a narrow, sectional feeling is contrary to the best interests of eastern Canada. The discussion on this question, in this House and out of it, is no very new thing. There has been sermonizing, by various governments and individuals, on the building of the Hudson Bay Railway nearly as long as I can remember. The same excuses have been put forward from time to time by those opposed to the project, and we have not the road yet. In 1884 the government sent out the 'Alert,' with Lieutenant Bordon in command, to explore the waters of Hudson bay and straits. For some reasons, it took him a very long time to make a report. When it was made it was none too favourable; we believe for none too unselfish motives. Those who favoured the building of the Hudson Bay Railway at that time believed the report was purposely adverse. We must remember that the Canadian Pacific Railway was at that time being built, which was probably a greater undertaking for the Dominion of Canada then than it would be to-day. There is no doubt that there was a fear upon the part of governments and financiers that the building of this road would be simply an excuse for another demand on the treasury of Canada ; and so the report of the 'Alert's' expedition was unfavourable to the building of the road and to the navigation of Hudson bay and Hudson straits. In 1897 the 'Diana' was sent out. It appears only to have cruised about the straits during the summer, and returned. The report of that cruise was also adverse, and for similar reasons. But a great many years have passed since that time, and we believe the time has come when the proposition is entitled to receive the serious consideration of the government. I am no great Calvinist or believer in predestination ; but I ask the members of this House to look at the map of North America, with that great inland sea extending so far into the country, and ask whether they do not believe that it was placed there for an all-wise purpose. I do

I believe that that great inland sea was purposely placed where it is in order that it might be utilized in the interests of that great western country. There we have a great bay, with its 2,000 miles of sea coast, one half the size of the Mediterranean, in what may be said to be a fairly temperate climate; and all the indications are that before many years the shores of this bay will be peopled with prosperous communities and its harbours will contain large elevators. Hudson bay is geographically to this continent what the Baltic sea is to Europe. Its length is 1,000 miles north to south and 600 miles east to west, having an area of 580,000 square miles. Perhaps the best idea I can give of its dimensions is to ask you to bear in mind that the length of the bay is as great as the distance from Winnipeg to the Rocky mountains and nearly six times the size of the great lakes separating Canada from the United States.

I want to call attention in this connection to some reports of temperatures. People seem to think that the weather is extremely

cold out there, but the more one studies the subject the more one is convinced that after all the country around Hudson bay is almost a banana belt. Here is what Dr. Bell says, and in giving you these quotations I do so that you may have some idea of the climate and of the feasibility of navigating the straits. If it can be shown that the building of this road is practicable, as I believe it is, then we ought to proceed with it. If not, we should let the matter drop. Dr. Bell says :

Both the bay and the straits are remarkably free from rocks and shoals, which might interfere with her free navigation. The groups of islands near the east side of the bay are surrounded by deep water, and a wide channel leads up the centre of James bay. Fortunately the main body of the bay, which is the portion likely to be hereafter frequented by shipping is entirely without shoals, reefs or islands. The depth is very uniform over most of the bay, and nowhere does it present any great irregularities. It averages about 70 fathoms throughout, deepening to 100 and upwards in approaching the outlet of Hudson straits; while in the strait itself the soundings along the centre vary from about 150 to upwards of 300 fathoms. The bottom appears to consist almost everywhere of boulder clay and mud. Near the shores a stiff clay, affording good holding ground for anchors is almost invariably met with on both sides.

As regards the climate, Mr. O'Sullivan says :

The ordinary half-breeds are more easily coaxed to eat than to swim any day. No matter how often you propose lunch they are always ready, but it is not so often you get them to strip and wash themselves. This day, however, I succeeded in getting them all to take a plunge and we enjoyed it immensely. The water was in excellent condition, reminding one of Old Orchard Beach or Chester bay. I have never found the water as warm in any part of the St. Lawrence or in Bay des Chaleurs as we found it on the east main coast in the end of August and beginning of September——

I would like hon. members for the east to take note of this statement :

—and I have no doubt that if easy communication could be had by rail, the most northern limit of our province would prove an attractive scene for tourists and health seekers.

Let me give you some information regarding temperatures because there seems to be the idea that the climate is an arctic one. Here is what Dr. Bell says on that point:

I took the temperature of the sea upwards of 20 times during our voyage which extended over the greater part of July, August and September, and I found it to average 53 degrees of Fahrenheit. I also noted the temperature of the rivers which we visited and found the average of five of them to be 61 degrees Fahrenheit. We bathed in the salt water almost daily and found the temperature agreeable.

He winds up by saying :

The average temperature of the air between July 11 and September 21, from the above observations, would appear to be 62½ degrees.

That is better than we have in the Northwest. If we had in September or August such temperature as that, we would not be troubled with frozen wheat.

As most of these observations were taken in the morning or the evening and as the nights were generally warm owing to the prevalence of southerly winds this is perhaps not far from the true mean temperature and it is above the average of the main temperature for these months of ten principal stations from Halifax, Nova Scotia, to Fort Simpson, on the Mackenzie river. About two-thirds of the bay in the south might be included in this classification with regard to summer temperature.

Now the climate of this vast territory compares very favourably with that of the western territories :

The temperature of the waters in Hudson bay is several degrees higher than that in Lake Superior and Lieutenant Gordon declared that the bay might be regarded as a vast basin of comparatively warm water, a fact which must help to mitigate the severity of the winter in the surrounding country.

My good friend opposite (Mr. Knowles) spoke of the ice being easily kept clear by means of ice breaking vessels. But, as a matter of fact, the bay freezes very little and is besides remarkably free from storms and fogs :

The waters are deep and uniform and the soundings of 480 feet at many points indicate that its bed is a level plateau. Now as to the opening and closing date of the harbour of Fort Churchill since 1825 can be given.

I am not going to give all the temperatures for fifty years, but I shall give you a few taken at random between the dates I have mentioned. I may say that since I started to make this address, I have heard men saying what is the good of Hudson bay, it is only open two months in the year. Well, I am going to furnish proof that these gentlemen are altogether mistaken:

1824, open June 12, closed November 18—five months, six days.
1827, open June 24, closed November 13—four months and twenty days.
1834, open June 21, closed November 15—four months and twenty-five days.
1844, open June 24, closed November 23—five months.
1848, open June 19, closed November 6—four months, eighteen days.
1852, open June 13, closed November 28—five months, fifteen days.
1862, open June 7, closed November 5—four months, twenty-nine days.
1863, open June 5, closed November 11—five months, six days.
1892, open June 19, closed November 11—four months, twenty-three days.

1894, open June 6, closed November 19—five months, thirteen days.

What do we find the average to be? The average is from June 19th to November 8th, five months. I have not asked anybody to say off-hand how long the St. Lawrence is open, but I suppose it is not open more than six months. The longest season for Hudson bay and straits was in 1846, five months and eighteen days; the shortest season was from June 14 to November 8. Now this period extended over seventy years and is taken from the Hudson bay officials. And I find no evidence against it, that harbours in Hudson bay and the mouth of the rivers are open about five months of the year.

It is wonderful what great men will do. I have a great deal of respect for the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, Mr. Butler, as a man of ability, but he is a little narrow on this point. They say every one is narrow on some point, and this is the point on which Mr. Butler is narrow. He made an address before the May Court Club in this city not long ago—about the time my hon. friend from North Renfrew (Mr. White) was talking about the Georgian Bay canal, and seemed anxious that the Georgian Bay canal should be built. I don't stand here to say a word against the building of the Georgian Bay canal, let us have it by all means. But I don't want the Georgian Bay canal or any other canal to be built at the expense of the Hudson Bay Railway which we must have. Mr. Butler, is thus reported :

Transportation, a subject of intense practical interest to all Canadians, was the item last night of a brilliant address before the May Court Club by Mr. M. J. Butler, Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals. In the course of his remarks Mr. Butler said that the Georgian Bay canal was the solution of Canada's transportation problem.

I say, it is only one of the solutions. The great solution, so far as we in the west are concerned, is to build the Hudson Bay Railway and use Hudson bay and Hudson strait for carrying our products to the markets of the world. Mr. Butler says the Hudson Bay road is 'in the talkative stage.' Well, how long is a thing to stay in that stage ? The Hudson Bay Railway has been in the 'talkative stage' as long as I can remember, and I am no kid. It seems to me that when a man like the deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, with all his ability—for which I give him credit—and with all his experience, says that the Hudson Bay Railway is only 'in the talkative stage' he needs a little educating, and I am trying to give it to him right now.

So far, we have talked about Hudson bay ; we have shown its extent and shown that it is free from shoals and fogs. And, on that point, I would like to make reference to another remark made by Mr. Butler, He says that insurance was an argument against the building of this road and utilizing Hudson bay and strait. Perhaps it is. But what is the experience ? In the course of a century and a half the Hudson Bay Company sent out 750 vessels through Hudson strait and bay. There were vessels running from 70-gun ships down to ships of ten tons burden. No one will say that these vessels were strongly built. They were rudely built and small. But the records of the Hudson Bay Company show that, out of 750 vessels, sent through, only two were lost. That does not look as though navigation of these waters was very dangerous. We must remember also that these vessels had none of the advantages of the aids to navigation—lighthouses and all the rest, that are provided on every well-travelled route to-day. Well, I have spoken of Hudson bay. What do they say of Hudson strait ?

Markham says :

I have in my possession an official record of the voyages out and home of the Hudson Bay Company's ship 'Prince Rupert' for a period of eleven consecutive years, namely from 1835 to 1846 inclusive. I find that the average time of getting through the straits in the outward voyages during this period 'and it must not be forgotten that the strait is 500 miles in length' was 16 days. The longest time was 31 days, when there was probably an exceptionally bad ice year. The shortest time was 8 days. But the delays in getting through the strait were caused by calms and adverse winds—

Something that will be absolutely overcome by the navigation of to-day.

—and not by the ice. On the homeward passage no difficulties were met with from ice in the strait, and the vessel usually reached London in about five weeks after leaving York Factory. . . . The 'Prince Rupert' was 38 days on the passage to London; so that it is impossible she could have had any serious detention from ice in the strait.

And Gordon says :

As to the length of season for practical navigation, if we regard the presence of field ice as the only barrier, the information which we have got would point to the months of July, August, September and October as being the months in which the straits are passable. As a rule, in July there will be delays, not to vessels strengthened and sheeted, there would be no danger in making the passage.

Mr. Low says :

The period of safe navigation for ordinary iron steamships through Hudson Bay strait and across Hudson bay to the Port of Churchill may be stated to extend from the 20th of July to the 1st of November. The period might be increased without much risk by a week in the beginning of the season, and by perhaps two weeks at the close.

In my report last year, I described the ice as consisting of three kinds, viz.: icebergs, heavy arctic ice and ordinary field ice. The icebergs are stated to have come from Fox channel. This conclusion was based on the re-

port of No. 3 station made on the homeward voyage of the 'Neptune' that the icebergs passed the bluff from west towards east. This report was made on the strength of the few observations which the party had been able to make in the interval between the two calls of the 'Neptune' at the inlet. Further and more perfect observations show conclusively that the current sets in the opposite direction and that the icebergs move from east to west.

This is a very important fact.

If further proof of the existence of this set were necessary we have it in the drift of the 'Alert' when fast in the ice off Ashe inlet and invariably carried to the westward.

It has been said a good many times that much of our grain would have to be stored at Fort Churchill. That is true enough but it is also true that a large per cent is now stored at Port Arthur and Fort William for the winter. With regard to ice in the straits, we have a good deal of information in the blue-books. Dr. Ferguson, in the Senate, describes four kinds of ice to be found; first the young or harbour ice, never regarded as serious; second the rafted ice which has drifted by the wind, one flake piled upon another until it assumes very formidable proportions. All authorities agree that no icebergs are found in Hudson bay or in the waters that flow into Hudson bay. Those that have been encountered by navigators have always been found within 100 miles of the Atlantic, and it seems now to be settled that they are icebergs that have been formed up about Greenland, have been carried into Hudson strait by the current, and, after going a short distance into Hudson strait, are met by another current and returned to the Atlantic ocean. They are formidable enemies to navigation and are treated by sailors with great respect. There is another class called 'growlers.' These are icebergs broken up. They are low in the water and do not appear on the surface. And, like all enemies that we cannot see, they are more to be dreaded than enemies we can see. It is said that most of the losses in the north are caused by coming into contact with these 'growlers,' but these are seldom found in Hudson straits. The most reliable explorers who have travelled these straits for twenty years for the sole purpose of investigation, now believe that Hudson bay and straits are now open for safe navigation for at least four and a half months in the year so far as ice is concerned. And, considering that the ship course from Churchill to Liverpool is free from rocks and shoals and that these four and a half months are when the days are very long in the northern region, the sun shining for twenty hours a day, these facts will enhance the rapid navigation to and from the sea. Fort Churchill communicates with the open sea as directly as Halifax. Comparing Montreal and Churchill, the latter is not hampered with the long St. Lawrence navigation.

My good friend on the other side (Mr. Knowles) put on 'Hansard' some distances. To make my story complete, even at the risk of repeating some of his statements, I also wish to place on 'Hansard' some distances because after all when it has been proven beyond doubt that the straits and bay are navigable and the great obstacle of the ice is removed from our calculations, the great remaining question is that of distance for our prime object is to place our products upon the markets of the world in the shortest possible time. The following tables of distances will be found of interest:

	Miles.
Fort Churchill to Liverpool	3,000
Montreal to Liverpool	3,220
New York to Liverpool	3,057
Duluth via New York to Liverpool	4,201
Duluth cia Hudson bay to Liverpool	3,728
St. Paul to Liverpool via New York	4,240
St. Paul to Liverpool via Hudson bay	4,096
Vancouver to Liverpool via Canadian Pacific Railway	5,868
Vancouver to Liverpool via Hudson bay	4,568
Saving from Vancouver to Liverpool	1,300

From	To Montreal.	To Churchill.	Difference
	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
Winnipeg	1,422	945	477
Brandon	1,555	940	615
Regina	1,780	774	1,006
Medicine Hat	2,082	1,076	1,006
Calgary	2,262	1,256	1,906
Prince Albert	1,958	717	1,241
Battleford	1,994	876	1,118
Saskatoon	1,924	806	1,118
Edmonton	2,247	1,129	1,118

Average saving in rail transportation for Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1,000 miles.

I have referred to the transportation of products, but there is another way in which the building of that road would be of great benefit to that western country and for that matter eastern Canada as well, that is in relation to immigration. This government and all governments have spent a great deal of money in promoting immigration, in bringing people from Europe and the British Isles to settle in the great Northwest. These people have left their homes to seek fortune in that great country, which was happily described by the Earl of Dufferin as a country of indeterminate possibilities. Every member of this House is aware that many of the immigrants who have been induced to come to Canada have drifted into the United States. This was only natural owing to the influences to

which they were subjected on the existing routes of transportation. Canada has lost incalculably in population and in money owing to this fact, and if we had this route these people would not be subjected to the influences of which I have spoken. The tide of immigration to this country continues and we all rejoice at that fact provided some restrictions are placed on the classes that come in. During the last century the United States always had a northwest, the energetic people of the eastern states, the young men and the men of energy were going west and occupying the land in that country that was still unsettled. That condition I am told and believe does not exist to-day, so that these people from the other side are flocking into western Canada. they are crossing the border. Previously they were settling in Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan, but Sir, they are to-day beginning to go forward, they are settling in a great country extending from 70 miles east of Winnipeg to the Rocky mountains, and from the International boundary up to the western shores of Hudson bay. I have no doubt and my opinion is borne out by the information furnished us in the Agricultural Committee that we have not yet begun to know the possibilities of the northern portions of that country which we previously thought was a frozen region, absolutely useless for agricultural industry. We find these people going up there and undoubtedly that country will be thickly settled. We find in Russia a province whose southern boundary is 100 miles farther north than Edmonton, with a population of one and a half million people, producing 65,000,000 bushels of wheat, and 100,000,000 bushels of oats. I think we have reason to believe that our north country will be just as productive and will be almost as thickly settled as this Russian province. Personally I have not the slightest doubt on this point.

I am sure that three-quarters of the members of this House believe that the country through which this railway will pass is nothing but barren rock and almost impassable from, say, the Saskatchewan river to Hudson bay. The facts do not at all accord with this idea. One engineer, Mr. Adrian Nelson, writing to the directors of the Canadian Northern Railway says :

> I beg to submit the following report on the feasibility and construction of the proposed railway to Hudson bay. The country that the railway passes through is of such description as to offer but few engineering difficulties in the construction of it. The whole of the country partakes of the nature of a flat plain. The first half being practically level and the remainder with a slight exception having a gradual and almost interceptible slope to the Hudson bay. There is very little rock work and the country far from being drowned is well drained by a system of rivers and lakes. Besides this there is an abundance of timber and stone.

Mr. W. W. Kirkpatrick, another of the engineers who made an exploratory survey of the line to the Hudson bay, says :

> There is no difficulty in building a railway through this country; there are no heavy grades or cuttings and very little rock work. Timber and ballast are plentiful in the vicinity while nearly all streams crossed appear to have timber suitable for bridging.
>
> The country is fairly level and about equally divided as to prairie and timber sections and considerably cut up by lakes and hay marshes. The soil on the average appears good, and I believe will prove a favourable country for settlement.

The American people, Sir, are alive to the great importance of this route. Senator Davis, of the Senate of Washington, drew the attention of the House to the fact that if the Hudson bay route was opened up the trade of the northwestern states would be diverted to it and the Canadians would thereby reap the benefits of the large carrying trade from the states adjacent to Manitoba and the Northwest Territories and to check this he advised the enlargement of the Sault Ste. Marie canal. But the United States may enlarge their canals and improve their shipping facilities, but it will be all of no avail. They cannot keep the trade of these states within their own boundaries because they are working against nature. Hudson bay is the natural outlet of the European market to the whole northwest portion of this continent, and just as soon as this route is opened up the large export trade of Minnesota, Dakota and Montana will go through Hudson bay.

I want to give a short history of the legislation which has been going on in connection with the building of the Hudson bay railway. The first measure for provincial aid was introduced by the late Mr. Norquay, in 1885 in the shape of an Act pledging the province to give a bonus of one million dollars to the enterprise on the completion of the road within five years from that time. The expectation was that with such an endorsement the promotors would be enabled to float their scheme on the English money market, but they failed, and in the season of 1886 sought from the province a more liberal bonus in the shape of a guarantee of interest on the bonds of the company to the extent of four and a half millions of dollars for twenty-five years at the rate of 4 per cent per annum — a provincial bonus, in effect, of one hundred and eight thousand a year for twenty-five years.

Mr. Norquay appeared unwilling at first to grant this measure and he proposed the appointment of a committee to inquire into the matter, a proposition which was met by a motion on the part of Messrs. Thomas Greenway and Joseph Martin to ask the House to vote the guarantee applied for.

This Mr. Norquay allowed and the Act of 1885 was passed authorizing the government to give such a guarantee for twenty-five years on the completion of the road. Again the promoters of the road were unable to float their scheme on the financial market and in 1887 they once more sought to extend this guarantee.

As before Mr. Norquay hesitated and was unwilling to go as far as his opponents in meeting the demands of the promoters, but a decided declaration of the intention of Messrs. Greenway and Martin to go further than this brought the premier once more to time and the Act of 1887 was passed authorizing the guarantee of four and a half millions of dollars to be given but on more liberal terms than those of the Act of 1887. The scheme was taken up in the succeeding year by Messrs. Onderdonk & Ross, the well known railway contractors, and they proposed to proceed at once with the enterprise. It was at this stage that the new Greenway government declared its unwillingness to give the guarantee authorized by the Act notwithstanding the premier's pledge when in opposition. The ministers rested their objections largely on the view that while the province had, for the sake of procuring a line of railway to compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway proposed to give a bonus equal to $180,000 a year for twenty-five years, it had since that time in the shape of aid granted the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Road, pledging its credit for about $80,000. In return for which it had secured competition.

For that reason the government contended that the government could not now afford or be expected to give more than $100,000 a year at the most to the Hudson Bay Railway, that being the interest at 4 per cent on two million five hundred thousand dollars. Although the promoters state they had obtained means in London to go on with the road if their terms were accepted their negotiations evidently came to nothing.

The Aid Act of 1887 was repealed. However, in 1899, a resolution was passed by the House on motion of Mr. Greenway offering aid to the road to the extent of $2,000 a mile within the province, not exceeding 300 miles; in other words offering at this time aid to the extent of $600,000 to the enterprise. In 1890 the government introduced a Bill which was passed authorizing aid to the extent of $3,000 per mile for 250 miles of line equal to $750,000. Neither of these propositions, however, seems to have been of much service in floating the scheme.

During the season of 1891 another Act was passed not simply containing an offer of assistance but undertaking on the part of the province by formal contract to grant a bonus for one and a half millions of dollars to the company on the completion of the road within five years.

It came to be generally considered that the necessary means could hardly be raised in the English or foreign markets without an additional bonus from the Dominion government. The hopes of the people in this direction were all greatly encouraged, however, by the scheme of financial aid to the company introduced and carried by the Dominion government in the 1891 session of the federal parliament.

The general opinion throughout the province at that time was that a complete railway to Hudson bay was practically secured. In reality the assistance pledged was not very great, no sum was absolutely granted by way of bonus and the proposed railway was only to extend so far as Saskatchewan. The aid pledged by the Dominion government was simply an undertaking in advance that the government for public service would pay the company a certain specific yearly sum for a definite number of years after the road should have been built. The sum announced was $80,000 a year and it was to be given for twenty years.

The value of this promise in advance was the help it might be to the promoters in raising money to build the road. None of these schemes or legislative enactments has so far come to anything. Now, I have taken up far more time than I expected but I could not very well have taken up very much less and done justice to the subject. I could speak for another hour if I wanted to. I quite understand that our eastern friends do not like to hear very much about the Hudson bay route. My good friend on the other side said that he was sad and sorry because my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) had not put something in his platform in connection with the building of the Hudson Bay Railway. He has had this motion on the notice paper for four or five months, and I suppose he has been waiting to see what policy his government would adopt in connection with this question. After waiting for all that time he concluded to introduce his motion advocating the building of this railway. I tell the government from the bottom of my heart that the very best enterprise in the interest of Canada in which they could engage is to take hold, and at once, of the building of this road, and I tell the government further that if they want to have the honour of building this road they had better get busy because after the next election my hon. friend the leader of the opposition will be most decidedly the man to build the road. Nineteen hundred and ten will be the tercentenary of the death of that great sailor Henry Hudson, who gave his name to that great inland sea and that beautiful river that flows through the state of New York to the Atlantic ocean. I believe that by 1910, the tercentenary year of that great man we will see a railroad built to the Hudson bay, we will see the shores of the Hudson

bay peopled by prosperous communities, we will see elevators built at ports on the Hudson bay, we will see docks there, and splendid system of steam vessels carrying the products of that great country to the markets of the world. I believe in making that prophesy, I prophesy for the prosperity not only of the west, but for the east.

Mr. GEO. E. McCRANEY (Saskatchewan). Ever since we have had an agricultural population in the west we have had a transportation problem upon our hands, and our people have been agitating for the building of a railroad to Hudson bay and the establishment of a port there from which to ship their products to European markets. When this proposal was first mooted some twenty-five or thirty years ago the conditions were then much different from what they are to-day, and at the present time we are able to discuss the question altogether in a more favourable light than we could then and with much better knowledge of the conditions. At that time our only outlet was by the Canadian Pacific Railway which was the original Canadian transcontinental line and which had few branches. To-day we have the Canadian Northern a second road across the prairies and which promises in the future to extend to the Pacific coast; we have the Grand Trunk Pacific under construction, and we have the Great Northern road which is likely to become an important Canadian railway in the near future. Twenty five years ago the proposal to build a railway to the Hudson bay meant the building of a road from the nearest point at which there was railway communication, namely from Winnipeg to Fort Churchill which is the best harbour on the Hudson bay, by way of Erwood and Le Pas, a distance of 945 miles. To-day in discussing the scheme, we reduce that distance by one-half and there remains to be constructed only a railway from Le Pas, 474 miles to the Hudson bay. In addition to having a much shorter route, we have a considerable fund of information with regard to Hudson bay and the country through which the railway would pass, and which was not available at that time. My hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) has mentioned the expedition of Commander Gordon in 1884 and 1885, of Commander Wakeham in 1897, and I will include the expedition of Mr. A. P. Low in the 'Neptune' of 1904 and 1905, and the later expedition of Captain Bernier in the 'Arctic,' all of which go to prove that the Hudson straits are open for at least three and a half months in the year. From the figures which my hon. friend from Souris has given it is quite evident that this would be probably the shortest period of open navigation in any one year, and that there are many years in which the navigation period would be much longer. The information we have now at hand has also established that Fort Churchill is one of the best and safest harbours on the north American continent. In addition to our information gathered in this way with respect to Hudson bay and straits we have also information acquired by railway surveyors who have gone through the country, and the valuable data obtained by the staff of our own Geological Survey. These reports all tend to show that there are natural resources to be found in that country which would of themselves justify the building of a railroad there, without any reference whatever to the solution of the transportation problem. There are great quantities of timber and pulp wood in the country, the rivers and lakes abound in commercial fish and there are signs of minerals which would justify the hope that considerable mineral development will take place, and there are also very considerable quantities of land which is fit for agriculture. Before the Agricultural Committee the other day Mr. McInnes, of the Geological Survey staff, told us of a clay belt through which the proposed Hudson bay line would pass. He said it was evidently in the bed of a glacial lake, situated in the neighbourhood of the Burntwood river and has an area of some 10,000 square miles. There is a larger view also in this question, not only with reference to the country which is in the immediate proximity to the proposed route of the railway, but we are getting more information all the time as to the available lands of the Northwest. In a speech delivered by the Hon. R. P. Roblin last summer he estimated that there were 180,000,000 acres of agricultural land in the west from which he believed that in a very short time at least 1,000,000,000 bushels of wheat would be produced. From statements made in this House by the Minister of the Interior last session, and recently before a committee of the Senate, there is every reason to believe that such an estimate is quite conservative. The Minister of the Interior told us that south of latitude 52 in Manitoba and of latitude 55 in Saskatchewan and Alberta there were lands available to the extent of 175,000,000 acres. Before the Senate committee, Mr. Bredin, a member of the Alberta legislature made a statement that north of latitude 55 in the province of Alberta there were available about 100,000,000 acres for agricultural purposes, and Mr. Conroy a member of the staff of the Department of the Interior, though he does not commit himself to figures says, that he believes that there is north of the 55th parallel of latitude a quantity of agricultural land which is equal in extent to the agricultural land west of Winnipeg. The other day in the Committee on Agriculture we had the evidence of Mr. R. E. Young, that there was under crop last year 8,600,000 acres of land of which 5,000,000 acres were in wheat and which produced approximately 100,000,000 bushels. So that when we consider the vast amount of land which is available and

the very small proportion which is now under cultivation, it is no stretch of the imagination to see that there will be in the future a volume of production which to-day we can hardly estimate. Immigration is coming into the country; we want to bring in the agricultural people as fast as we can, and the larger the number who come, the more productive will our country be.

Ever since there has been any considerable immigration into the west there have been great blockades, and the call of the western provinces is for more railroads. But while our call is for more roads to relieve the present situation, the roads which we are getting are colonization roads; and while to some extent they may relieve the congestion of traffic, they are themselves contributing to settle up the country for probably fifty miles on each side. I think the conclusion must be that until our lands are all settled we shall always have the transportation question on our hands, and grain blockades will take place every year. These considerations make us feel that we must not only increase the handling power of our present roads, but provide new outlets. Consequently our people have been looking to the Hudson Bay route. One objection put forward has been that if we make use of Hudson bay, which is open for a period of only four or five months of the year, there will have to be a great amount of grain kept in store for a considerable period each year. To one who has had any experience of western conditions the fact that grain must remain in store for five, or six or seven months of the year is not a formidable objection. Most of the crop of 1906, which was a very large one, was marketed in my own town in May, 1907. It would be no hardship to our farmers to have to wait a month or two longer, and perhaps the increased facilities would relieve them so that they might secure a better price for the portion of the crop shipped by way of Lake Superior. No question has been more agitated by the people of the prairie provinces than the Hudson Bay route, because they look to it as a means of shipping out their grain and their cattle. We think that the building of the road would be justified not only on transportation grounds, but in the results which it would produce in the settlement of the country immediately adjoining the road and also in developing and attracting attention to our northern country. We feel that this is a most opportune time to bring the matter to the attention of the government, because, while there may be some differences of opinion as to how the road should be constructed, we are in a position at least to discuss the question as to whether the road should or should not be built out of lands in the west now owned by the Dominion government. I beg to move in amendment to the motion that you do now leave the chair:

That all the words after 'that' be struck out and the following be substituted therefor: In the opinion of this House the government should, on account of the rapid development of western Canada and the continued inadequacy of existing transportation facilities, take early action towards the construction of a railway to Fort Churchill on Hudson bay.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY (Calgary). Mr. Speaker, it is not very surprising to me to find another resolution introduced by one of the Liberal members from the west in regard to the Hudson Bay question, a question that has been before the House for many years, and before the government almost every year since they came into power. I venture to say that if the pages of 'Hansard' containing the speeches that have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite on the Hudson Bay question were taken, they would almost reach from the Pas to Fort Churchill. If hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House are really sincere in their professed desire to have this road built, it appears to me that they should bring pressure to bear on the present administration. The road is not going to be built by men coming down here year after year and introducing motions and having them discussed in this House, and letting the matter end at that. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles) who first spoke on this question this afternoon, criticised the hon. leader of the opposition for not having put in his Halifax platform an article dealing with this great question. This question was discussed somewhat last session, and we had hon. gentlemen getting up and bowing their acknowledgments to the hon. gentleman who has made the motion this afternoon, indicating that some speedy action would be taken by the government in the matter. The reason for the delay apparently is that there is not unanimity of opinion on the other side of the House as to which is the proper outlet for the prairie products. Last session there appeared on the Order Paper a notice of motion by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles), and side by side with it another by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson), and I propose to put these notices of motion in 'Hansard.' The first was as follows:

Mr. Knowles—Proposed resolution—That in the opinion of this House the interests of the Dominion of Canada urgently require that every possible effort be made by the government to effect some suitable arrangemnt for the speedy construction of a railway to the shores of Hudson bay.

Practically the same as the motion brought up to-day by the hon. member for West Assiniboia; the only difference is that the motion of to-day mentions Fort Churchill as the desirable port. The notice of motion of the hon. member for Vancouver was as follows:

Mr. Macpherson—Proposed resolution—That in the opinion of this House it is advisable for the Canadian government to take active steps towards the establishing of terminal elevators at the port of Vancouver, for the better handling of the grain crops of Alberta and other western provinces, whose natural outlet is the Pacific coast.

So it is quite apparent that there is not unanimity of opinion amongst hon. gentlemen opposite as to which is the natural outlet for prairie products. Nor is there probably unanimity of opinion in the country on this subject. But in rising to speak to the amendment, I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that I am in favour of the government undertaking this work with the least possible delay. I have listened to the reasons advanced for and against the construction of the road to Hudson bay. Those in its favour appeal to me, and I propose to support the project to the best of my ability, believing that in so doing I represent the views of the majority of my constituents. If there were no other reasons in its favour, I would support it for this one. This road would furnish a safety valve at a time when there is apt to be congestion of freight and when there is great delay and difficulty in moving our crop. It would thus relieve any hardship suffered by the people in the west who desire to get their grain to market as speedily as possible. One of the reasons I have heard urged against the building of this road is that we have a short haul to Fort William which suits the greater part of the territories, and another argument used is that we should rather look to opening a market in the orient. It is claimed that in Vancouver we have a port which is open 365 days in the year, and which is frequented by tramp steamers, and that those tramp steamers keep down the freight rates. And it is further argued that none of this class of steamers can go to Hudson bay, because that bay has to be navigated by boats specially built for that purpose. But the great reason which appeals to me in favour of this project is that it would save a haul of about 1,500 miles from the majority of places from which grain is shipped in the prairie section and that it would also relieve the congestion of freight at a time when it is most desirable we should have speedy shipment. There is also this argument in its favour that it would be a much more suitable route both for cattle and grain. But while I am in favour of the construction of this road, I am not in favour of the wording of the amendment to the motion to go into Supply. I think that this notice of motion should rather censure the government for its delay. Although my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles) went as close as he safely could to censuring the government, the only fault he had to find was that the present railway facilities are not adequate. If he had followed out the history of this question a little closer, he would have found ample justification for censuring the government because the fact stands out perfectly clear that the government have taken hold of the land grant set aside for the construction of a railway to Hudson bay and given it for the construction of railways which for the most part go away from the bay. They have permitted railway companies to duplicate their lines and have given them out of this land grant subsidies for the construction of railways in very erratic courses and in many instances running in an opposite direction to Hudson bay. For ahat reason I think the government are deserving of censure. They are deserving of censure for what I might term their wilful waste of aid to railways by giving them land grants which were intended to aid in the building of a road to Hudson bay. At the same time I wish to point out that I am not objecting to the aid granted these railways, as they were no doubt built in sections of the country which require railway construction, but what I want to note particularly is that hon. members opposite claim that the Laurier administration have never granted an acre of land in aid of railways, whereas they have on the contrary given large grants but have tried to conceal these grants behind an old Hudson bay charter. Just trace back this question of the construction of a railway to Hudson bay. Some years ago we find that a charter was given to the Winnipeg and Great Northern Railway Company and that company was given the choice of two routes to Hudson bay, either of which it could select. One of these routes ran east of Lake Manitoba and the other ran west of Lake Manitoba to Lake Dauphin. Both joined at Waterhorn lake and then proceeded northerly to Grand Rapids.

The original line of this railway is laid out in a report of the Committee of the Privy Council approved by His Excellency on the 8th April, 1882. Here is the line of location as described in this order in council :

The chief engineer of railways reports that the line of location, as marked out, starts from the city of Winnipeg,' thence northerly to the east of Shoal lake, thence crossing the narrows between Lake Manitoba and Lake St. Martin, thence to the outlet of Cedar lake at the Grand rapids, thence following the shore of Lake Winnipeg, crossing Ross island, a short distance above Play Gren lake and Sea falls, thence following the general direction of the shore of Lake Winnipegosis to beyond the falls, thence in a direct line to its terminus on the Nelson river, a short distance below the Limestone falls.

That was the line originally intended. A short time after that the Winnipeg and Great Northern got the choice of two lines.

Some years after a land grant was given to the Hudson Bay Railway. That company was to obtain 6,400 acres per mile in Manitoba and 12,800 acres per mile in the territories. All these lines became finally a part of the Canadian Northern. I have tried to trace out what has been done with that land grant since the date of that order in council in April, 1882.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. When you left the chair, Mr. Speaker, I was endeavouring to point out how the present administration had exhausted the land grant originally set aside for the construction of a railway to Hudson bay and had applied that land grant, in many instances, to branch lines running in a direction away from Hudson bay . I was also proceeding to trace the history of some of the old charters authorizing the construction of this Hudson bay road. There was first the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company. Then there was a charter to the Nelson Valley Railway and Transportation Company. These two charters, some years after, were merged. Later on, the company was known as the Winnipeg and Great Northern Railway Company. This road, as I pointed out before you left the chair, had two alternative routes. One runs east of Lake Manitoba, the other west of Lake Manitoba, touching Lake Dauphin. Both join at Waterhern lake and then go north to Grand Rapids. There was also the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company. Their charter, as I understand it, provides for the construction of a line from Portage la Prairie or Gladstone to a point on the Saskatchewan river. All these charters have come into the possession of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, and, in the discussion of the matter they can all be treated as belonging to that company. What I suggested before you left the chair was that the government has simply been playing with this question. The question has been before them every year since 1896, as a perusal of the orders in council will show. Applications have been made to them to extend land grants, to extend the time of construction, or to extend the time within which the companies would be entitled to land grants set aside for the construction of the railway. They have not shown in this matter the haste which they have displayed in other matters. Only a couple of years ago the Grand Trunk Pacific was being mooted. An agitation was created in that country with the idea of persuading the people that there must be increased transportation facilities. Time, the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) told us, would not wait. 'Heaven grant that it may not be too late,' he said. But in connection with this matter of the Hudson bay road, he has not shown the same activity that he exercised in order to have the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific undertaken and gone ahead without delay.

Mr. SPROULE. It was Cox who could not wait.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. An hon. gentleman remarks that Senator Cox could not wait. It may be of assistance to hon. members from the west to point out that Senator Cox is greatly interested in that western country, having extensive investments there. Possibly if they could secure his influence to hurry on the building of this road, it might be of some assistance.

I also criticised the government, suggesting that they are not only responsible for the delay but also for wilfully wasting the aid in the handling of the grants, that is assuming that the object in view was a road to Hudson bay. I repeat that the government have practically exhausted the land grant set aside for this purpose, and that they have applied it to branch lines running towards Prince Albert, or in many cases to lines in a direction away from Hudson bay. Not only have they done that, but they have permitted these branch lines to take a very erratic course. If any person interested will look at the map, one moment will be enough to satisfy him that, if the land grant is being applied, it is not being applied to construct a railway to Hudson bay, and that to call this a grant for a railway to Hudson bay is simply a misnomer. The location of the line shows that there are a great many subsidy curves, if I may so call them. If you look back into the order in council, you find these people who had the right to construct a railway under these charters are entitled to a land grant of 6,480 acres a mile in Manitoba and 12,800 acres a mile in the Northwest. If you figure out the value of that grant on the basis of a reasonable figure per acre, say $6 per acre net at the time the road was constructed, you will realize the significance of the term 'subsidy curves,' and be able to see the reason of the erratic course the road pursues and realize why it is that it wobbles over the country in this way. Now, to be more specific, looking at the map for a moment—not at the map in the Canadian Northern folder, because the line of railway indicated on that map is a line that goes almost as the crow flies. There may be a jog of thirty miles to the west and another of forty-seven miles to the west, but one look at the line in the folder would infer that the line goes practically straight. But look at the map issued by the government and you will observe the jogs in the line and can follow the er-

ratic course of the location of the line throughout. To show the House just what these people have got for the construction of the different branches under these Hudson bay charters, I want to refer for a moment to an extract from the report of the Committee of the Privy Council, approved of August 10, 1903 :

The order in council continues :

The minister further states that the chief engineer of government railways reports that the mileage of the Canadian Northern Railway Company constructed and placed in running order is :

From Beaver to Gladstone, 18·37 miles.

From Gladstone to Winnipegosis, 124·75 miles.

From Sifton Junction to Mafeking, 125 miles.

From Mafeking to the provincial boundary, 28·33 miles, all in Manitoba.

And from the provincial boundary to Erwood in the Northwest Territories 22·16 miles, which entitles the company to a total land grant of 2,180,928 acres for the construction of 320 miles of railway.

We have often heard in this House, we read it in the subsidized organs of the Liberal party and in their campaign literature, and we hear from their speakers on the platform, that the present administration have never given away an acre of land to aid in the construction of a railway. I have just pointed to one instance where 2,180,920 acres of land were granted for the construction of this railway between the points I have mentioned.

If any person will look at the map and observe the locality where this line of railway is constructed and point out to me wherein it is a railway being built to connect with Hudson bay, I would be very glad to be enlightened on that point. No person could seriously take that position. The present administration were under absolutely no obligation to revive these land grants if they did not want to do so, and they cannot say that they have never given an acre of land to aid in the construction of railways, by trying to hide behind the fence of an old Hudson bay charter. For the construction of 320 miles of railway from Gladstone to Erwood, they have received this immense land grant but at Erwood you are not closer to the Hudson bay by more than 150 miles than you are at Gladstone. That would indicate that the 'subsidy curves' or the jogs in the line enabled the company to get a land grant on 170 miles of railway which was an utter waste of aid in so far as connecting with Hudson bay is concerned. On this 170 miles they received a land grant of 12,800 acres per mile for 22½ miles, and 6,400 acres a mile for 147½ miles, or a total of 1,229,824 acres of land over and above what was required if the object of the railway was to get to Hudson bay. If the Pas was the objective point why should not the line have gone from Sifton Junction to the Pas direct? I am given to understand by people who are familiar with the locality that there are no physical features to prevent that. I am not opposed to aiding the construction of railways in these localities, but I wish to point out the hypocrisy of hon. gentlemen opposite when they claim that they have never given away an acre of land to assist in the construction of railways. From Sifton Junction to Winnipegosis there is a little branch line 21 miles in length which surely could not be said to have been aided in order to get to Hudson bay. If they were going to Hudson bay in that direction it was not necessary to give a land grant from Sifton Junction to Erwood and from Sifton Junction to Winnipegosis as it is simply duplicating the line, you have a fork, one line running from Sifton Junction to Winnipegosis for 21 miles and the other from Sifton Junction in a northwesterly direction. If the object was to get to Hudson bay, why was it necessary to swing west in township 35 for 30 miles from Cowan to Swan River, and why was it necessary to swing west again from Baden to Erwood for 42 miles? I am not opposed to aiding these lines, but do they run towards Hudson bay? The answer is simply that when people are getting a land grant of 12,800 acres per mile for some parts of their road, an erratic course pays.

Mr. BURROWS. The reason they ran that line was to avoid the mountain in both places, first the Duck mountain and then the Porcupine mountain. There was no possibility of running the railway over the mountains.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity to answer me. I am told by people in the locality that there is no reason why the road should not have run from Sifton Junction to the Pas, but it would seem as if the company looked the country over in order to find mountains to get an excuse to run around them, and get 12,800 acres of land per mile.

I might point to another 'subsidy curve.' The Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company so far as I have been able to trace their rights when they obtained their charter, were to run a line from Portage la Prairie or from Gladstone to a point on the Saskatchewan river, but I find from the orders in council and memorandum which I have read that a portion of this land grant is applied for the construction of the line from Gladstone to Beaver, about 18 miles of railway running in a southeasterly direction from Gladstone. If any one will figure up this waste of mileage, taking as I have said a land grant of 12,800 acres a mile, and place on it a valuation of $6 per acre, which I take to be a moderate estimate, it will be seen what an enormous amount these people were getting for the construction of these branch lines, in some cases $78,000 per mile if the land netted $6 per acre. When this land grant was origi-

nally given, there were certain limitations on the area out of which they were entitled to select, but when the present administration came into power they allowed them to extend this area and they chose their lands all over Saskatchewan, right up to the 4th meridian. They are selecting lands to satisfy these old grants north of Swift Current and they have not selected 9 per cent of the lands out of the area originally set aside for selection. It is difficult to understand how this influential corporation can come down and secure an extension of the time within which they should construct these railways, and have the areas of the lands from which they can select enlarged running their line wherever they see fit, selecting lands at their own sweet will. It will be seen that they have received from the present administration as favourable treatment as any company ever got in this country and it does not lie in the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite to say that the present administration has not given away one acre of land to assist in the construction of railways in the west. If you will take the figures mentioned in the order in council it will be found that from Sifton Junction to Erwood 1,300,000 acres of land have been given to this company for the purpose of assisting in the construction of that part of the road—I say 'assisting'; it would more than pay for the whole construction. In connection with the question which was raised by the hon. member for West Assiniboia that no land has been given away, let me point out to him that if he would read through the orders in council he would find that there is hardly a year during the last ten years in which the time for the construction of the road, or the earning of the land grant has not been extended. For example, let me read the following :

> Extract from a report of the committee of the hon. the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency on the 19th October, 1899.
>
> The minister further states that the Canadian Northern Railway Company has applied to him for an extension of time for the completion of its lines of railway, for the purposes of its land grant, the period for the completion of such lines, for that purpose, having only been extended until the 31st December, 1899, by the order in council of 22nd October, 1898.
>
> The minister therefore recommends that the time fixed by the order in council of 22nd October, 1898, for the completion of the lines of railway hereinbefore referred to be extended to the 10th July, 1904.

Again, on the 20th February, 1900, the following order in council was passed :

> The minister, therefore, recommends that as the time for the completion of the company's lines of railway north of the Saskatchewan river was extended by the Act, chapter 57 of the statutes of 1899, 62-63 Victoria, to the 10th July, 1906, the time fixed for the completion of such lines for the purposes of the company's land grant therefor, as provided by the orders in council hereinbefore referred to including the order of the 22nd October, 1898, be extended to the 10th July, 1906. This order in council also shifts the line westerly to the Swan river district.

And so, all the way down the line. That is not the treatment which has been meted out to other holders of charters in the country. I remember that about three years ago an application was made by the Red Deer Valley Company for an extension of time. They also wanted to have the time in which they could construct their road extended and also the privilege of taking advantage of the land grant. That was not conceded to them. They apparently had not the influence with the present administration to secure the same consideration that the Canadian Northern have had for the last eight or nine years. The hon. member for West Assiniboia said that he was opposed to the scheme suggested by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), that it would tie up so many acres of land in the country. He said that the curse of the country had been so many acres of land had been tied up from time to time and that it was depriving the people of the opportunity of having proper schools and, of course, as he usually does, he blamed all this on the Conservative administration and on the Canadian Pacific Railway. Let me point out to him that since his friends have come into power there have been no less than 8,750,000 acres of land set apart out of which this company were to make their selection, and that the privilege has been extended from time to time during a great many years. In conclusion, I repeat what I have said that the whole history of this case shows that the government have only been playing with this question and that instead of this land grant having been used for the purpose of establishing railway conection with Hudson bay the orders in council show that the government have been guilty of wilful waste of the aid in connection with this whole matter.

Mr. E. L. CASH (Mackenzie). Mr. Speaker, in undertaking to take part in this debate, I must confess that I do it with a great deal of diffidence, because I realize probably as fully as any person the importance of what we are undertaking, and the serious consequences that may result if we fail to properly impress not alone this House and the government, but the people of the Dominion as to the necessity, the feasibility, and the advantages to be derived from this undertaking, not alone for the western provinces, but for the whole of the Dominion.

I shall, therefore, undertake to describe as nearly as possible the condition of the agriculturists in Saskatchewan, and as they are there, so they are in the other western provinces, and I feel that if I can do this properly, and can then show the feasibility and the advantages to be derived from this proposition, there would not be one member in this House who would oppose our proposi-

tion as such, whatever differences might exist as to the means of its accomplishment.

For instance, I personally believe that the government should undertake this as a national project, and that it might not prove a burden to this country, there is plenty of land in the west on which the scheme could be financed. They should build a line from the main line of the Canadian Northern to Churchill, and this should be built with the idea that it would eventually be double tracked. By making provision for double tracking this line at the time of construction great expense might be saved as soon as it became necessary to put in the extra track, as I can assure you it will not be many years before this will be absolutely necessary. Extensive terminal facilities at both ends of the line, prepared to take cars from all roads and carry them to their destination and return, large storage facilities at Churchill in the shape of elevators and so forth, a line of suitable boats from Churchill to Liverpool, and extensive elevators in Liverpool, would best serve the interests of that part of the country which we are endeavouring to promote.

I, however, am willing to support any feasible measure which has for its object, the building of this line, whether it be by the government or by a private corporation for the route is the one essential thing, and of much greater importance than the manner of its construction.

There is no question in the mind of any thinking man in this Dominion as to the importance of agriculture. It is the foundation of our whole prosperity and, I might almost say, of our existence, and by doing what we can to strengthen this foundation, we thereby are enabled not alone to raise a larger, but a safer superstructure. If we are to become the great nation which we aspire to become, it is well that our foundation be well laid, and in this way we will avoid many of the disasters which have overtaken nations, causing them in time of distress or financial difficulties to topple, and, in some instances, to fall, because their foundation was not broad enough and based upon the earth, from which all our riches primarily come.

The agriculturists in Saskatchewan have not the diversified means of prospering that farmers have in Ontario and the States. They are consumers of tomatoes, and not producers on which there is an extravagant protection. They are consumers of tobacco and not producers, and so I could go on and mention quite a number of other protected products for which our people pay extravagant prices, and, I am pleased to say, usually without a murmur. But they produce staple farm products, such as wheat, oats, barley, flax and so forth, and raise horses, cattle, sheep and hogs, and bitterly complain about having to produce grain which has to compete with all comers in the market of the world by the use of machinery upon which they have to pay a tariff.

I do not imagine that there is one member in the House who does not appreciate what the importance and value of the development of the west is to the whole Dominion, to the manufacturers of the east, to the fruit growers of the east, to the carrying trade, new boats on the lakes, new lines of railways; all these can trace their prosperity, and, in a great many instances, their origin, entirely to the development of the west, and I think that this is the place where we should pause for a moment to say, without any political bias, that this, in a large measure, has been brought about by the wise and energetic immigration policy inaugurated and carried out by the present government.

Now, we, who live in the west, know that even with the utmost straining and most earnest endeavour on the part of the railway companies, that they are not able to take care of in reasonable time, the freight which is offered them by our people which was plainly demonstrated in the fall of 1906 when there was such a demand for more cars from nearly all parts of the west. In my own town of Yorkton, there were over 250 names waiting at one time upon the car order list at the station waiting for their turn to be supplied with cars which they had ordered, and the elevators all filled to the roof. To illustrate the growth that has taken place in the west I would call the attention of the House to the district I represent. I took up my residence there in 1897, and until 1901, I think I am safe in saying that it was emphatically a ranching country. About that time, or shortly after, we began to raise grain—the country began to fill up, and while, prior to the time mentioned, we had no grain to ship out, yet, in the season of 1906, we raised:

Grain.	Bushels.	Acres.
Wheat	2,143,223	84,357
Oats	4,316,731	97,500
Barley	224,847	8,264

Area under cultivation 275,000 acres 'estimated.'

Elevator capacity 931,000 bushels.

Shipments of cattle 2,361.

I refer to those things in order to give hon. gentlemen some idea of the progress that has taken place during the last few years. The following extract from the Toronto 'Globe' of April 15 of last year, written by their special correspondent from Regina, will show the area under cultivation:

Regina, April 15.—While the farmers are waiting for opportunities to scatter the seed for the crop of 1907 the probable extensions of the grain growing area are receiving consideration. The mathematicians who make calcu-

lations in Winnipeg have usually considered that an increase of 10 per cent in the acreage under wheat was sufficient as an average for the whole west, but this will not do for Saskatchewan. The total under wheat in Saskatchewan in 1906, according to the figures of the Department of Agriculture, was 1,730,586 acres, as compared with 1,130,084 in 1905, an increase of 53.10 per cent. The total under all crops was 2,501,247 acres, as compared with 1,639,563 in 1905, an increase of .56 per cent. These large increases are sufficient in themselves to show the rapid development of the grain-producing industry, and the record which is constituted by them is difficult to maintain. For instance, another increase of 53 per cent in the acreage under wheat would bring the total in this province to over 2,600,000, and the amount looks very large at this writing. It will probably look normal six months hence, and there are those who say that it may even be exceeded.

I have here an extract from the Department of Agriculture's Report on the grain crops of Saskatchewan for the year 1907 which shows that there were in 1907 produced in the province :

Grain.	Bushels.	Acreage.
Wheat	28,042,106	1,847,708
Oats	29,167,964	772,770
Barley	1,903,072	60,261
Flax	921,043	85,209
Total	60,034,185	2,765,948

There was also shipped out of Saskatchewan :

Cattle	27,271
Horses	3,499
Sheep	15,929
Hogs	4,716

This is a very good showing, when the climatic conditions which prevailed over such a large area of our province are taken into consideration. There was a much larger area prepared for crop, some of which was not put in, and thousands of acres that were not cut, and a great deal that was cut was not threshed.

I bring these things to the attention of the House that you may have some idea of the progress that we are making. I may also refer to the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce which establishes what I have already stated, that similar progress is being made in Manitoba and Alberta as I claim for Saskatchewan. These are the figures :

Total grain weighed, Manitoba inspection division.

	Bushels.
1906-07, 9 months	97,041,653
1905-06 "	130,547,955
1904-05 "	77,371,533
1903-04 "	68,645,716
1902-03 "	39,442,575

With this growth of the trade of the country, the House will readily understand why our people are demanding from the government a better condition of affairs as regards transportation. We have all heard of the great railway tie-up we had in 1906, I will read a couple of letters that will emphasize this matter and will then undertake by railway statistics to show that we are liable to be up against a similar condition at any time when the crop in the west is of ordinary proportions to the amount of land under cultivation. I do not wish to find undue fault with any railway company for I realize they are making an effort to supply the country with reasonable facilities for the transportation of grain, but I wish to emphasize that notwithstanding their efforts they have been unable to cope with the situation and they certainly will not be able to if the country continues to progress as it has in the past. I shall read the following letters, most of which I received last year, bearing on this question :

Rokeby, Saskatchewan, February 23, 1907.

E. L. Cash, M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your favour of 19th instant, I may say that the amount of grain at Rokeby is as follows (grown 1906):

	Bushels.
Amount sold up to February 1, 1907	210,000
Amount in farmers' hands	190,000
Amount shipped up to above date	130,000
Amount yet to ship out	270,000
Total amount for Rokeby market	400,000
Increase over last season	100,000

Yours truly,
R. A. BLACK.

Mr. Black has charge of the Northern elevator at Rokeby. This is another letter sent to me :

Yorkton District Board of Trade.
Incorporated 1900.

Yorkton, Saskatchewan, March 19, 1907.

E. L. Cash, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir,—Shipments of grain from Yorkton are as follows:

	Bushels.
From September 1, 1906, to March 18, 1907	951,295
In store in elevators	224,180
Stored in sheds and warehouses about town	75,000
Grain held by farmers	1,000,000
Total	2,250,475

In addition to above there has been milled 70,000 bushels of wheat, making a total of 2,320,475 bushels of grain, the crop product of the Yorkton district, 35 per cent of this amount represents wheat, balance oats. A very large amount of grain has yet to be threshed. The supply of cars is very small and business is at a standstill. In regard to the Hudson bay road, the general opinion here is that the road would prove of immense advantage to this country for the timber, mineral and fish products which would be

carried over it even if no grain could be taken out by the Hudson bay straits.

Yours truly,

M. A. EBY,

President Board of Trade.

The Hon. Mr. Motherwell wrote to me as follows:

Executive Council, Saskatchewan,
Regina, February 28, 1907.

Dr. E. L. Cash, M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

Sir,—The inclosed crop statistics and summaries of condition and amount of last season's crop yet in the farmers' hands will doubtless be of interest to you in pressing for better equipment of our present lines and the immediate construction of the Hudson Bay Railway, which questions are now before the federal House.

Yours faithfully,

W. R. MOTHERWELL,

Commissioner of Agriculture.

Crop, 1906.	Shipped.	In Elevators.	In Farmers' Hands.
28,089,475	9,874,295	6,362,190	8,135,000

To show that there is still complaint I will read the following letter received by me last month:

Peaker Brothers, grain merchants,

Yorkton, Saskatchewan, March 19, 1908.

My Dear Cash,—We are getting stuck for want of cars at Rokeby. Do you think you could help us by a timely word to the Canadian Pacific Railway or its representatives at Ottawa?

Yours very truly,

PEAKER BROTHERS.

This correspondence plainly shows that last year the railways at that time were certainly not supplying the needs of the country, and that there are complaints even at present. This will be evident from the following railway statistics:

Number of freight cars in Canada—

1897.. 57,754
1907.. 105,540
Increase, 82 per cent.

Mileage of railway—

1897.. 16,550
1907.. 22,452
Increase, 35 per cent.

Tons of freight carried—

1897.. 25,300,331
1907.. 63,866,135
Increase, 152 per cent.

Traffic per car—

Tons.

1897.. 439
1907.. 605
Increase, 37 per cent.

Mr. CASH.

The growth of traffic in connection with Canadian railways is a natural sequence to the immense increase in the trade of the country during the past ten years. Following are the figures:

1897.. .. .. $257,168,862
1907 (9 months).... 465,063,204

As this latter is for only 9 months, it will be better represented by stating that it is $600,000,000, instead of $465,000,000 for the year. This would mean an increase of about 300 per cent, while the number of freight cars has only increased 82 per cent.

I will give a few figures in regard to the equipment of the different railroads:

The Canadian Pacific Railway had on June 30 last 1,296 locomotives and 40,405 freight cars. With a total mileage of 8,921, this would represent 145 locomotives and 4,529 freight cars per 1,000 miles.

The Grand Trunk Railway had 868 locomotives and 28,662 freight cars, representing, on a mileage of 3,117 miles, 278 locomotives and 9,195 freight cars per 1,000 miles.

The Canadian Northern Railway, with a mileage of 2,585 miles, had 323 locomotives owned and leased, and 6,551 freight cars. This would be equal to 125 locomotives and 2,534 freight cars per 1,000 miles.

On the basis of 22,452 miles of railway for the whole Dominion, there were on June 30 last 156 locomotives and 5,218 freight cars per 1,000 miles.

For the whole of the United States in 1906 there were 232 locomotives and 8,266 freight cars per 1,000 miles.

As a summary of this matter I will quote from the railway statistics of the Dominion of Canada for the year ended June 30, 1907, what the compiler of statistics has to say on this subject. He says:

Last year 16,949 freight cars were added to the total supply in Canada. But it must not be assumed that the congestion of traffic was relieved to that extent. In the first place, cars wear out and are destroyed. The Master Car Builders' Association years ago fixed a depreciation of six per cent on wooden cars down to forty per cent of their first cost, which would establish the life of a car at somewhere about 20 years. Placing it at 25 years, however, and fitting that figure to the 96,565 freight cars in service in Canada in 1906, it will be seen that 3,862 new cars would have been required in 1907 to replace those which had passed out of commission. But that is not all. There were 1,099 miles of new railway put into operation during the year, and on the basis indicated in the preceding paragraph, and applied to 1906, this additional mileage would call for an equipment of 4,523 freight cars. These two sums make up 8,385. Allowing for a service of 594 tons per car, the 5,899,422 tons of additional freight handled in 1907 would require 9,932 new cars. Adding together the three sums indicated, we have a required addition of 18,317 freight cars in order to maintain normal conditions, or 1,368 more than were actually brought into use during the year.

I need not comment on these figures; they speak for themselves, and indicate very

plainly that, with the normal growth of the country, we shall have to face a similar proposition in every season in which an average crop is produced.

I have no doubt that every member of this House, coming from a western grain growing section, will endorse what I say, and it is this: that the present railway systems cannot keep pace with the growth and demands of that country, and, on the other hand, the farmers cannot afford to pay the demands made upon them to get their products into the hands of the consumer. They have heard of the Hudson Bay route, have read with eagerness and interest everything they could find in the public press on the subject, also the bulletin lately issued by the Interior Department, and are now demanding to know if the government considers the route feasible, and, if so, that it be built with as little delay as possible.

The answer to this is that as far as the railway is concerned, from all the information I can get from engineers and others who have been over the line from the Pas to Churchill, there are no serious obstacles in the way, and that the road can be constructed without any serious engineering difficulties to be overcome, and that it would not be attended by any very great or unusual expense; also, that there is a large area about one hundred miles square, of good clay land, through which such a road would pass, and that it is rich in pulp wood and minerals of various kinds. With regard to the navigation of the Hudson bay and Hudson strait, I will read extracts from a recent report by Mr. A. P. Low, Director of the Geological Survey of Canada. This gentleman's observations carry the weight which attaches to the utterances of a responsible government officer, and have the additional advantage of being based upon personal knowledge and experience while in command of the 'Neptune,' a vessel fitted out by the federal government to determine the feasibility of the navigation of Hudson straits and bay. The first conclusion arrived at by Mr. Low is that Hudson bay is navigable by ordinary boats for four months, from the 15th July, to the 15th November, and that for reinforced vessels (those constructed to encounter ice) navigation may be prolonged another month. Mr. Low then says that the distance from Regina to Fort Churchill is equal to that from Regina to Fort William, while the distance from Fort Churchill to Liverpool is practically the same as from Quebec to Liverpool; consequently, the Hudson Bay route saves to the Northwest the transportation charges over a distance equal to that between Fort William and Quebec. He was confidently of the opinion that the grain crops of the Northwest could be easily transported from Churchill to Liverpool. This eminent gentleman demonstrates that Liverpool is approximately 1,000 miles nearer the wheat fields of the west by way of Fort Churchill than by way of Quebec. He demonstrates that the route via Fort Churchill is navigable for four months at least during the year, being a sufficient period to move the crops. He demonstrates, also that the vicinity of Hudson bay is rich in mineral, copper being on the west and iron on the east side of the bay. Speaking generally of the surrounding district Mr. Low says: 'It is undoubtedly contains much and varied stores of mineral wealth.'

Mr. Low holds that given a good harbour such as that of Churchill, and an adequate number of tramp steamships there will be no difficulty in removing during the season of safe navigation all the grain and other supplies that can be drawn by a single line of rails. The route is divided naturally into two sections, each about 500 miles long, that in the bay itself, and that in the strait leading to the North Atlantic ocean.

The first presents no serious natural difficulties. The water is deep, varying from 50 to 200 fathoms, the approach to the low shores being indicated by a gradually lessening depth, giving ample warning to the navigator. Only a few beacons would be required as guides to Churchill where a deep river gives safe room for ships to load and unload.

The causes of the short season of navigation are found in the strait. It is deep, with no shoals, and there is little danger of stranding on the bold shores of either side or on the few islands that bound the channel. At the main eastern end the strait has a practicable channel thirty-five miles wide. At its narrowest part the channel is thirty miles wide. The difficulties are due to its geographical situation. It lies north of latitude 62.30. The main stream of the Arctic current from Baffin bay loaded with ice passes across its mouth, and in November or early December closes the eastern entrance. This ice stream is sometimes fifty miles in width. It blocks the coast of Labrador during the winter, and in March is off Newfoundland, bearing with it the seal herd that gives the islander so much welcome wealth. It is an obstruction to the St. Lawrence navigation, as some of it finds its way into the strait of Belle Isle and closes that route to ships until late in the summer. The rest disappears in the warmer water of the Atlantic.

Early in October ice begins to form in the strait itself, and by the end of the month the northern harbours are frozen over. The southern ones do not close for a month later. The bay does not freeze over. The ice generally extends from the shores outward for a distance of five miles, though James bay at the south becomes completely covered. Specially constructed ships, of the 'Ermack' type, might navigate the bay all winter and the strait also.

The adverse reports rendered by earlier

expeditions dispatched to investigate the possibilities of Hudson bay were possibly coloured by political consideration or the decision influenced by the vested railroad interest affected by the proposal. We, however, know that the Hudson Bay Company's boats have traversed these seas for a couple of hundred years, and I have also read in the 'Gentlemen's Magazine,' an English publication, vol. 52, page 547, of date October 29, 1782, a quotation from the Paris 'Gazette' of an expedition to Hudson bay by a small French squadron under the command of Admiral De La Perouse. This squadron consisted of the 'Sceptre,' 74 guns, and two frigates 'L'Astree' and 'L'Engagente' under the command of Chevalier Langle and the Sieur Joillie, having on board a detachment of 250 land forces with two 8-in. mortars, 300 shells, and four field pieces, that they sailed from Cape Francois on May 31, 1782, and on July 17, 1782, they arrived at the mouth of the strait, that they had neither charts nor pilots, but that they entered the bay, captured Fort Prince of Wales and Fort York, which is at the mouth of Nelson's river and after looting the several forts they sailed away having captured valuables to the amount of twelve millions of livres, which would represent about five hundred thousand pounds sterling.

The fact that a vessel of this class, a sailing vessel of course, of 74 guns could go into the bay in 1782 at that time of the year, accomplish what it did, and get out safely, would convince any ordinary man that both the straits and the bays are navigable for vessels of a larger draught. It convinces me that ordinary steamboats with proper appliances could navigate those waters much earlier than the dates mentioned.

It is twenty-two years since the route was first officially examined, and the long delay in coming to a favourable conclusion affords another proof of the false perspective in which suggestions of transportation alterations are seen.

Last year several hon. gentlemen on both sides spoke favourably of this matter.

Quoting from 'Hansard,' page 901, on March 30, 1906, I find the hon. member from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) used these words:

> I do not see how any one can look at that inland sea and not come to the opinion that Providence had a very wise thing in his mind when he put Hudson bay there. It was to carry out the products, not only of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, but also of the Northern United States.

The hon. member for East Assiniboia, as reported in 'Hansard,' page 908, March 30, 1906, expressed the hope that a railroad to Hudson bay would shortly be built and that such road would receive substantial aid from the Dominion government. The hon. member for East Assiniboia agreed with the hon. gentleman from Souris that such a railroad was a necessity, and would be a valuable additional route for the whole of the western country.

Hon. Walter Scott in his address to the electors of Saskatchewan, in his last campaign said:

> We have been obeying the direction of the Saskatchewan Liberal convention to urge the Hudson bay road project on the federal authorities, and not without success. I have now received assurance that the Dominion Government admit this project to be a national undertaking, and that they will not deny their responsibility. In other words, the Dominion Government will take measures to procure the construction of a railway from a point in Saskatchewan to the Hudson bay.

The policy of recognizing the Hudson bay route has actually received the endorsement of this government, and the people of the west have been officially informed of this fact by the gentleman who occupies the position of Premier of Saskatchewan.

Referring to this announcement as made by Hon. Mr. Scott, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) reported in 'Hansard,' page 909, March 30, 1906, said in the House that he hailed this statement by Mr. Scott with infinite delight and that he regarded the pledge made by the Dominion government to undertake the work as one which would satisfy all the people of the west.

Dealing with the subject from a practical standpoint, one only has to quote from a speech delivered in the Senate, on March 16 last, by Hon. Mr. Perley, a practical farmer in the Northwest.

After alluding to the difficulty and loss occasioned to the wheat grower by reason of the long and expensive haul from the wheat fields to the sea, the honourable senator said: 'Freight from Wolseley, Saskatchewan to Fort William is 10 cents a bushel, from Wolseley to North Bay it is 22 cents'; concluding his remarks the hon. gentleman said 'export from the Atlantic sea-board by rail is entirely out of the question.'

The freight rate upon grain from the belt to Hudson bay would approximate 10 cents a bushel; this is a freight the farmer could afford to pay, but the additional 15 cents necessary to get the grain to the Atlantic sea-board is prohibitive and of itself represents a fair profit to the wheat grower.

The saving in freight to the western farmer by reason of an outlet at Hudson bay, is represented by appalling figures. Assuming an export of 20,000,000 bushels of wheat to European markets via Hudson bay, the saving at 15 cents, being about the difference in cost of freight from Winnipeg to the sea-board which would thus be obviated, amounts to no less than $3,000,000.

When one pursues these figures and calculates the legitimate measure in foreign demand for Canadian wheat, the amount saved to the western farmer who has the

facilities of shipping via Hudson bay reaches a colossal sum.

I contend that the people of the west, having been invited by the government of Canada to settle in and cultivate that important territory, are entitled to facilities whereby easy access to a shipping port may be secured, without being compelled to surrender a large proportion of the results of their industry in payment of freight charges for unnecessary long hauls.

Are the advantages gained through the efforts of the Immigration Department, with their accompanying vast expenditures of money to be made, nugatory by failure to appreciate a proposition that is self-evident? When one reflects upon Canada's great western heritage, with its vast natural resources, its inexhaustible vitality, its great areas, its millions of acres of grazing lands, the industrial and commercial genius of its enterprising and aggressive people, the conclusion reached cannot be that all these should go for nought, or be in any manner compelled to fall short of their greatest realization by the mere incident of neglect with respect to providing intelligent transportation.

It is a principle of political economy that legitimate demands of commerce for an outlet at the point of least resistance, cannot be long delayed, and never ultimately frustrated. If the products of the west can be brought 1,000 miles nearer a European market via Hudson bay, then that point becomes, as a matter of course, the natural outlet.

The question may be asked, are not the people of the west entitled to their natural transportation advantages? I believe they are, and I regard it as the paramount duty of the government to recognize this principle.

An outlet at Hudson bay for the products of the west will annihilate a quarter of the distance from western Canada to Europe, bring uncounted millions of acres in the wheat belt a thousand miles nearer to market, and cut in half the annual transportation cost of 50,000,000 bushels of grain.

A very important feature in connection with a railway which secures quick access to the sea is with relation to the shipping of cattle to all the European markets ; this great industry is at present seriously handicapped in consequence of the long journey to be endured under present conditions. It is admitted as a well recognized fact, that cattle shipped to the Atlantic coast arrive at the shipping port in poor condition, bruised and emaciated by long days of rail travel. It is also admitted that on the sea journey they gain rather than lose flesh, if put on board in good condition. Experience proves that after three days of rail travel cattle will deteriorate ; that three days is about the limit of the time during which they can travel and maintain the condition in which they are placed on board. This being so, cattle could be transported to Fort Churchill without loss of flesh, and the voyage to Liverpool would improve this condition rather than the contrary. Therefore, this great industry alone would find in the Fort Churchill route a solution of the difficulty under which those engaged in the business of cattle shipping now labour.

Mr. F. W. Peters, assistant freight traffic manager of the Canadian Pacific at Winnipeg, states that up to the end of October over 72,000 head of cattle had been shipped to Liverpool from western Canada, and he expected a further 10,000 head to be shipped that season. The freight rate on these cattle would be about 60 cents a hundred pounds in car lots from Winnipeg to Montreal. The rate from Calgary to Fort Churchill would be about the same as to Winnipeg, and the distance about equal, so that this 60 cents a hundred pounds could be saved to the shippers if he could put the cattle on board at Hudson bay, and he would also prevent the shrinkage which otherwise occur, by reason of the additional rail journey from Winnipeg to Montreal.

Upon the 82,000 head of cattle shipped to Montreal from the west during the past season, the saving in freight alone, $6 a head, or in round figures, $650,000, would be equal to about 20 per cent of the selling price.

Now, let us for a moment consider what amount of railway service will be required to handle 50,000,000 bushels of wheat and 82,000 head of cattle, which certainly is rather under than above the present output of that country, and we are not taking into consideration the handling of coarser grains, and, in my section of the country, as I have already stated, our oat crop is more than double that of the wheat. In order to move fifty million bushels of grain it would require 50,000 cars, loaded with 1,000 bushels to the car ; and with fifteen cars to the train, it would require 3,333 trains. For eighty-two thousand head of cattle, 5,125 cars, and, figuring on fifteen cars to the train, we would have 341 train loads. And if we stop to consider that the total area surveyed in the three provinces is about one hundred and twenty million acres, that it was stated before a committee of the Senate last year that there were one hundred million acres of land suitable for settlement north of the surveyed area, and that out of this gross amount there has been selected by railway companies and by homesteaders about thirty-six million acres, which we can state with a great degree of certainty is all arable land, and that out of this there are about eight million six hundred thousand acres under cultivation, we can see that with a continued increase in the development of the country, which I think will be more rapid in the future than it has been in the past, it will be utterly impossible for any three railways to handle

the grain and the products of that country. Therefore, I think that this parliament and this government are in duty bound to give the question their immediate and most earnest attention.

A revolution in traffic routes through Canada is bound to come, and the objective point for the west, is without doubt, Hudson bay. The citizens of Canada have not realized the transportation advantages of their country in the extraordinary rapidity with which they are being developed ; but the people of the west, those more nearly affected and most directly interested and having a knowledge of the conditions are clamouring for the immediate building of the Hudson bay route, because it will eliminate a long rail haul and save rehandling of freight.

Instead of this prejudicing existing transcontinental routes, I think they will be vastly benefited by the opening of the Hudson Bay route and by the improvement of the river and lake waterways of Canada. The possibility of direct communication with Europe through the very centre of the American continent and at a saving of a thousand miles over the route through the great lakes, affords the greatest opportunity of all times to bring Western Canada a thousand miles nearer Europe and to place the farmers who cultivate millions of acres of land in control of the grain markets of the world, by making possible a fifty per cent reduction in the cost of transportation.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Speaker, considering the great fund of information which those who have addressed the House have afforded hon. members on this important question, it is not with any idea that I can add anything of a very original character to the debate that I rise to address the House. I wish to take exception to the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles) reflecting, as he did in his opening remarks, on the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) for wishing to introduce on going into Supply his resolution referring to the immigration question, of which he gave notice some days ago. The hon. member for West Assiniboia claimed that this question paled into insignificance in comparison with the question of a railway line to Hudson bay which, he said, was a question of extreme urgency. I could not help thinking that, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Knowles) was sincere in making that statement, he did not by his actions show that he was any too urgent in bringing this question before the House. When I turn to the notice of his resolution on the order paper I find that it was given on December 8, 1907—just four months ago. The hon. gentleman waited until the last private member's day, then had the resolution dropped, and, to-day, he arises and introduces what I thought was going to be a merely academic discussion. So far as the hon. gentleman was concerned, it certainly looked as if it would be no more than that, for he sat down without even moving his resolution. It seems to have been an after thought on the part of his colleagues to have another hon. gentleman from the Northwest move the resolution of which the hon. member for West Assiniboia gave notice four months ago.

We must admit that this is a question of very great importance, more especially to the people of western Canada, but of importance as well to the people of Canada generally. For some years this question of a line to Hudson bay has been engaging the attention of the people of the west especially. The provincial government of Manitoba had taken steps many years ago, by way of statute in the form of money grants and guarantee of bonds, to ensure the completion of that road. Boards of trade, Farmers' Institutes, Grain Growers' Associations, have all passed resolutions in favour of the enterprise. And, in spite of many difficulties and many disappointments, the people's hopes have been many times buoyed up by indications that the road would soon be an accomplished fact. Rumours have been rife on more than one occasion that capitalists from Europe were ready to invest money in the enterprise, that steamship companies were about to place a line of properly constructed vessels on the route to carry our products across the Atlantic by the best and shortest route to the markets of the world. Those hopes have been, on every occasion, disappointed. But, in spite of disappointments, the people cling tenaciously to the belief in the enterprise, its practicability and its necessity. If the propaganda in favour of this enterprise has not been carried on during the past decade with the extreme vigour which characterized it some time before, it is not because the people believe that it is not necessary, nor is it that they are not in favour of it. The change is simply due to the fact that, during that time, our transportation facilities have very largely extended in other directions, and have, to a certain extent, relieved the grievances of the people during the past ten years. For instance, in days gone by, the Canadian Pacific Railway had practically a monopoly of the carrying trade in that country. That company was not better probably, and no worse certainly, than any other corporation similarly situated in a new country. However, the people felt that they were paying such high freight rates that they set up an agitation for what they believed would be the shortest route to market and one that would save a great deal in freight rates and make farming operations more profitable. However, in the meantime the Canadian Pacific Railway has largely ex-

tended its system. Let any hon. member take up the map of Manitoba and he will see that it is a network of railways. Farmers in that country have to carry their grain a comparatively short distance to the nearest market. Railway development has been so wonderful during these years by reason of provincial assistance, and Dominion assistance as well that now every farmer has a railway within a few miles of his door. The Canadian Northern Railway has an almost equal mileage in the province of Manitoba to the Canadian Pacific Railway. There are over 3,000 miles of railway in Manitoba alone and both these systems have been developing in the new provinces of the west, the Hill system to the south has tapped the prairie provinces of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan, and extends as far north as the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Grand Trunk Pacific has been before the people of this country for some years, and, while not in operation yet, combined with other roads has allayed to a certain extent the agitation in favour of the immediate construction of the Hudson bay road. But it is felt that, notwithstanding this great and wonderful development in our transportation facilities, the local traffic as created by these roads will supply more than sufficient for the carrying power of the roads and that, by the time this Hudson Bay Railway can be constructed, there will be sufficient and more than sufficient to afford traffic for that line also.

In the past political parties have vied with each other in the west in trying to impress on the people that each was more favourable and more earnest in its effort to secure the construction of this road than the other. This shows that if it were allowed to become a party question it would be a very keenly contested one. It is true also that in years gone by, especially in eastern Canada, whenever this project was brought up it met with serious opposition, I will not say from disinterested sources or from unselfish motives; the opposition came largely from interested transportation companies and they invariably started to 'knock' the enterprise. Newspapers were engaged in order to decry especially the feasibility of the route. Then too, business men in the east, who looked on the west almost as their own preserve, and who, to use their own expression, after having employed their money in developing the west felt that any advantages that would accrue from carrying the products of the west to the markets of the world should be realized by the people of the east, also opposed to it. I am glad to say, however, that a great deal of this former opposition to the enterprise has been done away with and this skepticism and doubt as to the feasibility of the route has been dispelled. Now a more enlightened public opinion appreciates the enormous potentialities of the west, and the fact that by reason of the large immigration and the larger acreage being brought under cultivation all these transportation lines will have more than enough traffic to tax their resources in the very near future. I am aware that while the people of the west are anxious to have the line constructed, there may be and undoubtedly is a difference of opinion as to the best method of construction. It has not been made a party measure and one political party in the west may differ as to the method of construction. For instance, the Liberals assembled in convention in Alberta showed their preference for a road that should be undertaken by the four western provincial governments, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia these governments joining together and making it a purely western enterprise. In convention assembled in the province of Alberta, they pased this resolution:

> Resolved, that, inasmuch as the provinces westward of the Great Lakes are peculiarly interested in the establishment of a new route to the sea-board alternative to that afforded by railways to the Atlantic coast, and inasmuch as the creation of two new provinces out of the Northwest Territories gives the first opportunity for co-operation with this end in view; therefore this convention is of the opinion that the earliest possible steps should be taken to secure joint action by the governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia, in order to ascertain definitely and finally the feasibility of the Hudson Bay route as an outlet for our commodities, and to decide upon the best means of constructing a railway by that route to tide water, whereby the long land haul may be divided by one-half and the ocean voyage to European ports also materially decreased.

The Liberals of Saskatchewan also met in convention and adopted a somewhat different course. They passed a resolution in the following words:

> That in the opinion of this convention the early construction of a railway to Hudson bay is essential to the full development and progress of western Canada, including the province of Saskatchewan, and that the building of the road should be arranged for as a federal work in the general interests of Canada as a whole; and
>
> Be it further resolved, that it shall be the immediate duty of the provincial authorities to press upon the Dominion government for the early completion of the project.

It will thus be seen that the same party in the two provinces differed materially as to the method of constructing the road. As to Manitoba, both political parties have been pledged to the construction of the road, both of them have placed money and guaranteed assistance in the statute-book of that province many years ago, so that while there may be a difference of opinion in regard to the method of construction, there is no dif-

ference of opinion in the west in regard to the necessity of the road.

I know that objections have been offered, such as have been referred to by my colleagues in the House to-day. These objections have been offered by those who do not seem to greatly favour the enterprise. These are such objections as that the route could never be navigable by reason of fogs and floating ice. Another strongly urged alleged reason is that the season of navigation would not be long enough to make it a profitable commercial enterprise. As to the question of fogs we have only to look up the history of the steamers that have already gone up there for the express purpose of testing the practicability of that route, and in every case it will be found that the captains of these steamers report that they were not as greatly troubled with fogs on that route as they would be off the coast of Newfoundland; they report that the St. Lawrence route is in some respects more dangerous than the Hudson Bay route would be. We all know to-day that there are people who, not from disinterested motives, try to decry our own St. Lawrence route, but still what would Canada be to-day without that route? It has been decried by rival enterprises and we have often heard complaints of discrimination by insurance companies against the St. Lawrence route on the ground of its being more dangerous than the New York route. These are objections that can all be dispelled, and as far as the navigability of Hudson straits is concerned, the steamers there have reported that there is four to five months of open navigation. We all know that in years gone by even our own great west was belittled. It was claimed not only by outsiders but even by those resident in our own country that it was only fit for the home of Indians and buffalo, and that no railway through it would ever pay as a commercial enterprise. Recently I came across a clipping from a Montreal newspaper of many years ago, and I shall read a short extract from it in order to show the opinion of our great Northwest as an agricultural country held in the east at that time. It will emphasize the great change of opinion that has taken place in this respect. This is from the Montreal 'Transcript' of 1856:

> The Red river is an oasis in the midst of a desert, a vast, treeless prairie on which scarcely a shrub is to be seen. The climate is unfavourable to the growth of grain; the summer though warm enough is too short in duration, so that even the few fertile spots could with difficulty mature a potato or a cabbage.

That is the opinion of an eastern newspaper of 1856, of what I and the members of this House regard as the future granary of the British empire. All these fertile plains with their miles of waving grain, have been opened up, and I wish to give due credit to the transportation company that has opened up that great country. Had it not been for its efforts we would not to-day require the Hudson Bay route. Just as experience has demonstrated the fallacy of this opinion of the Montreal 'Transcript' in regard to the fertility of the Northwest so we will be able to remove the prejudice and ignorance as to the Hudson Bay route. I feel that in less than a quarter of a century public opinion in regard to it will have very materially changed.

It has been stated that the Hudson Bay Company's vessels have been going in and out of the bay for 250 years, and the hon. member from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) who has been very industrious in looking up statistics, quoted to the House to-day the statement that out of 750 vessels going in and out of the bay in the course of that time, only two vessels have been lost. If that route were equipped with modern aids to navigation it would be even less dangerous than it has been in the past.

In Mr. Low's report I ran across two or three expressions in regard first to the necessity of the route and secondly to its navigability. Mr. Low says:

> The question of Hudson bay and Hudson strait has been before the Canadian public for a period extending back almost to the time of confederation.

The deputy Minister of Railways and Canals states that it is only at the present time in its talkative stage and here Mr. Low truly states that it has been engaging public attention almost since confederation.

> An answer to this question has become more and more pressing, as the latent wealth of the grain fields of the Northwest has been proved, and as the present means of transport of this great volume of grain to the eastward become yearly less capable of handling it expeditiously and cheaply.
>
> Within the past few years the yield of Northwest grain has increased enormously, and a second line of rails is being laid across the continent to aid in the rapid transport of this wealth to the sea-board. If the increase in the area of land opened annually to cultivation continues as at present, a few years will show such a volume of grain to be transported that the new outlets will be unable to give free exit to it, and a new lane by which it can be taken to the European markets must be found.
>
> The route by rail to the port of Churchill, on the western side of Hudson bay, and from thence to Europe in ships, is the shortest, and is likely to prove the best, of all those outside the present routes by rail to the head waters of the St. Lawrence navigation.
>
> Ships go wherever cargoes can be obtained, and all that is needed to open Hudson bay for ordinary commercial navigation is a line of rails to carry freight to one of its ports.

Evidently, Mr. Low, who has been up there during more than one season, and who has had an opportunity of making observations on behalf of the government, has no doubt, with respect to this enterprise

as evidenced by these statements which I have just read to the House. Apparently he has no doubt whatever as far as the navigability of Hudson bay is concerned, nor does he consider that there is any question as to the navigability of Hudson strait in so far as the strait freezing over is concerned; the only danger is in the frozen ice that comes down from the north. As to the period of navigation which has been referred to by previous speakers, Mr. Low has something to say. The bugaboo is raised by some hon. gentlemen that because you cannot haul the grain out during the same season, in which it is raised the route will be commercially unprofitable. I am not sure that Mr. Low is correct in his estimate of the quantity of grain exported during the same season, but this is what he says on that point:

The question of the storage of the grain until the season following the harvest, is at first sight a serious one, but when it is known that not 20 per cent of the grain at present reaches the sea-board before the opening of navigation of the year following that in which it is harvested this objection practically disappears, but the grain may be as well stored on the shores of Hudson bay as in the elevators on the plains, or at Fort William. The question of storage is reduced to the length of time between the opening of navigation of Hudson strait, and the time required to transport grain from Fort William to Montreal after the opening of navigation on the great lakes, and this difference in time may be measured by days.

So that, if Mr. Low is an authority on that point, there is no great difficulty to be overcome in regard to the question of the storage of the grain. It might just as well be stored there as at Fort William or in the interior elevators. It has been said that 1,000 miles of rail haul will be saved. That is very true. To-day we have a ten cent rate between Winnipeg and Fort William, a distance of 425 miles. If it is six cents a bushel for 425 miles, it would be 12 cents, that would be saved per bushel for 1,000 miles, but it would be really more than that.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought it was ten cents from Brandon.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. No, from Winnipeg. As a matter of fact the rate east of Fort William, by rail, is higher, so that probably 12 or 15 cents per bushel would be saved. If the statement of the last speaker is correct that there would be an export of 20,000,000 bushels by this route, it would mean a saving of upwards of $3,000,000 per annum. That $3,000,000 might just as well be put into the hands of the farmers of the Northwest as into the hands of the transportation companies. Certainly nobody is more deserving of it than those whose products are being marketed and they do not wish to enter into a partnership with the carrying companies and pay an excessive rate of freight, I think they have a right to benefit in the saving which the construction of this railway would bring about.

The question of the land grant has been referred to. I am not going to go extensively into this because my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) has referred to it, nor would I refer to it were it not for the fact that the hon. member for West Assiniboia, during the discussion of this question, treated the subject from a party standpoint. He tried to make a little capital against my hon. friend the leader of the opposition for not having incorporated in his Halifax platform anything in regard to the Hudson Bay route. But, we noticed that the hon. gentleman who introduced this resolution also introduced it last year, that he brought it forward on going into Supply and that there was a discussion upon it. What became of that motion we do not know. It was never withdrawn or voted upon and there is no record to show what became of it. Certainly it has not been acted upon, and although the Prime Minister declared that the question was engaging the attention of the government and that he would declare his policy no statement was made by the right hon. gentleman up to the end of last session. Still, the hon. member for West Assiniboia does not take his leader to task because of his non-fulfilment of his pledge, and although five months of this session have passed we are still without any statement from his leader. So, the hon. gentleman had better obtain a statement of the position and policy of his own leader before he undertakes to reflect upon the leader of the opposition party in regard to his policy upon this question. My hon. friend from Calgary has already stated that when the Liberals claim that they have not tied up one acre of land for railway purposes since they came into power they are saying something which they cannot substantiate. We know how they made the welkin ring on the western hustings when the elections were on as to how they had carried out their platform with regard to the granting of lands for railway construction, and we know they announced that when a particular railway charter which had expired since the government came in, that of the Red Deer Valley Railway Company, the land grant of necessity expired as well. They stated that the government, when they were asked to renew the charter, refused to renew the land grant showing that not an acre of land would be alienated for the purpose of building our railways. We are not condemning the voting of land or saying that we are not in a position to defend the voting of land in the past for the purpose of securing railway systems. We could not have had our railway systems

built were it not for the grants of land which were made. But, Sir, when these hon. gentlemen say that they have not given an acre of land for the purpose of building railways they have done so in regard to this very road, ostensibly for the purpose of building a line ostensibly to Hudson bay when really a portion of it was given not to build a road in the direction of Hudson bay but to build a road in the direction of Prince Albert. This charter has expired on more than one occasion. Did they drop their land grant when they renewed their charter? Did they do as they did in the case of the Red Deer Valley Railway Company? Not at all. Prior to 1896, there was placed on the statute-books a subsidy of $80,000 per annum for transport and mail service over this road. That was placed on the statute-book by the Conservative administration. That was changed by order in council on May 7, 1896 into $40,000 per annum to the Lake Manitoba Railway Company for a line from Portage La Prairie or Gladstone to a point on the Saskatchewan river, and the time was extended for the construction of the road until December 31, 1898. That was the position of affairs when the Liberals came into power. Of course, they had a land grant and it would expire on that date, less these two years, after this administration came into power. By an order in council of October 22, 1898, they authorized the deflection of the line from the mouth of the Saskatchewan river to the Swan river country, they also extended the time to December 31, 1899, for 125 miles, and there was further an extension of the land grant which was practically a renewal of the land grant although these hon. gentlemen claimed that they gave no land grant to the Red Deer Valley Railway Company. They gave 6,400 acres per mile within the province of Manitoba and 12,800 acres per mile without the boundaries of that province. Then again an order in council was passed on October 19, 1899, granting a further extension of time until July 10, 1904. That was extension number two. Then, again, on the 20th of February, 1900, they granted a further extension of time to the 10th of July, 1906. Again a land grant renewed. An order in council was passed on the 5th of January, 1907, for 125 miles from Sifton Junction, and this was approved of for subsidy purposes. An order in council was also passed on the 9th of October, 1900, and the engineer reported 250 miles completed and entitled to the land grant of 1,598,400 acres. That is what they had earned up to that time and of which they had selected 2,835. Another order in council was passed on the 5th of June, 1901, under which they had selected and had been granted 89,115:59 acres. Another order in council followed on the 11th September, 1901, under which 168,262 acres were selected and transferred to the company. Another order in council passed on the 10th of August, 1903, and it was reported that at this time the Canadian Northern had in running order from Beaver to Gladstone, 18 miles, Gladstone to Winnipegosis, 124 miles, Sifton Junction to Mafeking, 125 miles, Mafeking to the boundary, 28 miles, the boundary to Irwood, 22 miles, total 318 miles. Now, as the member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) has truly said, of that 320 miles there was subsidized the most of it to the extent of 6,400 acres per mile, some of it at 12,800 acres per mile, and when you get to the termination of the the 320 miles you are only within 150 miles or 170 miles nearer to Hudson bay than when you started. By reason of allowing the deflection westward and getting away from the bay, they drew that large land grant, and yet at the end of 320 miles they were no nearer than 150 or 170 miles to the bay than they were at Gladstone where they commenced. Now, on this 320 miles they were entitled to a land grant of 2,180,928 acres. But they claimed that some of these lands set apart for selection were not fairly fit for settlement and the government then allowed them a great number of concessions, amongst others: they enlarged their area of selection to include the territory reserved for the Manitoba and Northwestern, that is, after the Manitoba and Northwestern had selected their lands in a particular area, this company were allowed to go in and select the surplus of lands, and of the surplus of lands they were to select 100,000 acres out of the area of 124,330. They were also allowed to select from the reserve set apart for the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan, and the time for completion of selection was extended to the 31st December, 1905. An order in council was passed on the 27th January, 1904, under which they selected this 100,000 acres from the Manitoba and Northern reserve, another order in council was passed on the 1st October, 1904, under which the land grant they had earned on lines south of the Saskatchewan was extended to June the 25th, 1908. Another extension of time and another revival of the land grant. Now, an order in council was also passed on the 29th December, 1904, under which the survey fee was reduced from 10 cents an acre to 5 cents an acre. Up to this time they had been paying ten cents an acre for the survey, but the government made a concession to them reducing it one-half. There was also some land that they had to surrender for Doukhobor reserve, the Riding Mountain forest reserve in which they had selected west of the Duck mountains, and a certain amount along the Prince Albert branch. The lands necessary to complete their selection were to be selected from 55 townships west of the area set apart for the Qu'Appelle, Long

Lake and Saskatchewan. Not only were they allowed to go into the Manitoba and Northern reserve, not only were they allowed to go into the reserve set apart for the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan, but they were allowed to go into the 55 townships west of the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan reserve and where are situated some of the very best lands they have in the province of Saskatchewan. From these 55 townships, which have an area, by the way, of 580,000 acres, they had to select in round numbers some 250,000 acres. By an order in council passed on the 25th of June, 1906, the Canadian Northern Railway selected 557,000 acres within the reserve of the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan. I may say just here that the latter company protested very strenuously to the government for allowing this company to go in and select from their lands prior to the time they themselves had made their selection, because the order in council passed allowing the Canadian Northern Railway to have the privilege of selecting from the area set apart for the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan contained a provision stating that they were only to select the surplus lands. That is to say, after the grant of Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan had been satisfied. After that was done the Canadian Northern had the privilege of coming in as they had in the Manitoba and Northwestern area and making their selection, but they went in and made their selection of some 250,000 acres prior to the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan having completed selection and quite naturally the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan protested to the government. The matter was reported to the Minister of Justice by the Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Justice reported that what the Minister of the Interior did was illegal ; that he had done an illegal act by allowing the Canadian Northern to go into this area and make their selection prior to the time when the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan land grant had been satisfied. But notwithstanding that and in the face of the opinion of the Minister of Justice, the Minister of the Interior allowed the Canadian Northern Railway to make their selection. An order in council was passed on the 23rd of July, 1906, which allows them to select their lands which they had surrendered for the Duck mountain forest reserve, 213,640 acres, and for the Lake Manitoba forest reserve 70,000 acres, and they accepted in lieu thereof 33,367 acres of the surplus lands of the Manitoba and Northwestern and 250,000 acres in the 55 townships west of the area of the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan. Again an order in Council was passed on May 8, 1907, granting a further extension of time—and this is the last order in council I have any note of—to July 20, 1910, and this is an extension both of the land grant and of the charter. In face of that some hon. gentleman on the other side of the House claim that this government has not alienated an acre of land for the construction of any railway. I have cited no less than five extensions since they have been in power with reference to the construction of this road. I am citing this to disabuse the minds of the people of the idea that the Liberals were really in earnest ; or at least if they were in earnest they are certainly making, through inadvertence or ignorance, a statement which cannot be substantiated. I am not quoting this with any idea of stating that we on this side of the House object to granting assistance to any of these railway enterprises. In fact the Conservative party showed their faith in the country and showed their faith in the enterprise by placing the land grant originally upon the statute-books. Now, it is not necessary for me to occupy the attention of the House further ; I merely desire to add my voice to that of my colleagues in favour of this enterprise. This railway is a work that we need very greatly. By the time it is constructed there will be plenty of products to supply all of our transportation companies. The productiveness of that country is so enormous and the immigration going in, now that the tide has set in that direction, is so great that I am confident that there will soon be sufficient traffic for the Hudson Bay Railway route in addition to those we have at present. The people of eastern Canada are especialy interested in the supplies that the people of the west will require. Anything that assists us in the west will assist the people in the east. This enterprise is one that we should look upon as a national enterprise in which as Canadians we should all join. I hope that before this discussion ends, the Prime Minister will announce a policy on the subject on behalf of the government, and I trust that whatever pledge he may make will be implemented by legislation in a practical manner, and that the enterprise which hon. gentlemen say is today only in the talkative stage, may soon be an accomplished fact.

Mr. T. A. BURROWS (Dauphin). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the various speeches which have been delivered this afternoon and this evening on this very important question. Some of the gentlemen on both sides of the House who have spoken, have given the history of the different steps that have been taken from time to time by the western people to secure an outlet by way of Hudson bay. The subject has been pretty well covered by previous speakers, and were it not that I represent a constituency which is the farthest north in Manitoba and therefore the nearest Hudson to bay, and in which the first 200 miles of the Hudson Bay Railway have been built and operated, and feel a special interest in seeing a road to

the bay completed, I do not think I would have risen to address the House. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. W. J. Roche) seems to have risen more for the purpose of making a complaint against this government for the action they have taken in assisting in railway construction than with the object of advocating the construction of a railway to Hudsons bay. He objected to the extensions granted to the Canadian Northern Railway from time to time since 1896 by the Liberal government, but he forgot altogether——

Mr. SPROULE. He did not object at all.

Mr. BURROWS. Well, he criticised the government very severely; but he forgot that the original charter authorizing the construction of this railway was granted in the year 1880, and that from that time until 1896, when the government he supported so strenuously went out of power, there was not a single mile of that railway built, although the charter and the land grant were extended from time to time. What took place after this government came into power? In 1896, their first year, the first 100 miles of the Canadian Northern Railway were built. That was the portion from Gladstone to Sifton Junction, which was built under the charter of the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company. In the following year they built the extension to Winnipegosis, which was the total mileage they had power to build under that charter. The hon. gentleman knows that by virtue of that charter they earned a land grant of 6,400 acres per mile from Gladstone to Winnipegosis. The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) made a great complaint of the fact that there was a land grant for that portion of the road from Sifton Junction to Winnipegosis.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I did not make any great complaint of the land grant given for the line from Sifton Junction to Winnipegosis. I asked what was the necessity of giving that, and also giving a land grant for a line running in a northeasterly direction. Both could not be going to Hudson bay.

Mr. BURROWS. The necessity for giving the land grant for the portion from Sifton to Winnipegosis was that it was authorized by an Act passed by the Conservative government before the Liberals came into power. Before leaving that part of the subject, I might refer to the extensions granted from time to time. There have been various extensions granted by the present government to the Canadian Northern; but it must be borne in mind that the Canadian Northern built 100 miles of railway in 1896 and another 100 miles in 1897, and have continued to add to their mileage year by year; so that there was some reason for their asking for extensions of time when they showed their bona fides by going on and constructing the road. That was an altogether different state of things from what existed from 1880 to 1896, when not a single mile was built. With regard to a railway to Hudson bay, I may repeat what has been said by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that ever since Manitoba entered the confederation, indeed, ever since there was a settlement in any portion of that western country, there has been an agitation for the construction of a railway to Hudson bay. Probably this originated from the fact that the first settlers in the Red River settlement went into that country via Hudson bay, and therefore looked on the Hudson bay route as the natural trade route of the country, and looked forward to the time when they would not have to spend a month or six weeks on the journey to Fort Churchill, portaging around rapids, but would have railway connection with that seaport. Any person who looks at the map and observes the position of Hudson bay will easily recognize what an important factor it may yet become in the trade of the western country. It is an inland sea 1,000 miles long and 600 miles wide, and its principal port, Fort Churchill, is so situated that it is farther from the Atlantic coast than it is from the Pacific ocean. So that if you can once establish proper navigation to Fort Churchill, you will have an ocean port in the centre of the country 600 miles from the prairie, and bringing the prairie country closer to the sea-board than some parts of the province of Ontario. If you draw a line due north from St. Paul or St. Louis, it will pass 250 miles east of Fort Churchill. What the White Sea is to Russia, what the Baltic is to Germany and Sweden, what the Gulf of St. Lawrence is to eastern Canada, the Hudson bay is bound to become to Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. In 1880 the first charters were granted to two companies giving them power to build railways to Hudson bay. They vied with each other to get the land grant. Three years afterwards an Act of parliament was passed amalgamating the two companies, and from that time on the promoters of the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company endeavoured to raise money by various means.

They went to the local government and got assistance from time to time. They tried first to float their bonds in the markets of the world, but in those days it was impossible to raise money to build a railway to the bay. By and by, in addition to the land grant the Dominion government gave them a further subvention of $80,000 a year for twenty years, but even then they were not able to raise sufficient money to build the road. It was not until after 1896, when Mackenzie & Mann & Company, obtained the charter, that any work was done in the construction of this railway. It will be seen

that the parliament of Canada from 1880 on, under the direction of both governments, has from time to time recognized the importance of a railway to Hudson bay. It has done this by various enactments, by giving them a charter to build and a land grant. In 1884 an Act was passed authorizing the granting a land subsidy of 6,400 acres per mile for the mileage inside the province and 12,800 acres per mile for the mileage outside the province. In 1996 construction began and a year and a half ago the last 90 miles were built to the Pass. A year ago the company finished the last link connecting the southern prairie country with the Saskatchewan river, so that to-day we have a railway built as far as the Saskatchewan and the proposition now is to build a link which will connect the Pass with Hudson bay.

When the charter was first granted giving power to build this railway, we did not know much of that northern country, but during the last twenty-five years a great many surveying parties were sent out. The government sent out members of the geological survey and others and we have learned from them a great deal of information. We have found that instead of that country being full of rocks and swamps and not fit for settlement there is along the projected line of this road a great deal of territory valuable for agriculture. Commencing at the Pass there is for 150 miles a country containing a very large amount of pulp wood. Mr. Thibeaudeau, who made a survey for the government last year, reports that pulp wood can be obtained along that route for the first distance of 150 miles. After that the reports from many men who have explored that territory, indicate that there is in it a large area of agricultural land, and the lakes and rivers are teeming with valuable food fish. Mr. Tyrrell reports an area of country there of 10,000 square miles as good as the ordinary land in Manitoba. North of that the country is sot so good. Within 100 miles of the bay the reports indicate that the land is not very fit for settlement, but it seems to me that a country having 10,000 square miles of good land is a country through which we ought to have a railway. When you consider that in Manitoba, where we have a very large wheat yield, there were not more than 5,000,000 acres under crop last year, you can see what possibilities there are along this line of railroad, which will surely open up 6,000,000 acres to agriculture. There are besides natural resources such as mineral wealth which are very promising. Mr. Tyrrell and other geologists say that the formation is very similar to that of the western part of Ontario where we have discovered much valuable mineral. The railway will run along the Nelson river a distance of 50 to 75 miles, and the Nelson is one of the greatest rivers in point of volume of water, we have in the whole continent. It is 400 miles long and drains a very large area. In these 400 miles there are 300 miles from the upper to the lower rapids, and between those there is a fall of 850 feet, so that the water power which may be generated is tremendous, and if it should become expedient to run the road by electricity, the water power is there at hand. Churchill harbour is reported to be one of the best in America. There are therefore several grounds on which the construction of this road can be justified. In the first place it will be a colonization road. In the second place, it will be the final link connecting the prairies with Hudson bay ; and in the third place, it will open up a route to connect the western prairies with the markets of Europe. Some objection has been taken to the grants for building the portions of the line already completed. No doubt the grants seems to be large. In addition to the land grant, this railway draws a subsidy of $80,000 a year for twenty years. But when we look at what has been accomplished by its construction, we will see that the expenditure has been well repaid. The whole country through which this railway runs was not settled and would never have become settled had it not been for that line. That line has opened up an important fishing industry at lake Winnipegosis and very large lumber industries in the northern part of the province, so that although it has cost a great deal in money and land, it has developed that northern country in a marvelous manner.

There is a very large area around Hudson bay which we know contains natural resources, which it would be very important to develop, and the development of which can only be accomplished by means of a railway to that bay. Then at present the Canadian government is undertaking to administer that country. It has established mounted police stations around the bay. But if this government wants to communicate with these police stations, that will take a long time at present. The building of a railway, however, would facilitate the administration of that whole locality by the government. Then when the railway is built to the bay, stores will be established at various points from where prospectors can get their supplies. It will be easy for prospectors to get to the bay, and they will then use Fort Churchill as the point from which to start their exploring work. In two or three years after that railway is built to Hudson bay, you will see great development in the line of minerals, for we have as good reason to anticipate great mineral development in that country as we had to expect mineral development at Cobalt six years ago or in the Yukon fifteen years ago. The reports of Dr. Bell, Professor Tyrrell and other geologists indicate that there is gold, silver, lead, iron, copper——

Mr. LALOR. Any timber ?

Mr. BURROWS. Lots of timber can be found around the shores of the bay. With regard to the land through which this road would pass, I would like to read an extract from the report of the men who explored that country. Mr. McInnes, a member of the Geological Survey, was sent out to make an exploratory trip from the Pas to Hudson bay and he gives this as his opinion regarding the country in his evidence before the committee of the Senate a year ago :

The witness passed through this country, went by the Burntwood river and came back by part of the Grassy river, and made a number of excursions inland between these two rivers. After leaving Split lake, ascending the river, this clay-covered country shows absolutely no boulders and no gravel. Even the shores of the lakes, until you reach a height of about 800 feet, show no gravel bars at all.

There is absolutely nothing to interfere with the cultivation of the soil there. It is a country that has been burnt over. Witness assumed that the Burntwood river got its name that way. It has been subject to repeated burns. At the present time it is covered by a very open forest. Grasses grow fairly luxuriantly. There are two species of this, blue joint grass and a wild rye, that are the prevailing grasses. He understood, though he is not very familiar with those grasses himself, from Professor Macoun, that these are very excellent meadow grasses and make excellent fodder.

Mr. McInnes left Norway House in the second week of June and made the circuit and came out at the Pas on September 6, so it was June, July and August he was there. He saw grass growing from eighteen inches to two feet high.

The witness computed the area of this country at about 10,000 square miles. He does not mean to say that all of that ten thousand square miles is good land, but the basin characterized by this deposit of clay has an area of about ten thousand square miles.

Referring to what is grown in the country, he says :

Upon the Nelson river wheat has been grown successfully at Norway House, and also at Cross lake. Of course, he could see that they grow no grain at any of their posts nowadays. In the old days they grew it and ground it in hand mills. Witness saw potatoes that were grown about 50 miles north of the Pas. There were quite showy potatoes, great large fellows like those you see exhibited in fairs.

There are no settlers in the Nelson district. The Indians, however, grow potatoes at several points, even in the northern part of it, as far north as Nelson House, about latitude 55. On July 11, when the witness arrived at Nelson House, the Indian potatoes had vines about eleven inches high, and were almost ready to flower. When he got out on September 6 to the Saskatchewan, at the Hudson bay post there, at the Pas, Indian corn was very well headed out, with very large fine ears quite ready for table use, and there was no frost until September 29. He knew that because he stayed there until then.

With eighteen hours of the daylight, and no frost in the summer, vegetation is rapid. In a country where you can ripen Indian corn you can grow practically anything.

Mr. Tyrrell passed through that country some years ago, and this is the evidence he gave to the Senate Committee:

North of Lake Winnipeg there is another magnificent area of from five to ten thousand square miles of as fine country as there is in Manitoba or anywhere else.

That is on the proposed line of the Hudson bay railway. When the witness came out of there a number of years ago, after spending a summer there, and said there was a rich agricultural country north of Lake Winnipeg, the Hudson bay men and the people in the southern country pooh-poohed the idea. They said they had been up at the head of the lake and knew there was not a foot of good land there. But there is a magnificent stretch of country there, and it extends westward along the Churchill. These lands north of Lake Winnipeg are clay lands, an extension of the same basin as the Manitoba clays.

The hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) this afternoon, spent a good deal of time in setting forth the fact concerning the navigability of Hudson straits. I think the hon. member is to be commended for the diligence he has shown in hunting up the history of this northern country and the waters thereof. I do not see how anybody can assume that Hudson bay is not navigable, when you take into consideration the fact that it has been navigated since 1610. Since 1660, vessels have gone in and out of the bay once every year except two years. The Hudson Bay Company keep regular vessels on the route. For the last sixty or seventy years whalers from the Atlantic coast have been making periodical trips in pursuit of their calling. We have the record of trips made into the bay by all kinds of vessels. In the service of the Hudson Bay Company 750 vessels, ranging from seventy gun ships to ten ton pinnaces, have crossed the ocean and passed through the straits and sailed into Hudson bay and only two of them were lost. We have the record of men-of-war going into Hudson bay in 1782. La Perouse, with three French war vessels sailed into Hudson bay, took Fort Churchill, dismantled it, took Fort Nelson, looted the supplies and sailed out successfully in 1697. Commandant d'Iberville sailed into Hudson bay, fought an engagement with English battleships and got out quite safe again. From time to time during the wars between France and England, it was necessary for the Hudson Bay Company when their ships sailed into Hudson bay to have a convoy, and it was quite a common thing for a British warship to go with a trading vessel into and out of Hudson bay. If it was possible to carry on this navigation with the vessels of a couple of hundred years ago, when they did not have the advantages of navigation of to-day, when they had no steam vessels and none

of the aids to navigation such as lighthouses the route must have been a pretty easy one to navigate or we should have heard of more disasters. Our own government has sent in several parties to make investigations. Dr. Robert Bell travelled in and out from 1880 to 1897, making nine complete trips. He gives this as his experience :

The bay is open all the year round and there does not seem to be much evidence that the strait is closed at any season. The great width and depth of the straits with the tides, probably keep it open. He thought it navigable for four months each year, or from the middle of June to the end of October.

And Commander Low says:

Really prepared steamers could navigate Hudson bay and Hudson strait longer than the period he had mentioned; you could navigate the straits all winter if you had a specially prepared vessel, but it would be a long voyage. . . . Altogether, the witness considered the Hudson bay route, when it was clear, as even a clearer one than via the St. Lawrence. There is at least two months when there is no trouble from the ice at all, and when you do meet loose ice in the summer time there would be no trouble. There would have to be several lights established. There would have to be lights at Nottingham island and probably at Cape Diggs. Charlatan island would probably have to be lit at both ends, because it is practically in the middle of the channel and then there would have to be lights at Cape Chigney and on Resolution island. Lights would also have to be placed at the mouth of Churchill harbour.

I think we have ample evidence to show that the navigability of this strait is sufficient to warrant the government coming to the conclusion that, for a certain period of the year, this route will afford a means of transportation of the greatest benefit to the western country. In addition to the benefit to be derived from the improved transportation facilities afforded by the construction of this road, it will mean the development of a portion of our northern country which we never could have developed without a railway. Immigration to the west during the last 11 years has given us our prosperity in that country. According to the returns, nearly 1,200,000 people have been brought in by the Immigration Department during that period. The impetus to trade given by the influx of that number of people and the amount of money spent in railway construction has produced our good times in the west. To stop immigration would be to decrease the volume of our business, and the only way to keep up the stream of immigration is to develop the northern country where we have land on which to put our settlers. Until the present government undertook to build the Grand Trunk Pacific, no determined effort had been made to develop our hinterlands. At the time they launched their scheme many people objected on the ground that the country through which the road was to be built was not fit for settlement. Even to-day, in talking to a a Conservative member of this House, he expressed the opinion that it was a great mistake to build north of the height of land in Ontario and Quebec, because the country was not fit for settlement, and it was said that the Grand Trunk Pacific would be a great mistake. I think the majority of the people of Canada have only one opinion on that subject: that is that we have a great big country to develop and we never can develop it unless we get railway construction to the most remote parts.

With regard to the method of construction, I believe the road should be built and owned by the government, and inasmuch as there is in eastern Canada considerable objection to voting sufficient money to build a road of that kind at the present time, I believe that it will have to be constructed by obtaining money from the sale of lands in the west. The people of the west are a unit in regard to the construction of this road, and I do not think any objection will be raised to the government of Canada using the proceeds of the sale of land to create a fund for the building of this railway. The expenditure on the road itself will not be very large, but the incidental expenditures for the building of docks at Fort Churchill, for terminals, for lighting the straits and probably giving a subsidy to a steamship line, will be considerable in addition to the actual cost of construction of the railway. The road will be an easy one to build and when built to operate. There is a gentle downgrade from the Pas to Hudson bay and a fall in 450 miles of about 1,000 feet. It will be down grade in the way the traffic will go so that trains loaded with grain will be going down-hill on their way to the harbour. I think it is very important that this road should be built at once. Any one familiar with the western country knows that two years ago we had a very large crop of wheat, about 200,000,000 bushels of grain ; and before the commencement of the snow blockade to which the railways attributed all their difficulties, there was a complete tie-up of the railway systems, a complete grain blockade. At that time we had in that country some 800,000 people. If 800,000 people can grow enough grain to blockade two complete railway systems, what will occur when the population increases in that country as it is bound to increase ? To-day in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, we have about 1,000,000 people and I do not think I am over-sanguine when I express the belief that within the next four years that population will be doubled. In 1901 the population was a little over 400,000. In 1906 it was over 800,000, and, judging from the way immigration is going in there, it is safe to say that in four years we will have 2,000,000

people west of the Great Lakes. When that time comes, probably we will have another railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific; but by the time the Grand Trunk Pacific is built we will find that the trade has so increased that it will tax the powers of the three great railway systems to haul out the grain. The road should undoubtedly be built at once. If the government were to undertake the construction of this road at once, it would be four years before they could expect to have it built to the bay and it will be urgently needed before that time. If the government were to build the road they could easily entrust its construction to the present Transcontinental Railway Commission; they have the machinery at hand for looking after work of that kind and could superintend the building of the Hudson bay railway without very much extra general expense. If this road is built it will facilitate the opening of the country; that country has to be surveyed and this will require some time, and the building of the road will facilitate the surveying, exploration and development of the country. I do not think the government could get any railway company to undertake the construction of that road unless they gave a bonus equal to the cost of building it. I do not think the people of Canada would favour giving any bonus of that kind. The day of large bonuses or land grants is past, and it is the fixed policy of this government not to give a land grant to any railway. I am therefore strongly of opinion that the government should at once address itself to the question of finding some means by which this railway could be built, and I am in favour of the policy which was enunciated by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), that is to set apart certain lands in the Northwest, two sections or so in each township, preserve them until they become of sufficient value, and then sell them just as the school lands are sold at the present time to create a fund to pay the cost of construction of this road. The government could borrow money by the issue of bonds and by the time the bonds fall due the proceeds of the sales of these lands could be applied to paying them off. If you sold the lands to-day you would not get nearly what they will be worth in a few years. Objection has been raised to that scheme on the ground that reserving land is a detriment to settlement. However the amount reserved, two sections in each township, would not be sufficient to affect the people in the district. You do not find that the present school reserves affect the people. However, whatever scheme is devised, whether the road is financed by means of a land grant reserve or by charging a fee of $3 for preemption, it is a question of policy which the government has to decide upon and so far as I am concerned the building of the road is so urgent that I feel it should be constructed and constructed at once.

The public feeling in regard to the constuction of this railway has been so strong in the west that if the provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan had owned land of their own they would not have hesitated to have given it towards the construction of this railway. I have no hesitation in saying that if Manitoba had owned land for the last twenty years the same as Ontario and Quebec do this road would have been built long ago. The little province of Manitoba did not have the resources to devote to a project of this kind. We have been coming year after year to Ottawa asking the Dominion government to undertake its construction. As soon as this road is built I expect there will be considerable development in the way of manufacturing along the Hudson bay route. The water-powers along the Nelson and Churchill rivers will become developed. There is a possibility of a great pulp industry being established along the Nelson and Churchill rivers. Pulp wood and water-powers are available and as soon as this road is built industries of that kind will crop up that are not thought of at the prestent time.

I do not know that I have anything further to say on this subject except that I think that the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway is one of the most important projects which the government have before them at the present time. By the construction of this road they will not only give us a new outlet for the products of the western country but they will be establishing another port which will in time become one of the chief ports of the Dominion of Canada, and they will be turning the trade to our own ports instead of allowing it to go, as a great deal of it goes now, through American ports. I trust therefore that the government will see their way clear to adopting some policy this session which will result in the construction of this road and that they will go on and build the railway to Hudson bay as quickly as possible.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of detaining the House at any great length at this somewhat late hour of the evening, but I desire to make a few remarks on this most important question. First of all I would like to offer a word or two in regard to the remarks which were made by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles) to the effect that the present government has never given away an acre of land to a railway company. I consider that a somewhat unnecessary remark in view of the fact that the hon. gentleman had stated that he intended to make a speech of a non-partisan character. But, as he has raised the question, I think I may say a word or two in regard to the matter. My hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) has pointed out to

the House, and his contention has not been refuted, that great land grants have been given by the present government and given unnecessarily. He has pointed out that out of the land grant on account of the construction of 320 miles which has been given to the Canadian Northern Railway only 150 miles of that was justified, and that a land grant has been given to that company with respect to 170 miles of railway under the pretext that they were building a railway to Hudson bay, when, as a matter of fact, that railway did not bring them a mile nearer to Hudson bay. Taking the figures which were given by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) as to the value at which he would hold the land which he suggested should be reserved for the building of this railway, namely, $10 or $12 per acre, you will readily see that the million and a quarter acres of land which have been given away unnecessarily would represent a value of between $12,000,000 and $15,000,000 which would go a long way towards the building of this road. The equivalent of this sum of money has been squandered by the present administration and not one mile have we got nearer to Hudson bay. The hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows), when he rose to speak, undertook to explain how it was that the land grant was given for twenty-one miles of railway from Sifton Junction to Winnipegosis. My hon. friend stated that it was in accordance with the grant which has been promised by the Conservative government of which rumour says he was a supporter at the time. But he did not go on to explain what must have been in the mind of everybody present, how it was that when that railway commenced to build again from Sifton Junction they received an additional land grant for the additional and unnecessary twenty-one miles which were being built on the way to the bay. Of late years we have come to understand the true value of the land in the Northwest, and I suppose that at the present time there is no one who would dream of giving the land grants to railway companies which were given in the days gone by. Therefore, Sir, I consider that during recent years there has not been one shadow of excuse for giving these land grants which have been given to the Canadian Northern Railway outside of the road to Hudson bay of something like one and a quarter million acres of land—land to be chosen, not contiguous to the railway which they were building, but to be chosen from the very best parts of the province of Sackatchewan. It was a different matter in the early days. The people did not appreciate the value of the land in that western country, and in the granting of land to the railways which were being constructed at that time the Liberals were just as much to blame, if blame was to be attached, as the Conservatives were. It has been pointed out already this evening that the Liberals were prepared to give away more than twice the land grant for the building of a railway across the continent that the Conservatives gave away when they had a line constructed. I am going to call the attention of the House to the fact that two hon. gentlemen who are now sitting on the other side of the House, when they were members of the legislative council of the Northwest Territories, were themselves in favour of giving land grants for the construction of branch railways. I refer to the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) and to the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). The following resolution was moved in the Northwest legislative council by the hon. member for East Assiniboia on the 24th July, 1884:

Moved by Mr. Turriff, and seconded by Mr. McDowell, that a liberal policy on the part of the government towards railways in the way of making grants of land would most conduce to the opening up and development of the country, and would therefore recommend that the grants of land already made, or which may be made in the future for railway purposes in the Northwest Territories, at one dollar per acre, be made free grants.

They did not want the government even to take that one dollar per acre but they desired that the land grants should be made free. The hon. Minister of the Interior was in the council at that time and according to the minutes it is recorded that the resolution passed unanimously. So, I think it is time to drop all this talk about the iniquities of previous governments in giving away great grants of land and to admit frankly and truly as every one must admit that in the light of those days it was necessary to give those land grants in order to have railways constructed.

Now, let us pass from that to the business which we have in hand. After the very able presentation of the case which has been made before us this evening for the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway, showing the necessity for and feasibility of this route, I think it is unnecessary for me to use any further arguments along that line. I consider, Sir, that both in the Senate and in this House the case has been proved for the construction of this railway. Indeed, Sir, that necessity was admitted by the Prime Minister himself last year when, on the 27th of February, 1907, he stated in this House that the time had come for the construction of this railway, and went on to say that he expected the government would be in a position to make a statement in connection with the matter in a very short time. We have waited long for that statement, and it has not come yet, but we trust we shall have something definite about it in the near future. I am very glad the Prime Minister has been converted to seeing the necessity for building this railway. If he will remember, about 12 years ago, just before the election which returned him to power, the policy of the leaders of the Conservative party of that day was in

favour of the building of a railway to Hudson bay and definite pledges were given by them to the people of this country that this railway should be constructed. Sir Charles Tupper, then Prime Minister of Canada, speaking at Winnipeg on the 8th of May, as reported in the Manitoba 'Free Press,' said:

One of the great factors in the future development of Western Canada would be an outlet to Hudson bay, the natural pathway from the prairies of the great west to Great Britain, and it was his firm conviction that the prosperity of the west and of the whole Dominion called for the speedy construction of a road to the bay. The Liberal party had persistently though most inconsistently opposed this great national undertaking at every stage since the question of its construction was first mooted. The Conservative party had given to Canada the Intercolonial railway and the Canadian Pacific railway and he could now assure the people of Manitoba and the Northwest that that same party would give them the Hudson bay railway. The government was a unit on the policy of a road to the bay. They are publicly committed to that policy and he could assure them arrangements had been made which enabled him to state that the first link of that railway from Saskatchewan river would be built before the close of 1898.

Further on the Manitoba 'Free Press' in an article states:

Speaking in the evening at an immense mass meeting in the Brydon rink the Premier returned to the subject and after challenging any man living to bring him face to face with a pledge he had ever broken he again declared in unequivocal terms that it would be the policy of his government to give the Northwest an outlet to Europe via the Hudson bay.

They go on to state:

Of the friendly intentions of Sir Charles and his colleagues there can be no doubt and after these explicit declarations the people of the country may reasonably expect to get the Hudson bay railway within the next three or four years.

Now, Sir, the statement made by Sir Charles Tupper and his bona fides were called in question by the Liberal candidates in the campaign, and in order to give an assurance of the bona fides of the statement, the Hon. Hugh John Macdonald, then Minister of the Interior, put himself on record before the people of Manitoba and in a speech delivered on the 18th of June, 1896, as reported in the Manitoba 'Free Press,' said:

His breath was almost taken away at the first joint meeting when Mr. Martin said this promise of Sir Charles Tupper's was merely an election dodge. He could not understand how a man like Mr. Martin, who was once a member of the provincial government, could think that his leader would deliberately deceive his followers. However he remembered a trial here in Winnipeg when it came out that Mr. Martin had called Mr. Greenway a colossal liar. He might tell them that if these promises were not carried out he would resign at once from the cabinet. Some think that he should not resign from the cabinet, but rather stay there and fight it out. This could not be done under our system of government, if, as a member of the cabinet, he could not introduce a measure of this kind without the consent of his leader. If he should decide to introduce it, he would have to leave the cabinet and step down to the floor of the House, and this is the course he would follow in the event of Sir Charles breaking his promise. If he were forced to do this, do you think that there would be found a single man from the Northwest mean enough to accept his vacated seat in the cabinet, and even if one were found to do this, did they think any constituency in the west would return such a man?

Now, Sir, it will be seen that this is an old policy. It is a policy which was formally and definitely announced by the Conservative government in the year 1896 and which no doubt would have been carried into effect long before this had they been returned to power at that election. I am glad that after 11 years of power the Prime Minister of Canada has finally come to the conclusion that the Hudson Bay Railway ought to be built, although he has not given us a statement as to when and how he intends to build it. I have no hesitation in saying, and it has been already said this evening, that in the near future the products of the Northwest will be such that all the existing lines of railway will not be able to handle the business. As a matter of fact the railways cannot cope with the situation now and so a new outlet must be found. As has been pointed out this route will result in enormous economy in transportation and consequently enhanced value to the producers of cattle, grain, and other commodities in the Northwest. As has also been pointed out it will save a double transhipment, and a thousand miles of lake and rail transport from the principal grain centres to the markets of the world. Further than that it has been shown that the Hudson Bay Railway will in itself prove a very profitable trade route, convenient as it will be not only to our own Northwest but to a large portion of the northwestern states of the union. Keeping along the northern lines of latitude, it will be an extremely short route across the continent, and it will be the most economic route that can be found between the western countries of Europe and the far eastern countries which are now coming into prominence. Let me also say that which I think has not been called attention to this evening, viz., this route will be most useful from a military standpoint. Should unhappily we ever be in a state of war in Canada such a line of railway would be most invaluable to Canada and to the empire, and it would also be invaluable as affording a safer trade route than any now existing for the food supplies of the mother country. Even if we look at it from a selfish point of view it would give us an

immense advantage over any rivals we may have in the furnishing of that food supply because there can be no doubt that the northerly route would be the safest for the transport of food products to the United Kingdom. It would afford a short route also, the shortest of all routes by which imperial troops could be quickly and expeditiously and safely conveyed to the far east. This has all been gone over time and again and I do not think I need dwell further on it to-night. I believe, however, that it is time that we should stop playing with this question and if we are agreed as we all seem to be agreed that the route is necessary we should undertake its construction promptly. It is no use to go skating around it and saying for instance we will create a fund by the sale of pre-emptions or by reserving lands in the Northwest for the purpose. This is only postponing the fulfilment. Even if we start now, the need will be urgent before the railway is completed. The Finance Minister told us in his budget speech that this is a time for caution, and that large new enterprises may be laid aside for a while. I do not think, Sir, that caution ought to apply to the building of the Hudson Bay Railway. We do not look upon that as an enterprise in the ordinary acceptation of the term; we look upon it as an absolute necessity to the continued development of our great provinces in the Northwest. I am firmly convinced that unless it is provided that development will be checked in the near future.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I think this road of all others should be owned by the government. The hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) has taken the same position; but he has not gone so far as I go. I say that it should be not only owned but operated by the government. This Hudson Bay Railway will offer a route to the bay to three great competing lines of railway—the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian Northern Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific, and I do not see how it will be possible to have that road operated by a private company in a way that will be fair to all these great roads. Therefore I think that this of all others should be operated by the government. It will also be absolutely necessary for the Dominion government to provide the great terminal elevators which will be required for the storage of the grain of the Northwest for considerable periods when navigation is not freely open. I hope and trust that the government, even at this late moment, will come down with a definite policy during the present session and provide money for the commencement of this great undertaking.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (East Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, at this late hour of the evening, after this question has been so ably discussed by members on both sides of the House, I do not intend to take up more than a very few minutes. My principal object in saying anything at all on this subject is to state most emphatically as a representative of a western constituency that I believe that the Hudson Bay route in not only feasible, but is to-day a prime necessity of the west. I have heard it stated here during the present discussion that there had been a certain amount of opposition to that road from the east. I think that was the case some years ago, but at present we do not hear of any opposition whatever from the east to anything that will promote the development of the western country. All the people of Canada now realize that the success of Canada is as much dependent on the west as on the east, and that anything that promotes the development of the western country must of necessity tend to the prosperity of the eastern part of Canada as well. Therefore I do not look for any opposition whatever at the present time from eastern Canada to the opening up of the Hudson Bay route. If that is not opened up, I think there is no doubt that the first year in which we shall have a large crop, there will be the biggest blockade that has ever taken place in the western country. We have heard it stated that the cause of the blockade two years ago was the heavy winter—the cold weather and the deep snow. That may have had something to do with the difficulties of the railroads in handling the traffic; but the blockade of wheat was not caused by the storms. It took place long before we had snow storms, at least a month before the severe winter set in. On some of the roads there was no blockade at all. The line from Portal to Moosejaw was not blockaded during the whole winter. Wherever the railway authorities were in a position to look after their roads and take precautions to have them in order they were not blockaded. What would be the result of a blockade such as we had two years ago, with almost double the acreage, and this increasing rapidly? During the past year some 270,000 immigrants have been brought into the country, and the statement has been made by one of the speakers to-day that during the first two months of this year the immigration has been 60 per cent greater than that of the first two months of last year. I am satisfied that the immigration is going not only to keep up, but to go on increasing, and that in all probability for the next five or ten years from 300,000 to 500,000 people a year will be going into that country. Where can we put all these people? We cannot for many more years put them in those parts of the country which are now opened up by railroads. They will have to be put in the northern part of the country, and a great many can be settled on the lands that will be opened up by the Hudson Bay Railway. It has been pointed out that the surveyors who went over that country last year, reported that in the Burnt River district there is an area of 10,000

square miles which is suitable for agriculture. That is about 6,000,000 acres, which is almost as much as we have under cultivation to-day in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta producing something like 200,000,000 bushels of grain. If that large area can be opened up for settlement and be made tributary to the railway to Hudson bay for a distance of 475 miles, is there not sufficient justification in the government coming to the point at once and taking hold of this work as a government undertaking and carrying it to a successful issue in the shortest possible time? The development taking place in that western country is greater than the three existing roads can handle, and therefore, another outlet is necessary. I was rather amused to hear my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) make the statement that if the late government had remained in power, the Hudson Bay Railway would have been an accomplished fact long before this. Well, I went to that country a good many years before the hon. gentleman. I went in 1878, and from 1878 to 1896, at every general election, the building of the Hudson Bay Railway was promised by the late government just as emphatically as it was promised by Sir Charles Tupper in 1896. In no case did any results follow. It was simply an election dodge all through, and had the late government been returned to power again in 1896, we would not be any further ahead to-day than we were eighteen years before that. I quite agree, however, that there is no use harking back to these old matters. Conditions have changed very much. The railroad is needed, and it is now up to the present government to take hold of its construction and build it at the earliest possible moment.

Some reference was made by my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) to the land grant. He said that we on this side could no longer make the statement that the present government have not given any land for railway construction. My hon. friend is altogether wrong. I make the statement, without fear of successful contradiction, that this government has not given one acre in the west for the construction of railways. It is quite true that they carried out the undertakings which were entered into by their predecessors. Does any one suggest that they should not? Does any one suggest that when the extending time for the construction of what is now called the Canadian Northern for two years, the Liberal government should have cancelled that order in council? You might as well say that they should have cancelled all the contract for the construction of canals in this part of the country. The Canadian Northern Railway Company in 1896, during the life of that order in council, built over 100 miles of railway, and then came at the end of the two years and asked for a further extension of time. That further extension was granted them simply because they were living up to their contract and carrying out the work they had undertaken. But from 1880, when the charter was granted, to 1896, when our friends opposite were in power, they granted a renewal every year or so although not a mile of the road was being built. When, however, this government took office, they undertook to see that the company went on to construct the line. So that we are perfectly right when we say that this government has not given one acre of land for the construction of railways in the west or any place else. And yet, during the eleven years they have been in office, there has been double the railway mileage constructed in the west that there was in the previous eighteen years, and save in the cases of roads to which land grants had been promised by the late government, these roads were constructed without land grants at all. In a good many cases they were built for a cash subsidy and in some cases without any subsidy at all.

The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) also said that this Hudson bay land grant had been diverted from its destination and used for the building of roads going away from Hudson bay. That is not a correct statement in any sense. The government, under the present Dominion Land Act, had the authority to give a grant of 6,400 acres per mile within Manitoba and 12,800 acres outside Manitoba to secure the construction of a railway to Hudson bay, and they passed an order in council setting apart a land grant for the construction of that railway, the charter for which had been acquired by the Canadian Northern. The land grant which was set apart for the construction of that portion of the road between the Pass on the Saskatchewan and Fort Churchill provided that all that land should be north of the Saskatchewan river, and not one acre has ever been given to any other railway company or to the Canadian Northern for the construction of any other road, so that the statement of the hon. gentleman is altogether misleading. I would point that the government has power, under a clause in the Lands Act, to set apart a land grant of 12,800 acres per mile for the construction of a road from the Pas to Fort Churchill. It is altogether a matter of policy whether they should do that or not. It might possibly be the best way to secure the construction of that road. I do not know that it would be, but it is open for the government to do that if they think it advisable. But nothing has been done in the past towards giving away the lands set apart at one time for the construction of that road to any other road or to the same company for building any other branch lines.

Mr. J. D. REID. Were there special lands set apart for this?

Mr. TURRIFF. There was a large block north of the Saskatchewan river set apart by order in council, within which this company, if they built the road, could select their land. But the company did not build the road and the land grant lapsed and the government did not renew it. Under the Dominion Lands Act, however, the government have the authority to set apart 12,800 acres per mile in any part of the territory for the construction of that road. The clause in the Dominion Lands Act does not define where the lands should be taken. The old order in council did define it but that went out of existence by the fluxion of time.

Mr. J. D. REID. The government can take any lands not disposed of.

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) spoke about the building and operating of the road as a government road because he did not think that the traffic of the three different roads in that part of the country could be accommodated over this line provided it was built by a company.

Mr. LAKE. I consider it would be very much better to have it operated by the government.

Mr. TURRIFF. I would like to point out that my hon. friend took a different view a few years ago when the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway proposition was before this House and when his leader proposed, as an alternative plan, a patch work railway, one part of his scheme being the leasing of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Fort William to Winnipeg and giving other companies running powers over it.

Mr. LAKE. The hon. gentleman is wrong. I advocated government operation at that time, and do still.

Mr. TURRIFF. In that case, I withdraw my statement. But the great majority of members on the other side of the House endorsed the plan of their leader, which was to lease the road from Fort William to Winnipeg to the Canadian Pacific Railway, assist in having it double tracked and allow all companies running powers over it. If that were feasible in that case, it would be as feasible to have traffic running arrangement over the road to Hudson bay though that road was owned by one company.

Mr. LAKE. May I ask a question? Would the hon. gentleman have the road to Hudson bay owned by a company or by the government?

Mr. TURRIFF. I think it most important that we should get the road. And I would be perfectly satisfied to have the government build and lease the road giving all other companies running powers over it, or make arrangements with one of the companies to build the road and make provision, by placing the road under the Railway Commission, that every company should have running powers. But I have not seen anything in Canada, so far, to make me very much disposed to continue in the future in the line of government built and government operated railways.

I think the road should be built as a main line, as another outlet and inlet for the trade of the country. I think one good result of its operation would be to bring us into closer communication with the mother country. I think it would do a good deal to increase and foster the business between Canada and Great Britain, for it would furnish a short and direct route the western terminus of which would be right in the heart of the great western country. I believe also that it will pay for itself as a colonization road. Let me just point out the change that has taken place in a few years. I can remember very well—and it is not so many years ago—when none of us thought that great country north of the Saskatchewan river right up to near Edmonton was of any value. But the more we explore that country and the more we learn concerning it, the more we come to the conclusion that in that country which at one time, was thought of little value, we have vast stretches of rich agricultural land. The construction of this Hudson bay road would not only develop 475 miles of a colonization road, but you must remember that the sea line on the west side of Hudson bay will be made tributary to the railway which would assist in the development of that whole country and assist very materially in having it thoroughly prospected. And I think there is no doubt that when it is prospected you will find it a country rich in minerals. I believe that until you go away beyond where it is possible to grow anything in the far northern country, there is no part of this Canada of ours where, if you build a road for 500 miles, it will not of itself produce traffic enough to make that road a paying business. In every other part of the country we find we have vast resources not only of agricultural lands but of timber and minerals. We have a very good example of that in New Ontario, a country which, at one time, people thought was too rough to be any good, but as soon as they built a railway into it they found it was all right, making the railway a paying concern from the start.

At this late hour, it is neither desirable nor necessary for me to speak longer. I trust the government will take this important matter of the Hudson Bay Railway at once and will give us some definite pronouncement on the subject. I do not very much care how the road is built. I do not care very much whether the land is

sold on pre-emption for $3 per acre or a certain quantity of land set apart to build the road. We are not concerned very much about the details; what we want is to have the road started. For it will take three or four years to build the railway, as we can work with advantage, probably, only from one end. The sooner it is begun the sooner it will be completed. I am satisfied that, before it is completed, every one of the roads now existing will be taxed to its uttermost. Though, by the Hudson Bay route, we may not be able to get out a great deal of wheat the same fall it is grown, we shall be able to get out many millions of bushels, and, for the rest, it is only a matter of storing it a month or so longer than it is stored at Fort William. And, as a route for cattle, there is no comparison between this and any other. It is so much cooler and the land haul is so much shorter that the cattle can be landed in better shape than if sent by the St. Lawrence, by New York or by any of the Atlantic ports. So, in conclusion, I trust that the government will give us some assurance at an early day that this matter will be taken hold of at once and carried to a successful completion in the course of the next few years.

Mr. W. D. STAPLES (Macdonald). I understand how unkind it would be on my part if I were to inflict a long speech on the House at this late hour. But I feel that I should not be doing my duty to the constituency I represent in this House, or to the province from which I come, if I did not at least say a word or two to show that I am most desirous that this road should be constructed at an early day. We have listened to many good speeches this afternoon. Some of the speakers have introduced some new thoughts; others have resurrected a great deal of old thought, but while it is old it is good, and upon a question of this kind we do not lose anything by refreshing our minds with what is already in 'Hansard.' The feasibility and the practicability of this road, as well as its great necessity, have been thoroughly established by what has been said to-day. Therefore, I shall not deal with that phase of the question. It has now come down to a matter of policy—it resolves itself into this: where are we going to get the money to construct this road? We heard the policy of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) when he made a speech in this House a few days ago. I listened to that speech, and I want to ask hon. members what is there in it after all? What was there in that speech more than has been presented to this House time and time again? That speech was published in the daily papers throughout Canada and in the United States and even abroad—for what purpose I am not at this moment going to say. I believe it was all prearranged. And as to what it cost to get this great publicity through the press of the world, I shall not say anything at this moment. But I will say that if one of the new members of the House, or one of the members who are not in the habit of speaking often had made the same speech that the hon. member for Brandon made, it would simply have been thrown in the waste basket.

As I listened to the policies enunciated by the hon. gentleman who preceded me this afternoon, I thought that, after all, there was another policy by which this government could very easily save the money necessary to build the Hudson Bay Railway. If they would only exercise a little more economy in the various departments, it would not be necessary for us to set aside any of our lands to provide for the construction of this road.

Take for example the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company deal. If the people of this country had received value for that land for which the recipients received $1,750,000 that would have gone a considerable distance in constructing the Hudson Bay Railway. If the government had pared down the unnecessary and gorgeous expenditure in equipping the 'Montcalm,' if those on that boat had drunk out of a ten cent cup instead of a $12 cup and that money had been used for the construction of this railway it would have built a few miles. It has been proved over and over again in this House and in the Public Accounts Committee that the government have been building wharfs throughout this country where there were no people, where there was no water and where there was no business. If they had used this money to construct the Hudson Bay Railroad they would have found lots of produce and many people there, and the money would not be lying idle as it is when used in the construction of such wharfs. If they had even used the $400,000 expended on the North Atlantic Trading Company for which the people received no value, it would have been some assistance. They might have used the money that has gone to the middleman in the Moncton land deal, or the large sums that have been made out of the Robbins Irrigation Company. Mr. Knowles stated this afternoon that the government had not sold any of the people's land for $1 an acre, but if he investigates he will find that 9,450 acres were sold for $1 an acre. 380,000 acres were sold on long credit to other irrigation companies, and in this case alone the middleman got $1,145,000. Why should that not be taken for the Hudson Bay Railway? We have also the Galway Horse and Cattle Company deal. Here the people of Canada received only $600, but the man who got the land turned it over within a few days for $20,000. That would build at least a mile of the Hudson Bay route. Take the Blairmore townsite for which the people of Canada received only $480, but the persons who got the townsite to-day value

it at over $200,000. That would have built 10 miles of the Hudson Bay Railway. We find that the Militia Department is to-day spending $6,000,000 for a service that used to be carried on for $1,000,000. I would suggest to the hon. the Prime Minister that we should have a little less war and a few more miles of Hudson Bay Railway. I am one of the eleven who voted against the appropriation of $300,000 to get in the thin end of the wedge committing this country to $6,000,000 or $7,000,000 for the reclaiming of the Plains of Abraham. If they had taken even that $300,000 and used it in the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway instead of blowing it up in fire-crackers, as some of my hon. friends say, the people of the western provinces at least would have been very much more pleased. Then we come to the Marine Department. If you took some of the money you have been paying to those Americans who have been coming here at $75 a day and used it to build the Hudson Bay Railway, the people would have been much better satisfied and the government might have used a portion of it to pay Canadians who could very well show the Minister of Marine and his officials how to change a single entry system of bookkeeping to a double entry system. It is only a few nights since we had in the House a vote for a ten-year subsidy of $200,000 per year for a steamship line running to France. For what purpose? As far as I can ascertain from the French treaty, we as Canadians, especially we farmers, get no great value for that $200,000 a year. It will simply be paid into the coffers of the company operating the service, and this for the purpose of assisting France to place her goods on the Canadian markets. If this had been used for the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway, it would have been of much more benefit to the farmers of the west.

Hon. gentlemen say we have not given away any of our lands. What have we been doing with our timber? Where has it gone? Imagine yourself taking a train at Halifax and riding to the city of Vancouver, a distance of 3,000 miles and seeing on one side of the track for a distance of half a mile, a belt of timber and you will have some idea of the quantity of timber owned and controlled by the hon. member for Dauphin and the Imperial Pulp Company, the president of which is the Lieutenant Governor of the province of Manitoba. But they are not satisfied with giving away the land and timber, take our fisheries for example. If you can imagine yourself riding from Halifax to Vancouver, and viewing for that distance a lake twelve miles wide, you will have some idea of what has been given away to a few persons for a mere pittance. If these national assets had been so dealt with that the people received a fair value for them instead of their being given away, we would have more than enough money for the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway. The policy that I would suggest to the government for the raising of the necessary funds for the construction of the railway would be to cut out the middlemen, do away with the graft system and give the people value for the money collected from them in taxes.

Mr. JOHN CRAWFORD (Portage la Prairie). No question is of more interest to the people of the whole country to-day than transportation. That question is at the bottom of practically all the agitation there is, particularly in the western country to-day. It affects not only the movement of our crops but every other line of business. It not only affects the farmers and the labourers on the farms, but it affects every line of business throughout the whole country. I consider this is a more important proposition at the present time than anything we have to consider. I do not wish to speak at any length but I think it is only right that I should at least make some correction with respect to some of the remarks which have been made by previous speakers. I noticed that the hon member for Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) and the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) tried to misrepresent the conditions which surround this undertaking with reference to the acts of the present government. One hon. gentleman undertook to say that the mileage was increased more than it ought to have been owing to the route which was taken in the direction of Hudson bay, or owing to Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann not trying to get to Hudson bay. I notice that it was suggested in the order in council of 1882 that the proposed road would be about 800 miles long and if you will look at the route of the Canadian Northern Railway you will find that, in reaching Hudson bay, it covers a distance of about 800 miles. I have just one complaint to make. In all the business which has been done in connection with the matter they seem to have lost sight of the fact that when the land grant was originally given in connection with this road it was given for the sole purpose of getting a completed road. The orders in council one after another bear that out. The complaint I have to make is that no provision has been made in that direction. The present government may not be so much to blame as their predecessors in that regard owing to the fact that the arrangement provided that so much of the land grants should be handed over as every twenty miles were constructed. Whenever twenty miles were built a proportionate amount of the land grant was handed over but there was no provision made for the completion of the road. Messrs. Mann and Mackenzie or the Canadian Northern people should go on and complete the road. They have had sufficient to do it and I think it has been a great mistake that proper and sufficient provisions were not made surround-

ing the contract. In 1885 an order in council was passed providing that this road could be built practically anywhere the company chose to locate it. They could start anywhere and tap the Canadian Pacific Railway. The order in council provided that in so far as that portion of it in Manitoba was concerned, the builders of the road were entitled to 6,400 acres per mile and that they should also receive 12,800 acres per mile in the Northwest Territories. The land grant would not have been along the line of railway if it had run in the direction that hon. gentlemen opposite have been talking about to-night. Throughout the different orders in council they make provision for the giving of the land grant to be selected not particularly along the line of railway, but the order in council passed in 1885 provides that in so far as the location of the land is concerned it is entirely at the disposal of the Minister of the Interior. Then having regard to the fact that they could start anywhere, build anywhere that would be advantageous to the company and that they could get into the Northwest Territories and select the land grant anywhere they pleased, goes to prove that the argument of my hon. friend's opposite, in so far as land grants are concerned, are not in keeping with the facts.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. What is the date of that order in council?

Mr. CRAWFORD. May 11, 1885. The order provides that they can build from any point and in any direction that may be considered advantageous to the company and that the minister is to be sole judge as to the selection of the land.

Now, I will leave that feature of the situation. This proposed railway is the foundation of practically everything in connection with the business of the west at the present time. Its construction not only affects the moving of our grain but it affects the marketing of it as well. During a discussion which took place in connection with the working of the Grain Inspection Act the other day the bankers of the country took the position that owing to the condition of transportation they were not prepared to make advances and they gave that as a reason for cutting off credits to the grain dealers. The grainmen stated that before my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) made his announcement at the beginning of the session with reference to the assistance which the government had given to the banks the whole grain trade of the country was practically tied up because the grain dealers who were buying grain throughout the country could not get a dollar from the banks on account of their inability to get the grain which they had purchased and stored in interior elevators moved. When the announcement was made by the Finance Minister that he had made certain arrangements to assist the banking institutions to provide funds for the removing of the grain it relieved the situation immediately. Anything that is going to bring about better transportation facilities is of the greatest importance to the people of the country. As to the question of what advantage we may derive from the construction of this road it does not appeal to me from the point of view of dollars and cents quite so much as it may to other hon. gentlemen. It may present itself to them in that light owing to the parts of the country from which they come. I cannot see that we are going to derive an advantage even of 10 or 15 cents a bushel in connection with the shipping of our crop. I speak of the Manitoba part of the situation.

To the more western part of the country it would be of greater benefit but taking it on the whole I do not think the project would result in as large a gain in the matter of reducing freight rates as has been represented by some hon. gentlemen. The fact is that at certain periods grain is being taken from Winnipeg to Liverpool for about fifteen cents a bushel and it is not at all probable that it can be carried much cheaper than that by the Hudson Bay route. It is far more probable that when the Grand Trunk Pacific is in operation the result will be that the eastbound freight rates will be lower than they are to-day. I see that the rate quoted from Chicago to New York, a 900 mile haul, is sometimes as low as ten cents a hundred pounds when navigation is open, and there is water competition, and fourteen cents per hundred during the winter months which is about the highest rate charged for that 900 miles of railway transit. If they can haul wheat from Chicago to New York at a rate of about 8·40 cents a bushel it would seem that the railway rates in wheat in this country should be lower than they are to-day. When we remember that the Grand Trunk Pacific will have practically a level grade, especially going eastward, there is no doubt that the cost of transportation will be reduced, and it is therefore not likely that the construction of the Hudson Bay route will give us the advantage in the reduction of of about 8·40 cents a bushel it would seem to anticipate. At the same time the construction of this railway will be of great advantage to us, for it would give us more facilities for moving our crops and that is a most important feature. It would seem to me that if the road were constructed from Calgary to Edmonton or any other point in the west to Churchill, the grades obtained would be such that the cost of operation would be extremely light, and the freight rates would be as low as you could possibly expect in any railway haul. No doubt there are certain seasons when the navigation on Hudson bay will not be as favourable as in others, but undoubtedly in some seasons the weather will be so open as to allow our moving the greater portion of the season's crop by this route. I believe the undertaking to be feasible and that the country need have no hesitation in assuming

the responsibility for it. In fact the whole western country demands it and the people will not be satisfied until it is carried out. As to providing the means for constructing the railway, the idea suggested last year by the Minister of the Interior when he was discussing his land Bill is nearer to my view than the scheme suggested by the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). I am not in favour of tying up the lands in this country from settlement in any form, and in my opinion the sooner we get settlers on the land the better. If there is one thing more than another which in former years retarded the progress of the west it was the fact that the Conservatives adopted the policy of reserving the odd sections for these railway grants, thus necessitating sparse settlement and driving out many of the early settlers who would otherwise have remained in the country. I am inclined to favour the policy of the Minister of the Interior under which the sale of lands at so much per acre would create a fund to build this railway; I would certainly prefer that to reserving large tracts of lands for railways for any length of time. Then I am of opinion that the government should construct the railway and own it. However, I am not in favour of government operation and I think the line should be leased and running powers reserved so that it may be kept practically as a highway for the people of Canada. As to the terminals at Fort Churchill, I think they should be built and maintained by the railway companies who interest themselves in the trade there. I would remark that the conditions in western Canada have a direct effect upon the conditions in all other parts of the country. The manufacturers of the east suffer if the farmers in the west are depressed, as we could see last year when the little damage caused to the crops was so exaggerated as to bring about financial stringency in the country. The fact is that there was more money made out of the crop in the west last year than any other year's crop we ever had. There was more money made to the acre than was ever made before, but the slight damage done to the crop was made use of to the detriment of the whole country. There are no hard times in the west to-day, and if you consult the loan companies there they will tell you that they never had their interest paid as well as it was paid last year. I have a statement taken from a Winnipeg paper to the effect that two or three loan companies collected 90 per cent of their interest before the first of March this year much better than they did last year. When I was in the west a short time ago I was told by some of the bank managers that their accounts had never been in as good shape as they are at the present time. There is no danger for the future, conditions vary so much in different sections it is hardly possible to expect any reverse affecting the whole country. I think the future of the country is assured, and we cannot too soon meet the necessity of providing for that future. It is coming faster than we can provide for it, and nothing that we can do will go further to serve the people than increasing the means of transportation.

Mr. J. HERRON (Alberta). Mr. Speaker, I had contemplated speaking at some length on this important question; but owing to the lateness of the hour I will not occupy more than a minute or two merely to place myself on record as being in favour of the project. But before sitting down I wish to refer to a remark made by the last speaker (Mr. Crawford) with regard to the odd numbered sections. He asserted that the late Conservative government had been largely responsible for keeping back settlement, and otherwise retarding the progress of the country by failing to throw the odd-numbered sections open to homesteading or disposing of them in some other way. I think that statement comes with very bad grace from a supporter of the present government, which, although they have been in power for twelve years, during which they have had full power to deal with that question, have taken no steps towards throwing the odd-numbered sections open to settlement, or dealing with them in any way. With regard to the Hudson Bay Railway, I do not think that at this late hour of the night it is necessary for me to urge the importance of that great work. The subject has been very ably presented to the House by several gentlemen on both sides of the House, particularly by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) and the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy). I would like, however, to say that one phase of the Hudson Bay route which especially commends it to the favour of the people of southern Alberta, lies in the advantage that it will offer in connection with the shipment of cattle from that range country. Our wild stock raised on the prairies do not take kindly to transportation by rail. It is the long railway journey from Alberta to the seacoast that takes practically the cream off the business of cattle raising on the western plains; and if we had a railroad to Hudson bay, it would give us the advantage of a shorter railway journey by 1,000 miles. For that reason alone the people of southern Alberta are specially interested in the building of that railroad. I would be glad to see the government take up the question in a practical way and carry it to a termination, instead of simply using it for political purposes from year to year, and letting it end at that. With these remarks I merely wish to state that I will support the resolution.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON (Selkirk). Mr. Speaker, on this very important question, that of the Hudson Bay Railway, I desire to

occupy the attention of the House for a very short time. In the session of 1880 chapter 69 of the Statutes of Canada shows that a charter was passed for the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway. After this charter was passed the promoters made application to the Manitoba government for assistance to the road. After several years of negotiations, finally in the year 1886 the legislature passed a Bill guaranteeing the bonds of the road for the first forty miles from Winnipeg at the rate of $6,400 per mile, taking the land grant as a security. I might say here that the Dominion government had given a land grant to the company providing that for that portion of the line which was in the province of Manitoba, about 200 miles, the company were to get 6,400 acres per mile, while for that portion outside of the province of Manitoba, about 500 miles, 12,800 acres would be granted to provide for extra difficulties supposed to exist in the construction of the road. The company went on and built the first forty miles. They did the grading, laid the ties and rails, but put on no ballast, and never operated any portion of this section. The ties rotted on the ground, the culverts and bridges were destroyed by fire and weather, the rails lay along the dump, and the only use made of them for about fifteen years was by the farmers along the line who occasionally hitched on to one and used it as a weed killer on their summer fallow. This forty miles remained from 1886 to about the year 1900 in the condition I have just mentioned. About that time Mackenzie and Mann got possession of the charter and started to reorganize and complete the line, already graded. They also added about twenty miles, taking the line to Oakpoint, a settlement on the east shore of Lake Manitoba which is now the terminus of the Hudson Bay Railway in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, and I think I speak for a very large number of the people of the province of Manitoba, the present location of the Hudson bay road from a point on the Canadian Northern Railway Prince Albert branch, to the Pas on the Saskatchewan river, will never be a satisfactory route for the province of Manitoba. This line starts about thirty miles west of the western boundary of Manitoba, and if completed to Churchill on the Hudson bay would have its terminus to the east of the eastern boundary of the province. In other words, taking Portage la Prairie as the centre of the province our grain and other exports would have to go 170 miles west to this point and then come back east to Fort Churchill, about 300 miles, an extra haul for the province on all its exports and imports of 235 miles. If Manitoba is to get any benefit from a Hudson Bay Railway a line will have to be built from Winnipeg north between Lakes Winnipeg and Manitoba or the east side of Lake Winnipeg which is the best route of all for Manitoba as well as being 200 miles shorter than any other route. In addition either of these two routes would open up a large extent of new and unoccupied territory which is capable of carrying a large population when the land is cleared. Most of this territory is covered with bush which would help the farmers to clear up the land by enabling them to take out pulp wood and ship it by this railway.

There has never been any doubt in the minds of the Manitoba people as to the benefits of a Hudson Bay Railway to that province but the difficulty in the past has been the owning of the charter by people who could not convince the capitalists of the feasibility and profit of putting money into this railway.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition seems to doubt that any pronouncement has been made by any member of the government on the question. Let me refer him to what the hon. Minister of the Interior said during last session when introducing his Lands Act:

The government is fully convinced of the propriety of giving the Northwest an additional railway outlet by way of Hudson bay at the earliest possible date. The government believes that with the increase in production of the west now in progress, such an additional outlet will be urgently needed as soon as the railway can be built, even if it were commenced at once. At the same time it realizes that public opinion throughout Canada could scarcely be expected at the moment, in view of the great obligations already incurred in connection with railway enterprise, to sanction the additional obligation that would be incurred by the construction of a railway to Hudson bay, unless special provision were made to meet that obligation. It believes however, that there will be no objection from any quarter if the funds acruing from the disposal of preemptions in the three prairie provinces, under the terms of the proposed land Bill, shall be considered as a provision in place of the land grant stated in the Act to meet the burden upon the credit of the Dominion as a whole that must be assumed at an early date—if not immediately—if a railway is to be in operation to Hudson bay in time to meet the urgent need which is now in plain sight for an additional and shorter railway route from the prairies to tide water.

Now, if this should be agreed to by the government, there is nothing to hinder surveys being made during the coming summer and operations commenced and contracts made in the spring of 1909. This road could be finished in two years as there are no special difficulties along the route. This would help the situation a good deal

as it will most likely be five years before the Grand Trunk Pacific is finished. While the line is being built, I would suggest that the government put up elevators with a capacity of say twenty millions so that when the line is finished it would at once become useful in relieving a situation which must become acute every fall until relief is furnished in this way. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, even after this line and the Grand Trunk Pacific are finished, there will be enough business to keep all the roads busy for twelve months in every year.

I might say further that my idea would be to give every railroad in the west running rights (under the Railway Commission) over this road from some fixed point, to which they would have to build as soon as this is done, and not before, will the relief for which the west is looking be provided. I would point out another fact, Mr. Macoun of the Department of Agriculture, in giving evidence before the Committee on Agriculture, a few days ago, told us of a belt of good land north of the province of Manitoba, through which the Hudson Bay Railway must run on its way to Churchill, of about 100 miles square or 6,400,000 acres. This belt will support 20,000 farmers giving each 320 acres. A few years ago 20,000 farmers in Manitoba raised 50,000,000 bushels of wheat, so it is easily seen what this belt when settled will do for the Hudson Bay Railway. As the government are likely to appeal to the people in the near future, I would like to see a plank for the building of this road along the lines I suggest, put in their platform, and from what I know of the people of the county of Selkirk, my majority instead of 500 as at the last election, would, I am sure, reach 1,500. At this late hour, Mr. Speaker, I will not at any further length discuss the subject under consideration.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens). It really seems to me in looking at the map that every man east of the Bay des Chaleurs ought to hold up his hand for the construction of a railway to Fort Churchill, provided they are convinced of the navigability of Hudson straits for even five months in the year. The industrial communities of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island would thereby secure easy access to the northern part of this continent for their manufactured products by securing direct water shipment and avoiding the heavy tolls charged on the different railways, while so far as regards the agricultural interests of Prince Edward Island and Cape Breton, contiguous to the route, there is every reason to suppose that they would be able to find a ready market among our own people for all they have to sell. Take for instance this present year, the parliament of Canada has voted over $2,000,000 to supply seed for the west and the only difficulty that came to public notice in the way of securing oats from Prince Edward Island, was as to the procuring of freight rates. If the people of Prince Edward Island were convinced that they could supply even a proportion of the needs of the west, they would be perfectly willing to pay their quota towards the construction of a railway to Hudson bay, provided always that the people of the west would be wiling to pay their quota of the cost of a tunnel under the straits of Northumberland and thereby securing a complete circle of inter-communication between the Island province and Central Canada.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE (Strathcona). At this very late hour, I do not propose to take up time discussing this question at any length. I had intended giving some statistics, but former speakers have used most of them, and I do not intend to repeat them to the House which must be somewhat weary of listening to statistics to-day. The question of transportation is one of the most important questions with which the western country has to deal. For the last five or six years we have had every year to suffer to a greater or less degree from what is knows as the transportation blockade. The acuteness of that blockade was not so great this season for various obvious reasons, but it does not require any prophet to foretell that the first abundant harvest will again bring on this transportation blockade in a much more acute form than we have ever experienced it in the past. The conditions this year were very favourable to the railway. The crop in some part was injured, the prices were very materially lowered, and consequently the export of the grain was not great. But I say again that it does not require any great reflection on the part of anybody to see that, with our present conditions of producing grain, we shall have another transportation blockade just as soon as any very great quantity is prepared for export.

Now, another feature that we have to reckon with in the west is this : whereas we have already had these blockades, we have only begun, one might say, the occupation of raising grain in that country. We have alienated from the government somewhere in the neighbourhood of 80,000,000 acres of land, and we had in cultivation in 1906 8,000,000 acres. We have over 40,000,000 acres of land occupied by settlers. With these facts before him, any one on a moment's reflection will see that an enormous output must necessarily follow when we begin operations seriously.

Now, as to the method of building this road, I am not going to go into that in detail. But I believe we have had amply proven here to-day the feasibility of building the road, the suitability of the country through which it is to run, the availability of the port which it reaches, the possibility of storing the grain there, and the feasibil-

ity of the water route from that point to the European market for a reasonable number of months in the year. I believe that these facts in the main are plain to every member of the House. It is the duty of this government to see to it that that road is constructed and that the government has absolute control over it. I could go very much into detail in this matter, but all I wish to do is to add my expression to that of others and to statements that I hope the government at the earliest opportunity, will have this road constructed.

Mr. GEO. W. FOWLER (Kings and Albert). Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate the House upon the very lively interest they seem to take in this very important question—I think it would require some stretch of imagination on your part to see a quorum in the House at this moment. That is regrettable. This is a question of great importance not only to the west but to the east as well. And notwithstanding the insinuation made by the hon. member that the east does not take the interest it should in western questions, I must say that the eastern part of Canada has in every case shown a very great interest in the west and all that pertains to the west. Sacrifices have been made; they were not deemed sacrifices because of the overpowering interest which the east had in the west. From the very foundation of our confederation, the eastern provinces of Canada have been interested in the west. We in the maritime provinces do not fix the western boundary of Canada at the St. Lawrence river, nor do the older provinces as a whole fix their boundary at the great lakes. We extend our boundary to the Pacific ocean. It was the dream of that great statesman, Sir John Macdonald, and of the statesmen who surrounded him, as soon as confederation was formed, that the Pacific ocean should be the western boundary and the Arctic ocean the northern boundary of this great Dominion of ours. I say that we of the east are and ought to be interested in the questions of the west. And the question of the Hudson Bay Railway is a very important question to the people of the east and the west. There can be no doubt that the time is not far distant when the means for carrying the products of that great country will be found insufficient, even with the new Transcontinental road which is now under construction. And I do not believe that a more feasible route for a new transportation line can be found than by way of Hudson bay. For my part, though coming from the extreme east, I am very strongly in favour of the construction of this road, and the opening of another outlet for the products of our country. The government that was in power in 1881 had the same idea—I believe it was in 1881 that the first order in council was passed in respect to this matter. Then there was to be an alternative route, as has been pointed out.

Mr. W. McINTYRE.

Changes have been made which have altogether changed the idea of the men who passed that first order in council. As has already been pointed out by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. S. J. Jackson) the route that is adopted at the present time going to Erwood and thence by Le Pas towards Churchill is not the shortest route to Hudson bay. The first route intended by the order in council, the route that obliges them to pass east of Lake Manitoba, would be, as I understand it, the shortest route between Portage la Prairie and Churchill. I was somewhat amused at the statement made by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) that, as far back as 1885, by order in council, the Minister of the Interior was given power to place this land grant where he pleased. I can understand how hon. gentlemen opposite after the assertions we have already made with respect to the conduct of this government regarding land grants for railways, would make very strenuous efforts to get out of the hole in which they were placed by the conduct of this government toward this particular railway proposition. They have stated again and again that not an acre has been given by this government as land grant. But they are met with the statement that the government revived a land grant, which was the same as giving it originally, because the grant had expired, and they were not obliged to renew it. And not only had the grant expired, but the object for which it was given had expired, the object being a railway to Hudson bay and they had changed the route so that the object no more existed than did the grant itself. They revived the land grant for another purpose. Not only did they revive the grant, but they increased tremendously the area from which it was to be selected, so as to allow the company to choose land not necessarily more fertile, but infinitely more valuable by reason of the large settlement that had already taken place in the vicinity. My hon. friend from Portage la Prairie says they were authorized to do this by reason of the order in council which was passed by the Conservative government in 1885. Now the only section which gives the Minister of the Interior any discretion with respect to where these lands should be located is section 7. I have a certified copy of the order in council before me. The sections preceding sections 7 state in detail where these lands shall be taken from; section 7 goes on to say:

> And any deficiency in the area of the land which the company may be entitled to receive arising on account of any portion of land hereinbefore described being occupied by actual settlers——

Mark the condition:

> —establishing legal rights thereto or which might be set apart by the government for Indians under any treaty, or arising from

any other cause, of which the Minister of the Interior shall be the sole judge, shall be made up from such lands as the Minister of the Interior may from time to time designate.

That is the deficiency shall be made up. But there are some eight and three-quarter million acres of land from which the selection shall be made, provided for by the preceding sections. We find that instead of confining themselves to the lands originally set aside for the purpose of selection they go over 200 miles west of that to the extreme western boundary of the province of Saskatchewan. I have here a map which shows that and you will observe, Mr. Speaker, just how far they have gone from the area originally set apart. This was done not because there was not sufficient land of good quality, 'fairly fit for settlement,' in the terms of the order in council, but because settlement had already taken place in this particular district and those lands were very much more valuable and much more saleable on that account. So gentlemen who had this railway to build were able to get 6,400 acres of the best land in the country in districts in which there already was settlement in sections not set apart. $6 an acre would be a fair value for this land and on 6,400 acres this would make a very acceptable subsidy indeed, in addition to the $40,000 a year for 20 years which was also guaranteed for the construction of this road. Such a good thing was this, so valuable were these concessions to the Canadian Northern Railway, that they were not particular whether they observed the desire to cover the distance between the two points in the most direct way; they did not care how much the line varied from the straight because the variation would simply increase the amount they were to receive. I have here a map which shows the line, and you will observe how it is constructed. Did anybody ever see such a wobbly straight line as that? Every wave in that line cost this country from $250,000 to $500,000. Those were expensive wobbles, but you see the longer the distance the more land they get. In Manitoba they got 6,400 acres a mile and outside of that province 12,800 acres a mile. The actual distance they made in the journey to Hudson bay would be only 150 miles, but they had journeyed 320 miles in order to make that 150 miles. This was done because they were getting 6,400 acres per mile and were allowed to select that from the very best lands in the provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan. Taking the 12,400 acres allowed in Saskatchewan at $6 per acre, they would receive $75,000 a mile for building this road. It seems to me that this is a matter for which this government deserves the censure of the people of Canada. They have taken from the public lands, the public domain of this country, land to aid a company in the construction of what is simply a local line. Then they have the nerve to stand up here and say they have never alienated one acre of the public lands of this country. My hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) might have added one or two other items to the list he gave of savings which the government could have made to procure funds for the building of this road to Hudson bay. He might have suggested that the government could have used the $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 that to-day lie at the bottom of the St. Lawrence river in the ill-fated Quebec bridge. If this had been devoted to the Hudson bay road it would have fairly well built the line from Le Pas to Hudson bay. It would have been much better for the country if it had been used for that purpose.

While this discussion has been mostly carried on by western members, it seems to me that at least one eastern man should state to the House that so far as he was entitled to speak for the east the east was in favour of anything which would make to the betterment of conditions in the western country.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Speaker, before the question is put I wish to congratulate the House, the west and the country at large on the unanimous expression of approval of this project in which we are all, especially in the west, so deeply interested. It is very fortunate, I am sure, that after some four months of a strenuous session it is possible to hold a discussion on such an important question in the House and not have any division of opinion as to the merits of the main question. This is fortunate for the project and for the country. I do not propose to discuss the question myself as it has been discussed at such length and so ably during the day. I might, however, refer to one point suggested by Mr. Fowler, that the road had been lengthened very greatly from what was first intended. I shall not dispute that, but I would point out that the decision of the question whether the road has really been lengthened, depends on the points taken. If the initial point is to be Portage la Prairie or some point in the older part of the province of Manitoba and the usefulness of the road is to be confined to that district, then the road has been lengthened by being taken west of Lake Manitoba instead of between Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg. But if the road is intended to serve the western country generally, then this change in the route has very greatly shortened the road. That is to say the route has taken a shortened distance between the centre of the wheat fields and Fort Churchill as compared with the route which would go direct from Portage la Prairie to Fort Churchill. Last year, when this question was up for consideration, the premier informed the House that the government had the matter then under consideration and that he hoped to

be able to make an announcement with regard to it before the close of the session. Unfortunately he was called away and did not return before the close of the session; therefore the government was not able to reach any conclusion on the subject and he was not able to make any announcement. I am at liberty to say that the question is now under the consideration of the government and that a conclusion has not been reached is not because of any dilatoriness in regard to the question at the hands of the government. I think it will be agreed that the subject of transportation has been dealt with and is being dealt with very energetically on the part of the government and very satisfactorily to the country at large, and if no conclusion has yet been reached in regard to this question of the immediate construction of a railway to Hudson bay it is not because of any lack of sympathy with the project or any lack of intent on the part of the government to deal with the question, but because other matters have hitherto been more pressing. However, it is again hoped that before the end of the session it will be possible for the government to make an announcement upon this question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just one or two words before the discussion closes. I am very glad indeed to hear that the subject is once more under the consideration of the government. It was very much under the consideration of the government last year and it remains up to the present time exactly where it was then and exactly where it was twelve years ago when they came into power. I have no doubt that my hon. friend (Mr. Knowles) who introduced this subject to-day, regards that as being so entirely satisfactory as to merit his approval and commendation. I think I may assure the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) on behalf of the hon. member for West Assiniboia that as long as it remains under consideration the hon. member for West Assiniboia will be absolutely satisfied and will continue to give to the government in future that steady support which he has always been ready to accord it in the past.

The hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) made a very interesting speech in which he referred to what he was pleased to term the patchwork policy propounded by the leader of the opposition in regard to the Grand Trunk Railway project some years ago. If my hon. friend had not got weary of this discussion and retired from the Chamber, I would have been inclined to tell him if he really wants an example of patchwork he had better search the areas in the western part of Canada that have been practically filched from the people under his administration as land commissioner.

In regard to the general question, the subject is one of intense interest to the people of the west. That is perfectly apparent to any gentleman who has gone to the west and who knows how thoroughly the people of Manitoba and the two other provinces are convinced that the Hudson bay route will give to them an outlet which is absolutely necessary to the full and complete development of their country. It is only a question of the requisite information and we are informed that the government have in their possession at the present time information which justifies them in coming to the conclusion that the Hudson Bay route is a reasonably practicable and feasible route for a reasonable number of months in the year as the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. McIntyre) very well put it to-night. If that is the case why have they not effectively dealt with the matter during the last twelve years ? Why is it that they did not take some steps to give a practical illustration of the sympathy which was dwelt upon so much here to-night by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) ? Sympathy is a very desirable quality, but action is a much more desirable quality on the part of the government in regard to a great transportation question of this kind. Let me point out to the minister one illustration of that. In 1904, four years ago, there was the same unanimity in this House in regard to the application of the British preference only to goods which entered Canada by Canadian ports. There were the same delightful expressions from even greater statesmen than the Minister of the Interior, from the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and from the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and we know very well that in so far as the application of that principle is concerned the matter is exactly in the same position as it was when that motion was passed by the House. If that is a fair omen of what the people of the west may expect from this resolution, I do not know that they have any very great cause for satisfaction after what has taken place. There was on that occasion in 1904, a unanimous resolution of the House and yet the government have paid absolutely no attention to it, except that the terms of that resolution have been incorporated in the statutes of this country to be brought into operation at some indefinite and unknown time in the future, described by the Prime Minister as dependent upon the completion of the National Transcontinental Railway. Four years have elapsed, we do not know how many more will lapse before effect will be given to that resolution, now four years old, and if the people of the west are to wait for a similar length of time before any action is taken by the government in regard to this railway, it does not seem that the hon. member for West Assiniboia has made quite so impor-

tant or great a stride towards the goal on the present occasion as some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House seem to imagine.

The subject recalls the discussion on the tunnel between Prince Edward Island and the mainland which was alluded to by one of my hon. friend from the island; it is simply a question of getting the requisite information as to whether or not this is a feasible route. This government have been in power for twelve years and assuming the worst default that you are entitled to assume in regard to their predecessors, I think that they long ago should have acted upon the information which has been available. Now, we are assured by the Minister of the Interior that the government have it under consideration, and I suppose that we must content ourselves with that unless some other gentleman of the treasury benches is inclined to go a little further than the Minister of the Interior has done.

Motion as amended, agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. We propose to take up a number of Bills on the Order Paper, as follows: Bill relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies; second reading of Bill (No. 135) to amend the Immigration Act; second reading of Bill (No. 143) to amend the Inland Revenue Act, second reading of Bill (No. 113) to amend the Land Titles Act; second reading of Bill (No. 118) to amend the Railway Act with respect to telegraphs and telephones and the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners; and Bill (No. 112) to amend the Railway Act as respect this constitution of the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.40 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, April 8, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

TIMBRES-POSTE—NOUVELLE SERIE.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE demande:

1. Est-il vrai que le ministère des Postes doit émettre à l'occasion du troisième centenaire de Québec une nouvelle série de timbres-poste?

2. Dans l'affirmative, le ministère se propose-t-il de reconnaître et l'esprit de la Confédération et celui de la célébration en émettant et imprimant ces timbres dans les deux langues officielles du pays?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. Yes.
2. Under consideration.

LESSER SLAVE LAKE—FISHING PRIVILEGES.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. Has the government leased the fishing privileges of Lesser Slave lake? If so, by whom were such privileges first obtained, to whom have they been assigned, and by whom are they at present exercised?

2. On what date, for how long, and at what annual rental was such lease granted?

3. Have any protests been received from residents of the neighbouring localities? If so, when, from whom, and what is the substance of the complaint?

4. Has the government been asked to cancel such lease? If so, when and by whom?

5. Has the government endeavoured to secure a voluntary diminution or abandonment of the privilege exercised under the lease by the holders thereof? If so, when and with what result?

6. Did the lessees mention or suggest any sum in return for which they would forego their privileges? If so, what was the amount indicated?

7. Do the same parties still operate without abatement to the full extent of the privileges contained in the lease?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. The government has leased fishing privileges in Lesser Slave lake; but not the exclusive fishing privileges there.

The lease was graned to John Kenneth McKenzie, president of the Imperial Fish Company, of Selkirk, Manitoba, and was assigned by him to the Athabaska Fish Company Limited and is still exercised by that company.

2. May 14, 1904, for a term of nine years, at a rental of $10 per year, one of the conditions being that the lessee or the company shall expend $300 per annum during the three years from the 1st May, 1904, in the exploration of the territory leased, and during the remaing period of the lease at least $1,500 per year in the exploration, development, equipment and improvement of the property leased.

3. No such protests have been received.

4. No.

5. No.

6. No.

7. The conditions of lease remain unchanged.

POST OFFICE AT FARNHAM, QUEBEC.

Mr. BERGERON—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. Was any money voted at the last session of this House for the improvement of the post office at Farnham, Quebec?
2. If so, has the money been spent? If not, why not?
3. Has a report been made by the post office inspector on the improvements to such post office?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. Yes, $5,500.
2. No. It was not found practicable to carry out improvements suggested.
3. Yes.

IMPROVEMENT OF GROUNDS SURROUNDING RIVIERE DU LOUP POST OFFICE.

Mr. BERGERON—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. What works, if any, have been made on the grounds occupied by the post office at Rivière du Loup, during the years 1906 and 1907?
2. How much has been spent for such improvements, by whom were they made, and what was the salary paid the inspector or the foreman?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. In October, 1906, a contract was let which included new plumbing work, carpenter work, plastering and painting in the building and also the following works on the grounds : drain from cellar to street, new plank sidewalks, pipe rail fence, sodding and tree planting and ditch at rear.
2. (a) $1,765.75 ; (b) A. Fortier ; (c) The work was looked after by the caretaker and inspected by an officer from headquarters.

POSTMASTER AT RIVIERE DU LOUP.

Mr. BERGERON—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. What is the salary of Jules Gauvreau as postmaster of Rivière du Loup?
2. Does he still occupy the position? If not, who succeeded him, and what is his salary?
3. If Mr. Gauvreau has resigned, what is the cause of his resignation, does he still occupy any position in the post office, and is he paid as such?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1, 2 and 3. Mr. Jules Gauvreau is no longer postmaster of Rivière du Loup (en bas). He tendered his resignation voluntarily and was succeeded by Mrs. Alice G. Mailloux. The salary and commissions of the office amount to :—

Salary	$1,205 00
Commission on box rents	76 00
Summer season allowance	40 00
Night allowance	50 00
Forward allowance	160 00
Commission on money order, savings bank and postal note business for the year ended June 30, 1907	97 29
Total	$1,628 29

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—MR. EVARISTE TALBOT.

Mr. BERGERON—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. What is the position which Evariste Talbot occupies on the Intercolonial Railway, and what is his salary?
2. Has he made any report to the Department of Railways and Canals or any other since a year?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Evariste Talbot occupies the position of freight tracer on the Intercolonial Railway, his salary being $85 per month.
2. His duties do not call for any report to the Department of Railways and Canals, but he is constantly employed making reports to the freight claims agent on lost and damaged freight.

WHARF AT NOTRE DAME DU PORTAGE.

Mr. BERGERON—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. How much money was spent on the wharf at Notre Dame du Portage, in the county of Temiscouata, during the years 1906 and 1907?
2. What was the quantity of wood or lumber used, what was the price paid for such wood, and who furnished it?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. In 1906 $4,982 62
   In 1907 2,013 36
2. In 1906, from G. A. Binet, spruce timber : 6,280 lineal feet, 11 by 11 and 12 by 12, at 20 cents ; 577 lineal feet, 10 by 10, at 16 cents ; 8,861 lineal feet, round, at 15 cents ; 779 lineal feet, sundry, at 9⅔ cents ; 12,360 feet plank, at $15 ; sundry lumber, $12.90.

In 1907, from J. S. Michaud, spruce : 260 lineal feet, 7 inches, at 5 cents.

From G. A. Binet, spruce : 891 lineal feet, round, at 15 cents ; 296 lineal feet, 12 by 12, at 20 cents ; 26 lineal feet, 6 by 6, at 10 cents ; 6 feet plank, 20 cents.

ACTS OF SASKATCHEWAN LEGISLATURE.

Mr. LAKE—by Uriah Wilson—asked :

1. Have the Acts of the legislature of the province of Saskatchewan, adopted in 1907, been duly transmitted to the Dominion government? If so, on what date were said Acts received?
2. Has the Department of Justice reported upon said Acts ? If so, on what date was said report made ?
3. Have any of the said Acts been disallowed ?
4. When does the delay for disallowance expire ?

5. Is it the intention of the government to disallow any of said provincial Acts?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) :

1. The Act establishing the Supreme Court of the province and the Act establishing district courts were received on 13th March, 1907. The other statutes on 22nd April, 1907.

2. Yes, on the 11th October, 1907.

3. No.

4. At the expiration of one year after receipt of the copy of the provincial statute by the Secretary of State.

5. No occasion has appeared for any reconsideration of the question.

HOMESTEAD ENTRY—RODERICK McLEOD.

Mr. LAKE—by Mr. Uriah Wilson—asked :

1. When did Roderick McLeod enter for the northeast quarter-section 18, 46a, 25, west second meridian?

2. Has he fulfilled all his duties?

3. Was leave of absence granted to him on any occasion ? If so, between what periods, and at whose recommendation ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Roderick A. McLeod entered for the N.E. ¼, of section 18, township 46a, range 25, west of the second meridian, on the 11th of June, 1904.

2. He has not fulfilled all his duties. He executed a declaration of abandonment, and on the 26th of March, 1907, the agent was instructed to carry out cancellation and to permit his mother, if eligible, the privilege of re-entry, in view of the fact that she had been in residence since the 15th of June, 1906, having a log house worth $200, 60 head of cattle, with stabling worth $100 and 5 acres of breaking. Mrs. Jessie McLeod secured re-entry on the 19th of April, 1907.

3. On the 8th of May, 1906, Mr. McLeod's entry was protested until the 1st of August following, by the commissioner's direction.

PRINCE RUPERT—COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

1. Who is the present collector of customs at Prince Rupert?

2. When was he appointed, and whom did he succeed?

3. Why was B. R. McDonald, the late collector, superseded by the present incumbent?

4. Has the present incumbent large interests in mercantile concerns in Prince Rupert?

5. Does he own or partly own a cannery and sawmill or either, in that part of British Columbia?

6. What position is assigned to B. R. Mc Donald, the late collector?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. George W. Morrow.

2. He is the first permanent collector of the port, appointed February 15, 1908.

3. B. R. McDonald was transferred temporarily to Prince Rupert, as acting collector, from Rossland, where he was collector.

4. The government is not aware that Mr. Morrow has large interests in mercantile concerns in Prince Rupert.

5. The government is not aware that he owns or partly owns a cannery and sawmill or either in that part of British Columbia.

6. B. R. McDonald's rank was formerly changed from collector of customs at Rossland, British Columbia, to that of a customs officer at Prince Rupert, by order in council of 4th April, 1908. He is the second officer at the port of Prince Rupert.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked :

1. What was the total expenditure of the Geological Survey Department in 1896, and each of the folowing years up to the present time?

2. When was the mining branch of the Geological Department opened, and what amount has been expended each year in the mines branch?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Mines) :

1.

Year	Total
1896-97	$116,983 31
1897-98	106,904 12
1898-99	113,510 01
1899-1900	112,824 47
1900-1901	113,377 64
1901-1902	117,586 44
1902-1903	129,553 09
1903-1904	127,384 61
1904-1905	170,082 97
1905-1906	168,376 64
1906-1907 (9 months)	145,582 15
1907-1908 to March 31	204,280 43

2. There is no mining branch of the Geological survey ; but the Mines branch of the Department of Mines was opened 3rd May, 1907, and the expenditure has been :

1907-08 to March 31	34,255 00

IMMIGRATION HALL, EAST SELKIRK.

Mr. STAPLES asked :

1. What furniture, stoves, supplies, cattle, hogs, horses and other effects were attached to the immigration hall at East Selkirk?

2. Has any or all of these effects been disposed of ? If so, how, by public or private sale?

3. Who disposed of them, and what were the receipts from sale?

4. What has become of the hall, or is it still owned by the government

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

A report is being obtained from the commissioner of immigration at Winnipeg in this relation. It will be brought down as soon as received. The information however is voluminous and I would ask that it be brought down in the form of a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as a notice of motion for a return.

PLAYGREEN LAKE

Mr. STAPLES asked :

1. Is the government aware that the lessees of the waters north of lake Winnipeg, including Playgreen lake, have not made the expenditure called for under such lease?
2. Is it the intention of the government to cancel the lease?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. No, the reports show that a greater expenditure has been incurred than was called for by the lease. Playgreen lake is not under lease from the Department of Marine and Fisheries.
2. So far as reports have been received the conditions of the lease are being carried out ; but the department is procuring further information on the subject.

STEAMER 'LADY OF THE LAKE.'

Mr. STAPLES asked :

1. How many of the crew of the government steamer 'Lady of the Lake' are under pay during the winter, who are they, and what positions do they hold on said boat?
2. What salaries do they get during summer season, what do they get during winter, and what are their duties?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Three : Alex. Vance, master ; Wm. Simpson, mate; Robert Rennie, engineer.
2. Summer salaries ; master, $100 per month; mate, $65 per month; engineer, $85 per month.

Winter salaries; master, $50 per month; mate, $32.50 per month; engineer, $42.50 per month.

Duties in summer comprise all the work they are called upon to perform in their respective positions.

In winter such officers are held under half pay subject to the call of the department for duty at any moment.

COLD STORAGE SHIPMENTS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked :

What was the total number of boxes of cheese, butter, eggs, bacon, apples in boxes and barrels, respectively, shipped in cold storage, the number in cooled air chambers, and the number shipped in ordinary storage in twelve months previous to March 1, 1908?

Mr. STAPLES.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). The trade and navigation returns do not show separately the products carried in cold storage, cooled air or ordinary stowage.

The following figures have been compiled from the reports of the cargo inspectors employed by the Department of Agriculture during the period of navigation at Montreal and Quebec, for the season of 1907 :

—	In cold storage.	In cooled Air.	In ordinary stowage.
Cheese, boxes	.....	290,076	1,721,569
Butter, packages	66,896	52	.....
Meats, boxes, Canadian	2,858	29,071	25,982
" " U. S. A.	33,707	11,615	127,119
Beef, quarters, U. S. A.	4,991	.....	.....
Lard, packages, Canadian	.....	.....	1,040
" " U. S. A.	19,635	6,711	403,489
Apples, bbls., Canadian	6,131	1,729	634,780
" boxes, "	500	3,232	25,240
" bbls., U. S. A.	.....	.....	24,701
" boxes, "	.....	796	.....
Tender fruits, boxes, Canadian.	754	.....	87
" " U. S. A.	11,118	.....	.....
Eggs, cases, Canadian	.....	938	24,249
" U. S. A.	1,436	.....	.....

The proportion of products carried in cooled air was really much larger than what is shown in these figures, because only those shipments on which the extra freight was paid are included. Many shipments were carried in cooled air at ordinary rates, but in such cases they are shown on the ship's papers as ordinary cargo.

There are no figures available to show the proportion of the various products carried in cold storage, cooled air and ordinary stowage since the close of navigation in the St. Lawrence, but it may be stated that practically everything is carried in ordinary stowage during the winter months.

MAIL ROUTE TENDERS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked :

1. Are all mail routes let by tender? If not, why not?
2. Were tenders called for the carrying of mail on the route between Brewster post office, in South Huron, and Park Hill, in North Middlesex?
3. If tenders were called for on above route, what was the date of last tender, and when will said tender expire?
4. What was the date of the previous tender, and to whom were the tenders sent?
5. What was the amount of each contract, the names of each tenderer, and the amount in each case?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. Tenders are invited for all services costing more than $200 per annum. The

Postmaster General has power under the provisions of the Postal Act to enter into contracts for amounts less than $200 without calling for tenders. When the price was reasonable and it was in the public interest to do so this has sometimes been done, but even in these cases tenders are called for unless it is shown to the department that the price at which it is offered to perform the service is reasonable and reason exists in the public interests why the contract should be arranged without delay. Expiring contracts, the prices of which have been determined by public tender, are also open to renewal if as a result of the inspector's report the Postmaster General is satisfied that the amounts at which the services are being performed are reasonable and as low as would likely be secured if tenders were called for, and that the services of the contractors have been satisfactory.

2. Yes, tenders were invited in June, 1900. Only one tender was received that of Maxim Gratton at $500. This was considered by the department excessive and the inspector at London was instructed to secure lower offers, with the result that a contract was awarded to John Ravelle at $300 per annum from the 1st October, 1900. This contract has since, in view of the satisfactory manner in which it was performed, and in view of the fact that the contract price represented $200 less than the offer secured by public tender, been renewed for four years on the 1st of July, 1904, and also from the 1st of July, 1908. In both cases the inspector reported to the Postmaster General that the service was being satisfactorily performed, and that the price was reasonable.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4. Notices inviting tenders were posted in all the post offices on the route, and in the principal places of business in the district served.

5. Answered by No. 2.

POST OFFICE RETURNS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked :

How many returns have been asked for since the opening of parliament requiring an answer from the Post Office Department?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). Eleven returns have so far been asked of this department since the opening of parliament. Of this number eight have already been answered.

MILITIA SUPPLIES.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

1. Has a contract been made for groceries and provisions for the active militia at Halifax for the current year? If so, were tenders called for?

2. Who were the tenderers for bacon, what were their offers, what is the price in the current contract, and with whom has this contract been made?

3. Who got the contract last year and the year before?

4. At what price did he agree to supply breakfast bacon?

5. Has the department received information that the bacon furnished was not breakfast bacon, but shoulder or roll bacon?

6. If so, was any action taken to ascertain the truth of that statement?

7. Had the department an offer to supply roll bacon for the current year? If so, from whom and at what price?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence) :

1. (a). Yes. (b). Tenders were called by newspaper advertisement.

2. No tenders for bacon separately were called for. The custom of the department is to make a contract for groceries and vegetables, including bacon. Only one tender was received for groceries and vegetables, that of Mr. J. F. Outhit. His prices were : for breakfast bacon, 13¼ cents per pound ; green bacon 7 cents yer pound.

Messrs. Davis and Fraser submitted a tender for bacon and lard only, on the form of tender for groceries and vegetables ; the prices being, for breakfast bacon, 12 7-8 ; for green bacon, 11¾. To their tender was attached a letter quoting 10⅝ cents per pound for shoulder, or rolled bacon, smoked; and 10 cents per pound for shoulder or rolled bacon, green.

The contract for groceries and vegetables, including bacon, was made with Mr. J. F. Outhit ; the prices for bacon being those specified in his tender, as above.

3. Mr. J. F. Outhit.

4. In 1906, 14 cents, in 1907, 13¾ cents.

5. In letters received from Messrs. Davis and Fraser, rival dealers, the opinion was expressed that rolled bacon was being supplied, instead of English breakfast bacon.

6. No action was necessary as no complaint from the supply officer was received by the department.

7. (a). Yes. (b). See answer No. 2.

GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS IN POLITICS.

Mr. CROCKET asked :

1. Has the Minister of Customs received any communication complaining of the active participation of Mr. P. G. Veniot, collector of customs at Bathurst, in the late provincial election in Gloucester county, New Brunswick?

2. If so, in what manner and to what extent was it complained that Mr. Veniot engaged in said election?

3. What action has the minister taken, or what action does he propose to take, in the matter?

4. What is the salary of the said collector?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Complaint has been received against

Mr. P. J. Veniot, collector of customs at Bathurst, as to active participation in the recent provincial election in Gloucester, N. B. Mr. Veniot has been advised of the complaint, and his explanation requested. His salary is $1,100 a year.

DREDGING AT WIARTON.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Who were the parties who tendered for dredging done at Wiarton in 1907?
2. What proportions or quantities of clay, sand, and boulders were in the estimates for which $25,026 was paid to Mr. Bowman at Wiarton in 1907?
3. Was the request of the council of Wiarton for said work verbal or in writing?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. A. F. Bowman and C. S. Boone.
2. Clay, 115,800 cubic yards ; clay and sand, 5,800 ; clay and boulders, 2,200 ; boulders, 400, ; total, 124,200 cubic yards.
3. In writing.

THE SOULANGES CANAL.

Mr. BERGERON—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. Was an investigation held on the Soulanges canal? If so, when, where, and for what reason?
2. Who was the commissioner?
3. How many witnesses were examined?
4. What is the cost of the investigation?
5. What is the report, if any?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. Yes, at Vaudreuil, on account of certain charges made against the overseer.
2. Mr. Louis Boyer, advocate of Montreal, was appointed commissioner, by order in council, dated 5th March, 1908.
3. No report has yet been received from the commissioner.

THE 'LABOUR GAZETTE.'

Mr. BERGERON—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

1. Where has the 'Labour Gazette' been printed in English and French since its existence?
2. What is the cost of such printing?
3. What is the cost of the 'Labour Gazette' altogether?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. The 'Labour Gazette' from the date of its establishment has been printed in Englisn and French by the Printing Bureau or by arrangements made by the Printing Bureau. From April, 1906, the 'Labour Gazette' has been printed at the office of the Ottawa 'Free Press.'
2. Cost of printing and paper.

	English.	French.
1901-2..	$6,564 87	$3,058 47
1902-3..	7,094 77	3,344 44
1903-4..	9,034 22	4,628 39
1904-5..	8,886 99	5,033 15
1905-6..	8,939 98	4,781 19
1906-7 (9 months).	7,374 78	3,583 22
1907-8 (Dec., 1907)	8,576 12	3,673 56

3. There are at the present time forty-eight correspondents of the 'Labour Gazette' representing the various industrial centres of Canada who send monthly reports relating to the industrial conditions of their respective districts, the state of the labour market, changes in wages and hours, and other matters of particular interest to the industrial world generally ; these correspondents receive $100 each per annum. There is one legal correspondent who reports each month the judicial decisions, relating to labour matters, and who receives a salary of $300 per annum. A translator receives $1,200. These sums are to be added to the figures representing the cost of printing and paper. It is difficult to state, precisely the cost of production under other heads, namely, editorial services, mailing, proof reading, typewriting, &c., this work being performed by various officials of the department in conjunction with their other duties.

CANADA-FRANCE STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Bill (No. 145) to amend the Act relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies—Mr. Brodeur—read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it to be paid $100,000 or $200,000 ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We will undertake to pay $100,000 for eighteen trips, being at the rate of $5,555 per trip. If it makes other trips. the company is to be paid at the same ratio for the increased number, but the total payment is not to exceed $200,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What regulations will be put in the contract regarding freight rates and cold storage?

Mr. BRODEUR. This subsidy is based on a contract passed some years ago. The government proposes to require that cold storage facilities be established on this line. That is also provided by the contract about to expire. As regards freight rates, we intend proposing that they should be under the control of the government. I do not know whether the company will agree to that, but it is the intention of the government to try to get that clause put into the contract. It is proposed, however, that the freight rates shall not be higher between a Canadian and a French port than between an American and a French port. The government intend exacting this clause, and in that respect the contract will be a departure from the others, because there is no such

provision in any contract made so far with any company subsidized by the government.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the rate of speed?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think in the old contract no rate of speed was provided and it is not in this.

Mr. SPROULE. Practically we have no definite information. We are told that there will be cold storage, but we are not told what kind or how much. When we ask about freight rates, we are told that they will not be higher than the rates between France and Boston. That is very indefinite. The rate of speed, we are told, is something to be agreed on later. In fact, we are not given any information at all.

Mr. BRODEUR. The cold storage facilities are to be absolutely under the control of the government and to be provided as required by the Department of Trade and Commerce. That was the provision in the old contract, and I do not anticipate any difficulty on that score. All shipping companies are interested in having cold storage facilities on their steamers. This line will have to carry butter and cheese and there is no reason why it should not furnish proper cold storage facilities. As regards the rate of speed, it is provided in the contract what time shall be taken on each voyage. I think it is eleven or twelve days.

Mr. MONK. When this question came up the other day, I was not opposed to the principle of our having direct communication with France. Does my hon. friend not remember that?

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend said he was not opposed to the subsidy, but he proposed an amendment to provide that the freight rates should be under the control of the government.

Mr. MONK. I am glad to have this admission of the hon. minister because a statement was made in his Montreal organ——

Mr. BRODEUR. Have I an organ?

Mr. MONK. I believe so. The statement was made in it that Col. Hughes and Dr. Sproule with Mr. Monk opposed altogether the idea of having direct communication by steamship with France. I am glad to take note of the minister's admission that there was no opposition offered to the principle of having such communication. What ground has he for anticipating that we will do a good business with France in butter and cheese? The French export a great deal of butter, and my hon. friend knows that there is no market there for the cheese we make here.

Mr. BRODEUR. With regard to cheese, I was told, when in France in connection with the negotiation of the treaty, that quantities of cheese were consumed in France supposed to have been produced in Canada. This cheese was sent to England, warehoused there and afterwards sent to France. This was the statement made to me several times, and those who gave me the information led me to believe that it was absolutely correct, and I had every reason to believe that they were well informed. As to butter, my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) knows that this line of steamers will run not only between Canada and France, but to England as well. Last year, considerable quantities of butter and cheese were exported by this line, especially butter to London. And I do not see why this should not be done.

Mr. MONK. There is no doubt that the line may be used to export butter to England; but I understood the minister (Mr. Brodeur) to say that he wanted to insist on cold storage because there was to be an export of butter from Canada to France. The exporters of butter in Montreal will tell the minister, that, under the present conditions, there is no probability of our exporting butter to France.

Mr. BRODEUR. There may be some trade in salt butter.

Mr. MONK. There may be a little, but not much. I do not question his statement that he received the information as to cheese of which he has told us. But I do not think he will be able to substantiate the statement that our cheese, which is exported to England in large quantities, finds its way to France. I would like to ask why the hon. minister intends making it a condition that the freight rates on this line shall be subject to the American rates. Can he give us any idea what the rates are between American ports and Le Havre?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think there is any fixed rule; the rates vary according to the circumstances and the time of year. But I understand that those who engaged in negotiations with the government on this subject were willing to undertake that the freight rates should not be higher between Canada and France than between the United States ports and France.

Mr. SPROULE. Which reminds one of the Irishman, who, when asked his age, said he was the same age as his brother Mike—both were born in the same month. It has always been understood that those taking advantage of the cold storage were charged so much above the regular freight rates, and thus one could judge pretty accurately whether the exporter would be inclined to ship in cold storage. So, the two elements must be taken into account, first, whether the cold storage is adequate in every respect and kept in proper condition, and, second, whether the rates are so low that the method of shipment will be used. The information given to the House by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) in answer to a question went to show that, in shipping apples to

England, only a few thousand barrels were sent in cold storage while a great many thousand barrels were sent by the ordinary means. And so with eggs and butter. It must be, therefore, that either the cold storage is not adequate or not kept in proper condition, or the rates must be too high for the ordinary shipper to use the cold storage system. Without information on these points, we cannot very well know what return we are likely to get for this subsidy. We are granting $5,000 for each trip. What for? Not merely for the purpose of establishing a steamship line between here and France but to develop trade. But trade can only be developed by providing suitable transportation at reasonable figures. I think the government should have been in a position to give the House the information we are asking, so that we might be able to judge whether or not we are likely to get any substantial return from this expenditure. Up to the present time we have failed to get any information, as far as I can see.

Mr. HENDERSON. I find, from the trade and navigation returns that neither butter nor cheese is exported from Canada direct to France. It is possible that cheese may have been sent to the United States or to England and thence to France, but in that case, Canada would not get credit for it.

Mr. BRODEUR. My information is that the cheese was exported to Britain and thence to France.

Mr. HENDERSON. However, nothing in these lines seems to have been exported direct to France. Now, I would like to ask what advantage will imports into Canada have if brought in by this subsidized line? We understand, from the discussion we had the other evening, that Canadian goods, to secure the advantage of the minimum tariff to France must be exported directly, or if they go, for instance, through England to France, they must go direct by the vessel and in unbroken bulk from the British port. Will goods imported from France into Canada have to come the same way? Suppose they were sent through England, or through the United States, will they get the benefit of Canada's intermediate tariff? Or will the government, in that case, insist upon the general tariff?

Mr. BRODEUR. If the goods are imported from France direct, of course, there will be no doubt about it. If the goods are imported through England to Canada, the rates will be the same—that is, the rate under the treaty will apply. Suppose that goods are sent from France to some British port, Liverpool for example, and thence from Liverpool to Canada. These will be subject to the duty provided in the treaty. If, under the treaty, they enjoy the benefit of the intermediate tariff, they will be dutiable under the intermediate tariff. If they belong to the class coming under the most reduced rates, what we call schedule C, they will be liable to the duty mentioned in that schedule.

Mr. HENDERSON. Assuming that silk goods, for example, are exported from France to London, are repacked by a London dealer, and the Canadian purchases them through the London dealer. The goods come from France to London, they are packed and sent to Canada, what would be the tariff under which they would come into Canada? Would it be the intermediate tariff?

Mr. FIELDING. They would come under the treaty, provided satisfactory proof of origin was furnished. If they could prove that these goods, although sent from Great Britain, were French goods and of the class mentioned in the treaty, they would be entitled to the benefits of the tariff when shipped from Great Britain.

Mr. BRODEUR. The goods will have to be imported direct, whether from France or from a country enjoying the benefits of the preferential tariff. I think those are the words of the treaty.

Mr. MONK. Then we are in this position, that we give a great advantage to France.

Mr. FIELDING. In what respect?

Mr. MONK. In this respect, that we cannot ship from England to France at all after transhipment, whereas the French can ship here through London. In the case of silks, goods can be transhipped, repacked, and after an interval sent to Canada, and get the benefit of the special list under the treaty, and no article that we ship to France through Liverpool, even if transhipment takes place on our part, can benefit by the treaty. Surely that is not possible.

Mr. FIELDING. That is quite possible, but we thought it desirable that French goods coming here by way of Great Britain should receive the benefits of the treaty.

Mr. MONK. Why not give us the same advantage?

Mr. FIELDING. Because the French government, by their national law, will not do so. They have the right by their law of imposing the surtax, and all we, in our wisis to put in a proviso that if we, in our wisdom, wish to impose the surtax we can do so. We have not deemed it advisable to do so. If we want to put ourselves on even terms with our French friends, we may do so by imposing a surtax, because we have put this proviso in the treaty:

> Provided, however, that nothing in this article shall exempt the products of either country from any surtaxe d'entrepôt that is now, or hereafter may be, imposed on products imported indirectly.

The French authorities impose a surtax; if we wanted to be on even terms with them

we can impose a surtax. Up to the present we have not thought it advisable to do so.

Mr. MONK. The Minister of Finance is always telling us what the French law is. We have a law too, and we have broken that law when we made the treaty; we have altered our law in order to make the treaty with France. Why did not my hon. friend tell them that we never impose a surtax, that we raised our taxation in an entirely different manner, and that we could not easily resort to that form of taxation. When nations meet together in order to conclude treaties, those treaties are supposed to supersede the law ; favours are granted mutually and the law is changed to that extent. In this case I did not think that the French could send their goods to London or any port in England, and then those goods might come out here at any time on proof of origin and get the benefit of that treaty. We are bound down ; we cannot transhipp through England in any way, and we have to subsidize a steamship line in consequence. I did not think, when there was such a demonstration in honour of the Minister of Finance, and a still larger demonstration in honour of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that things were as bad as that.

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot agree with my hon. friend when he says that the law has been broken. There has been no law broken.

Mr. MONK. We have changed our tariff law.

Mr. FIELDING. We have not broken any law. A proposal was made to amend the law in precisely the same way as we propose to amend any other law, and when the Senate and Commons of Canada decide to amend the tariff law as proposed, then and not till then will this take effect. Therefore there is no breaking of the law. That is the first point. The second point was, that we should have told the French authorities that we did not impose anything like a surtax. Well, we could not tell the French authorities that, because the statement would be untrue. We do impose surtaxes in Canada, but my hon. friend I suppose forgot that at the moment. Now, the only difference between the position of the two countries is this, that it suits the purpose of the national law of France to establish a surtax under the conditions which have been spoken of ; it does not suit Canada to impose a surtax under those circumstances. But we have reserved the right to impose that surtax if we want to do it. If we think it will do us any good to require those goods to come direct from a French port to Montreal or any other Canadian port, rather than by way of Great Britain, all we have to do is to exercise the right that we have reserved to ourselves in this treaty and impose the surtax. If the surtax is not imposed in Canada, it is not because we have given up the right to impose it, but because, in our judgment, from a Canadian point of view, it has not so far seemed desirable. So I fail to see the point of my hon. friend's observations. If we want to put ourselves on exactly even terms with France, the parliament of Canada has the right to do so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems to me the observations of the Minister of Finance are not to answer to the remarks of my hon friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). The real point of the argument made by my hon. friend has not been met at all. It is this : All treaties of this kind are designed to effect a certain change in the fiscal laws of both countries, that is the object in view when you begin negotiations for a treaty. Therefore, it is not an answer to my hon. friend for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to say that the French law is so and so. Our law was of the same character until we made this treaty, and proposed to sanction that treaty by Act of this parliament. Therefore it is merely begging the question to say that the French law is so and so. Our law would equally have prevented this entry if it remained as it was. The whole point of the observations and arguments of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier is this : The treaty is designed to encourage commerce from Canada to France and from France to Canada ; it is designed to assist France by giving her a certain market for certain of her products in Canada; it is designed to assist Canada by giving her a market for certain of her products in France. The question as to whether these improved markets will be found in either country depends largely on the question of transportation. As the matter has been left by this treaty, France enjoys the privilege and advantage of sending her goods by the numerous steamship lines which ply between Great Britain and Canada, whereas Canada does not enjoy the advantage of sending her goods to France by the same steamship lines. That is the whole matter, as it seems to me, in a nutshell. Under the terms of this treaty, a decided advantage is left on the side of France in that respect.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is entirely wrong. The government, by the terms of this treaty, have done nothing of the sort, on the contrary the government, by the terms of this treaty, have specifically the right to impose a surtax if we want to impose it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are you going to impose it ?

Mr. FIELDING. I have no hesitation in saying that that is a question for the future and that is a matter in the judgment of parliament. If we should in the future impose the surtax on goods coming from France by way of Great Britain then the two things would be equal. If we do not

impose the surtax on goods coming from Great Britain it is not because we have not the right to do it, it is not because we are under any obligation to the French government not to do it, but it is because we do not think it expedient to do it. But, since the French government say that it is part of their national law which they cannot change, we take the precaution to say that if at any time in the future we want to make it a part of our national law we shall have the right to do so, and that the treaty shall not be a barrier to it. It seems to me very simple.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is very simple indeed, and the simplicity amounts to this that while France will be enjoying the benefit and advantage of a dozen steamship lines by which she can send her goods to this country we shall get the advantage of only one steamship line—the one contemplated by this Act—and all the consolation that our shippers and producers can enjoy will be the knowledge that this government has the right to impose the surtax which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance admits he has absolutely no intention of imposing at any time in the immediate future. What is the policy of the government in regard to this surtax? Have they any policy at all in regard to it? If they intend to exercise that right in future under what conditions and upon what grounds and for what reasons will they do so? If the Minister of Finance declares, as he does declare, that this country enjoys some advantage by the reservation of that right, under the terms of the treaty, under what conditions do they propose to exercise it? My hon. friend argues that he has secured this right. Then under what conditions does he propose to exercise it? I do not think my hon. friend will desire this question to be put to him by the shippers and producers of Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. I do desire it. I do not think the question has any appropriateness at all. In the first place, may I suggest, that we are not discussing the treaty and if it were such a vital and important point as my hon. friend has suddenly conceived it to be might it not have been his duty to have raised that question when the treaty was before parliament? However, I do not attach any importance to that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It was raised.

Mr. FIELDING. I say again that if my hon. friend thinks it is the part of wisdom for us to shut out English goods, or French goods coming by way of England, we have the power to do it. My hon. friend asks what is the policy of the government in this matter. If the government had a proposal to make on the subject it would be their duty to expound and proclaim it. As they have no proposal to make they are not called upon to expound or proclaim any thing about it. However, I will answer my hon. friend. He wants to know what the policy is. The policy at the present time is not to impose any surtax. Is that clear? It is a little late for my hon. friend to wake up to the importance of this question. He allows the treaty to go through and now he comes to something in it that he never heard of before. I do not think my hon. friend is so dense on the subject as he appears to be.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I hope I am not as dense as the Minister of Finance seems to be. As a matter of fact the surtax was discussed in the debate of the French treaty. I do not think the hon. gentleman is accurate when he says that it was not discussed. It may not have been gone into exactly on the same line but it certainly was discussed if my recollection is correct. The hon. gentleman has very frankly declared his policy; it is that he has reserved a right, which he regards as sufficient compensation for the certain right that he has given to France, and that having reserved that right he has no policy with regard to its exercise.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, he has.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is it?

Mr. FIELDING. It is for the present not to exercise it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is what I say.

Mr. FIELDING. No, that is not what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, let us take it at that then. He has reserved the right as compensation for certain advantages which he has given France and it is his policy not to exercise the right which he has so reserved as compensation. I am very much obliged to the hon. gentleman for the statement.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman is quite welcome to it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It may be a consoling circumstance to the shippers and producers of this country to know that having given France a certain advantage and having reserved a certain power as compensation for that advantage the policy of the government is not to exercise it.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is very much alarmed about the shippers of this country but it may surprise him to know that no shipper has raised a question such as that to which he alludes. I do not know of a shipper in this country who will regard it as any advantage that we should impose the surtax and shut off importation from England.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not talking about shutting off importation from England at all. I am talking about the right which should have been obtained of sending goods to France by the steamship lines which bring goods to this country. We will have a dozen steamship lines bringing goods from France to this country but we will have only one line taking goods to France.

Mr. FIELDING. If we do not want a dozen steamship lines bringing goods to this country this parliament has the right or power to cut off eleven of them at any time that we think it wise to do so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But this parliament could not get the other eleven steamship lines to carry the goods of our shippers and producers to France.

Mr. FIELDING. When my hon. friend talks about insisting upon making arrangements which are at variance with the well known laws of France, and which they will not change, the hon. gentleman ought to know that he is talking very absurdly. This question of the surtax is part of the national law of France. If we do not wish to make a treaty under those conditions we need not do so but we must make our treaty with France with a recognition of the fact that they are attached to that principle and that they will not change it.

Mr. MONK. Of course the imposition of a surtax by Canada at the present moment, when we have just concluded a treaty with France, is such a preposterous and ridiculous idea that I quite understand the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) declaring the policy of the government to be that they will not do it. In what position do we find this question ? In the first place I would remind the Minister of Finance that when the treaty was discussed these matters were gone into. The question of shipment through England at that time was discussed and although objection was taken to it I must confess that I never understood that French shippers had such an immense advantage over us. What is the position as I find it now ? We went to France and we insisted on direct shipment. There is no question about that ; it was admitted the other day. We insisted that in order to benefit by the treaty goods should be shipped direct from one country to the other and then, without asking for any assistance from France, we took the responsibility of the payment of $200,000 a year to help that direct shipment without having the advantage of shipment through England or of the lines of steamers that come from England to Canada. The result is that our own shippers are met by a formidable question of monopoly. Without competition we are bound to ship direct to France. One would suppose from what the Minister of Finance says that the surtax law of France forms part of the constitution of the country. It is like our own laws; we changed our law in order to include this treaty and they changed theirs.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, they changed their constitution, but not their commercial law.

Mr. MONK. They did not change their constitution but they changed their tariff law as against ourselves. The law with respect to the surtax is not in the constitution of the French Republic. That law, like another, simply applies to shipments through European ports and the object of it is to protect France from undue competition from European shipping. Why cannot they allow us to ship through England since we allow them to ship through England, why cannot they modify their law to that extent. On the question of shipments, it seems to irritate the Minister of Finance that the Canadian plenipotentiaries have been outdone, and I am not surprised that Mr. Pichon speaking in the French Chamber seemed to speak like a man who had triumphed over our negotiators.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend must have had in mind the negotiators of the earlier treaty which permitted just the condition which he has attributed to this treaty. Under the old treaty our goods could only be sent direct to France just as under the present treaty. There is no new condition in that. The present treaty as respects shipments of goods to France is precisely the same as the former treaty which my hon. friend admired so much. But now in this treaty we have made it reciprocal. It was one sided under the old condition of affairs and now it is made reciprocal. Under the former treaty we were obliged to send our goods direct and they now can only send their goods direct from France, or by way of England so long as we see fit to allow it. They cannot send via the United States. There the principle of the non-European country comes in. I point out again that as respects the shipment of Canadian goods to France there is substantially no change. The law which has been in force for the last fifteen years is the law which continues in this treaty, but as respects the other side of the question we say that as whereas formerly they would have the right to send goods out here through any country and get the benefit of the treaty, they must now send them either direct or by way of Great Britain, and if we want to put a limitation as respects Great Britain we have the right to do it. My hon. friend will therefore see that the one-sidedness which he speaks of existed in the old treaty but is not to be found in the new one.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not understand the Minister of Finance when he says that

goods from France cannot be shipped through the United States. I am not aware of any such restriction so far as I can read the treaty. They may ship through Hamburg, through London, through Liverpool, or through Hong Kong, or through the United States if they think fit.

Mr. BRODEUR. If goods were shipped from Germany would my hon. friend say they will enjoy the benefit of the intermediate tariff ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not discussing that feature of it at all. I am discussing the feature of the treaty which gives to the public of France all the privileges and gives us comparatively none. In that way I think the French negotiators have got the best of the deal. Now, in order to get the advantage of the minimum tariff with France we are called upon to provide direct connection between France and Canada, and on the other hand France is not obliged to export directly to Canada. Should the Minister of Marine and Fisheries go to a steamship company and say: I want to make an arrangement with you to give you a subsidy to carry goods direct from Canada to France in order that they will get the advantage of the minimum tariff, it would be very natural for that steamship company to ask: What return cargo will we get? and the minister would have to answer: We cannot guarantee you any return cargo because we failed to insist that the French republic should send their goods direct to Canada; they may send them via the United States, they may send them by Great Britain or any other route they may think fit. Had we insisted upon direct shipments coming to Canada the same as respects goods going from Canada to France it would have been a very important matter when we come to arrange for the subsidy which we are obliged to arrange for in order to get this direct exportation. To my mind that is where we are going to sustain the greatest loss. I fear we will have to grant a larger subsidy to convey our goods directly to France to get the advantage of the minimum tariff simply because we cannot assure the steamship company that under the treaty they will get any return cargo whatever. However, there is no use discussing it now; it is all signed, sealed and delivered, it was all completed before ever it came before the House. All we can do now is to criticise the acts of the ministers who negotiated the treaty in the hope that if they ever have to negotiate another we may be able to give them some light as to how they can get better advantages for Canada, and not allow the other country to get all the advantages. We do not expect we are going to make the treaty any better now, we are simply pointing out what we regard as oversights on the part of the negotiators and to show that in negotiating this treaty they have not got all the advantages we think ought to reasonably accrue to Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. The desire of my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) to divert attention from the inequalities of the old treaty——

Mr. HENDERSON. Excuse me, I made no reference to the old treaty whatever. I see no advantage in discussing the merits or demerits of the old treaty because it is a thing of the past and we are repealing it. If the negotiators of the old treaty made a mistake the present negotiators should have taken a lesson from it and made a much better treaty. For them to say they have got something just as good as we had before, is no argument whatever.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman is a veteran member of the House and he was here no doubt in 1893 and 1894 and gave enthusiastic support to that old treaty. I do not see why he should now have a disposition to repudiate it and say he is not responsible. So far as direct shipments of Canadian products to France go the provisions in this treaty are just the same as they were in the old treaty. The only change that is made is that that which was one sided before is now reciprocal and that the French products which formerly could come to Canada through any channel in the wide world must now come either direct from France to Canada or by way of Great Britain. We are willing to have them come by way of Great Britain and if hon. gentlemen opposite think that is a mistake we disagree with them. But if at any future time, for any reason, the parliament of Canada should desire to change its policy in that respect, then we take the precaution that the treaty should not stand in the way, and that we should put in the reservation that if at any time in the future it might be deemed expedient to impose the surtax on the goods coming by way of Great Britain we have the right to do so and the treaty will not stand in the way. The only difference between the old treaty and the new on the question of direct shipment is that while the provision in the old treaty was unequal and one-sided and against Canada, it is now reciprocal and as fair to Canada as it is to France. But there is another and broader question involved in this with regard to these negotiators having been over-reached. The least we could ask from my hon. friends is that they should have some regard for the very able negotiators who conducted the previous treaty, and what do we find they provide ? They provided that a certain limited list of Canadian products—some of them important, some of them trifling—should be entitled to the French market. Then they provided that as respects that limited list—canned meats, condensed foods, eels, fish, lobsters, &c.—if as respects the items on that limited list France should at any time grant conces-

sions to other countries, like concessions should come to Canada. That is the application of the favoured nation principle, but it is applied only to the limited list of articles mentioned in the treaty. France gives Canada the right to send these articles in, and if it should at any time grant to any other country the right to send these articles in on better terms, Canada shall likewise have that right. So far so good. Then turn to the other side. You talk of one-sided agreements and of the negotiators being over-reached. Read the article of the old treaty :

Any commercial advantage granted by Canada to any third power, especially in tariff matters, shall be enjoyed fully by France, Algeria and the French colonies.

Canada was only to get favoured-nation treatment on a small list of articles ; but when you turn to the other side, you find that Canada was bound to give France favoured-nation treatment in any commercial or tariff matter whatever. Not making the conditions reciprocal by limiting them to a number of articles in each case, you were placed in this position, that you were assured of favoured-nation treatment in France only on a small list of articles, while you agreed to give favoured-nation treatment to France, not on a limited list, but on every article that entered into the commerce of Canada. By the new treaty, Canada gives to France favoured-nation treatment as respects a list of articles mentioned in the treaty, and France gives to Canada favoured-nation treatment as respects a list of articles mentioned in the treaty. The treatment is reciprocal ; the one-sided condition which existed before is swept away.

Mr. HENDERSON. I had expected that the hon. Minister of Finance would have replied to my criticism with regard to our inability to secure the best treatment from a steamship company to convey our goods to France, from the fact that we were not in a position to offer any return cargo because of the benefits obtained from this treaty. I thought that was what the hon. minister would reply to ; but instead of that he has followed the old custom of beating around the bush and getting a thousand miles away from the point in order to draw a red herring across the trail. I congratulate the hon. gentleman upon his adroitness ; perhaps he has no equal in this House in meeting an argument in that way. But I would like to know whether the Minister of Marine, when he negotiates with a steamship company, will be likely to obtain accommodation on as favourable terms as he would have done had the treaty compelled France to send her goods to Canada in the same direct way as we are compelled to send our goods to France. That was where I thought the negotiators were somewhat lame. I repeat that if they saw errors in the old treaty, if after some thirteen or fourteen years they found some things that had been overlooked, they would have been perfectly right in taking advantage of that, and we might reasonably have expected that a much better treaty would be negotiated now. Perhaps France, having had a small taste of the advantage of reciprocity with Canada, would have been willing to concede something that she did not concede before. I notice that the Minister of Finance was very particular to say that for the present there was no intention of Canada imposing a surtax, although Canada had reserved the right to do so. Why did he use the words for the present ? Was it because he had in contemplation the imposition of a surtax at some time in the future ? I am not going to say that he would make a mistake, because I do not feel that I would be justified in making such a suggestion to him with his large experience. On our goods going into France we get the advantage of the minimum tariff, but we only get it on a restricted list, and to get it we have to send our goods direct and pay a large sum of money to get them in ; or, if we send them via England, we can only do so under special restrictions. The minister may have it in contemplation to say to the French people, we will impose a surtax unless you remove these restrictions or unless you remove your surtaxe d'entrepôt.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that the treaty stands in this position. We want some advantages in the French market ; the French people want some advantages in our market. They say to us, you can have the same advantage in our market that we have in yours, providing you pay a subsidy to get your goods sent to France ; but there is no obligation resting on us to pay any consideration in order to get the advantages of your market. The arrangement seems to be jug-handled in its nature all through. France has the single advantage of a monopoly. We have to pay for the advantage of getting into their market, whereas they do not pay for the advantage of getting into ours.

Mr. MONK. Is it not possible that the French, in shipping to Canada, having the advantage of ten or twelve competing lines to England, which we have not, may obtain such reductions of freight on this direct line through that competition, and may recoup themselves completely for the sacrifices they have made by the tariff concessions in the treaty itself.

Mr. BRODEUR. If France has several lines of steamships, it is because the French government spend a good deal more money than we do in the way of subsidies. It has been suggested several times that this is going to entail an expenditure of $200,000 and that besides we are going to lose $400,000 of revenue. I thought this $400,000 was going to be a reduction of taxation to the

people of this country, so that instead of losing, we are going to gain $200,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If that is a fair way of looking at it, the minister could secure the country still greater advantages by removing the taxes from all goods entering into Canada from France; that would be the logical conclusion of his argument. The observations made by gentlemen on this side of the House point strongly to the necessity of having some proper control of the rates. The rates on goods coming from France to Canada will be regulated by the competition of a dozen steamship lines. It is not correct, as the minister says, that this treaty provides that goods shipped from France via Great Britain shall come to Canada without any surtax. The provision is simply that goods may come via any country enjoying the intermediate or preferential tariff; there is no direct reference to Great Britain. If Italy, or Germany, or Norway or any other country were granted the advantages of the intermediate tariff, the same advantages in the way of shipment would accrue to that country as accrue at the present time to Great Britain. It is not strictly accurate therefore to put it in the way the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) did just now. But if you have a dozen lines from the British Isles to Canada competing with the one direct line now subsidized, that must affect the freight rates from France to Canada. If on the other hand you have only one direct line from Canada to France which can carry goods enjoying the benefit of the minimum tariff, you will not have that competition, and the result might be that shippers from France to Canada would enjoy lower freight rates on this line than shippers from Canada to France. That seems to emphasize the necessity for some control over the rates, and I trust the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or the Minister of Trade and Commerce, or whoever has to do with this contract, will bear that in mind.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no doubt very good reason why we should try and get some control over the rates and it is the intention of the government to ask for it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The government are not in the same position with regard to this as the Minister of Finance says they were in with regard to France. They have the control of the situation pretty well in their own hands because they are not obliged to enter into any contract without reserving that right. There is no provision in this Bill for bringing the contract down and placing it on the table. There should be a provision that all these subsidy contracts should be laid on the table immediately after the opening of the following session.

Mr. BRODEUR. The contracts are always brought down in the departmental report. At page 113 of the report of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in the supplement, there is the contract with the Allan Line concerning this same service.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I accept the statement that these contracts have been brought down in recent years, but I do not think that practice has always prevailed, because I have had to move for them.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend is correct. It is only in the last three or four years that such contracts are brought down.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If we have the minister's assurance that that is to be the invariable practice of the department in future, I would not insist on our making a general provision to that effect.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed by the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce that it is the intention to give synopses of contracts in all the departmental reports as is done in the last report.

Mr. MONK. To give effect to this treaty, it would be absolutely necessary for us to have adequate commercial representation in France. We are competing with other nations, particularly the Americans, and the Americans have in France a consular staff which gives them an immense advantage over us. Our representation in that respect is not at all what it should be, but I shall defer what I have to say on that subject until we come to consider the remuneration of our agents in France at present.

Mr. FIELDING. We have at present in France a commercial agent, who is a most excellent and able officer. If this treaty realizes the hopes many of us have for an extension of trade, it would be probably desirable that our agency should be strengthened. Mr. Poindron, I have found very capable and energetic. He is our only commercial agent. We have gentlemen representing us connected with other branches.

Mr. MONK. I do not wish to refer to the gentleman we have had as our representative in France many years because I do not suppose he is much concerned with our commercial relations, nor have I any special complaint against Mr. Poindron, who is a diligent man. But I think the time has arrived when we should have Canadians, men who had a commercial training in this country, who have much experience, and would be better able to represent us than men like Mr. Poindron, who have not been brought up in this country. Mr. Poindron is a very intelligent man and no doubt has brought a good deal of diligence to bear on his work, but he is a Frenchman, who has only sojourned in our country a little time, and even with the best natural ability it is impossible that he should be able to advance our interests as much as if he had been brought up and trained in this

country. Besides alone he is not able, with all the skill one is prepared to give him, to do the work that has to be done there. Take our American neighbours, I suppose they have in France at least 200 consuls, and their consular service is pretty effective all over the world. Those men are busy year in and year out pushing American commerce. We have just concluded a treaty from which we may expect some results. We are going to subsidize a direct line to France, we shall have to compete with other nations, and we shall be handicapped in having only one agent and he a native born Frenchman, who probably has other occupations.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, he devotes all his time to this.

Mr. MONK. I do not think that the struggle, under those circumstances, is at all equal. We shall have to organize something better if we expect to obtain satisfactory results. However I do not want to detain the committee longer just now on this point as a better opportunity will occur later.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not dissent from the idea that, after concluding a treaty, we should make some vigorous efforts to develop trade, and I rather expect that such effort will be necessary. But as regards employing Canadians to do business for us in France, while one's first thought is to approve of that suggestion and give preference to our own, on the other hand if a Canadian goes to a strange country, without knowledge of it, he may find himself at a disadvantage. While as a rule we shall find it advantageous to appoint Canadians, I should imagine that the fact that Mr. Poindron combines a certain amount of knowledge of Canada, having resided here some years, with his knowledge of France as a native of that country and his consequent familiarity with French affairs and conditions, would indicate that he is rather better fitted to do our work in that country than one whose chief quality is that he is a native Canadian. I think that if we could find the happy combination of a native Canadian, who, at the same time, has a knowledge of the country in which he is to work, that would be best. However, I accept in the spirit in which it is given the suggestion made that we need a vigorous and energetic representation in France, and that, so far as the trade of the world is concerned, we should have in view the appointment of vigorous agents wherever trade can be obtained.

Mr. BERGERON. What is Mr. Poindron's salary ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is $3,000.

Mr. SPROULE. The man who understands the lines to be introduced has an advantage over a native of the country into which they are to be introduced. Look at the example of the manufacturing concerns of this country ; the Massey-Harris concern, for instance, sends to Europe a native Canadian as its representative. This is a man familiar with the goods and the conditions of manufacture. He establishes agencies in France, Germany, Russia and other countries without difficulty. The Noxon firm does the same. They sent a young man from Canada who established agencies in France, Germany, England, Scotland and many other countries, and was regarded as a much more suitable agent for this purpose than any native of the countries to which he went. If individual manufacturers can make a success of this policy, why could not the country do the same ?

Mr. BRODEUR. As to Mr. Poindron, he was appointed when he was in Canada. He resided in Canada for some years and was engaged in the development of trade between Canada and France. I think he endeavoured to have a line of steamships put on the route between Canada and France. I do not know whether he was successful or not—I think probably he was not successful, for, as I explained the other night, the establishment of this steamship line at that time was a very difficult proposition. In the course of his work he became well acquainted with the requirements of trade in France and the opportunities there for the sale of Canadian goods. There was no man in Canada, probably, who knew better the trade between the two countries than did Mr. Poindron when he was appointed. I do not know whether he became a British subject or not, but I know he lived in Canada for several years and was appointed to his present position from here. I think it not unlikely that he is and always has been a French citizen.

Mr. SPROULE. The knowledge of the trade acquired by one resident here would be greater——

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. Poindron was a resident of Canada for several years.

Mr. SPROULE. —and more valuable in the development of trade in the various lines of manufacture than that of one familiar with the conditions of commerce in the country in which he is to work. If he has a knowledge of trade conditions in th's country, it will be much more easy for him to learn the trade conditions in the country with which we are to trade than it would be for one from that country, by residing in Canada for a time, to learn the conditions here.

Mr. BERGERON. I know Mr. Poindron very well, and, if we are to choose a man who is not a Canadian, I do not think the government could have a better man in this position. He is a very industrious man,

and, as he resided in Canada for some years, he acquired, I believe, as good a knowledge of Canadian affairs as any native Canadians possess. He acted for the government of France in many parts of the world before coming to Canada. I believe he was in China, in Japan, and in many European countries. I am not sure that, with the salary afforded him, Mr. Poindron could be expected to do the work. I do not suppose that he stays in his office. I would like to believe that he goes about, finds out where there are opportunities for Canadian trade and seeks to establish that trade. Unless his expenses are paid, or unless he has an account for contingencies, I do not see how he could do much good. You could not find a better man, but he must have opportunities to do his work properly. Otherwise, no matter who may be our agent the money is simply thrown away. I suppose the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) saw Mr. Poindron when in Paris. I take it that Mr. Poindron has an office and a staff, or at least has help so that, in case he finds it in the interest of the service to travel, he may be free to do so. If due opportunity is not given to our agent to do the work for which he is appointed, I would be opposed to the whole thing.

Mr. BRODEUR. The salary as I have stated, is $3,000 a year, which is a fair salary considering the expense of living in that country. Mr. Poindron's office is provided with an office by the Department of Trade and Commerce, and he has a clerk who is paid by the department. For travelling expenses, he is allowed $50 a month. On the whole, I think the salary paid is a very good one.

Mr. MONK. As the newspapers, particularly in Montreal, and more particularly the organ of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), are liable to make erroneous reports, I would not like to say anything that could be interpreted as against Mr. Poindron, for I know him and know that he is a competent man. But look at the difference. The American government has in every important city in France, one of its own men, a wideawake, active man of business, as consul, who pushes for business for all he is worth. There are very few instances in the countries of Europe—and I travelled there a good deal in former years—in which the American government is represented by one who is not an American citizen. On the contrary Canada has in France one man, Mr. Poindron. On principle, as he is our only agent, I think there is grave reason why we should have a better representative in a man who is of our own nation and our own allegiance, a man who, in case of any doubt, would naturally incline to take the part of his own country rather than that of the country to which he is a native and to which he owes allegiance. What is our whole representation in France? We have Mr. Poindron. Then we have as our immigration agent Mr. Wiallard, at a small salary. And, latterly, we have sent a young lawyer, Mr. Geoffrion, a very estimable young man, who I suppose, also represents the Immigration Department. And this is all we have. And this at the conclusion of a treaty from which it is said we are to expect great results, and when we are to have a direct line of steamships which is to cost us a great deal of money. This development of trade is a question which deserves our best attention, and, when we come to look into it at a later day, I hope to have some observations to make.

Mr. FIELDING. I may say to my hon. friend that I sympathize heartily with his views with regard to the position of our representatives in Paris. What struck me, and my colleague also, when we were over there was that our offices, while well located perhaps for some purposes, were not as well placed as they might be, and we devoted some time in trying to obtain a building on one of the more public avenues, even though it should cost considerable money. We had negotiations with a view of taking a lease of a building in a commanding position where the offices of our French representatives might be consolidated. At present Mr. Fabre and those associated with him are in one part of the city, while Mr. Poindron's office is in the commercial centre, near the Bourse. We thought it desirable to consolidate these offices and we wished to get a more prominent place, though it should cost us a little more money. We thought we had satisfactory negotiations to that end on one of the grand boulevards. Unfortunately, a rival concern cropped up, and notwithstanding all we were disposed to do, they outbid us and we lost the opportunity. We afterwards instructed our representatives to try and look for a more satisfactory site, but up to the present moment we have not been successful. I think that Paris is one of the great show places of the world, and if the offices of Canada were located in a more central place it would probably bring us an indirect return and would be well worth while spending a little more money. I agree that we need to make a more vigorous and energetic campaign for Canada in France.

Mr. BERGERON. Since my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has mentioned the name of Mr. Geoffrion, what is Mr. Geoffrion's occupation in Paris, what is his salary, and what department does he belong to?

Mr. OLIVER. He belongs to the Interior Department; I cannot say at the moment what his salary is.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think it is $2,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Will my hon. friend find out and let us know later on? My information is that he is getting $4,000 a year.

Mr. OLIVER. His salary cannot be more than $2,500, if it is that.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

IMMIGRATION ACT—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 135) to amend the Immigration Act—Mr. Oliver—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We have not had much explanation with regard to the object of this proposed legislation. Perhaps the minister will take this opportunity of giving it.

Mr. OLIVER. The purpose of this amendment is to make further provision in regard to the exclusion of immigrants. The Act as it stands contains provisions for the protection of immigrants and also for the exclusion and deportation of immigrants. An immigrant arriving at a Canadian port, if considered to be undesirable according to the terms of our immigration law, may be excluded at that port, and if excluded under the terms of the law the transportation company which brought him to the Canadian port must take him back to the port from which he sailed, and the country in which that port is situated must receive him back, because until he has officially landed in Canada he is still to all intents and purposes a resident of the country from which he sails. If an undesirable comes into Canada and it becomes necessary or desirable to deport him, we call upon the steamship company which brought him to Canada to take him back to the port from which he sailed. But if he is not a citizen of the country in which that port is situated, that country does not need to receive him back, and it is not possible for the steamship company to carry out our order of deportation. We were, therefore, in the position of having possibly to deal with numbers of people whom it might be desirable to deport, and yet because of their not having sailed from the country of their citizenship, or not having come from that country by a ticket upon which we could hold the transportation company responsible to take them back to the country of their citizenship, we were not in a position to deport them. In order then that the intent of the immigration law might be carried out and made effective in regard to the exclusion of undesirables, it was provided by a regulation passed on the 8th of January last that immigrants arriving from a country other than that of their citizenship might under certain circumstances be excluded. This regulation was put in force and was applied to the arrivals of Asiatics on the Pacific coast, in one instance, to Japanese coming from the Sandwich islands, and in another case to Hindus coming from Hong Kong. There is a large Japanese population in the Sandwich islands who, for industrial or commercial reasons, are looking for another field of settlement. These people, having left the country of their citizenship, having become residents of the Sandwich islands, which are dependencies of the United States, and then having decided to come to Canada, were not under the jurisdiction of the country of their citizenship. If we had reason to order their deportation and to order the steamship company to take them back into the Sandwich islands, the United States government could refuse to receive them. They were then in the position in which they were when they came from the Sandwich islands and we practically hand to let them land. The same condition prevailed in regard to the movement from Hong Kong. Large numbers of Hindus who have left India and settled in Hong Kong, for one reason or another desired to settle in Canada. The question, in fact, came up in the first place, because of our finding it desirable to deport a number of these Hindus who had landed in Vancouver. They were subject to the deportation clauses of the Immigration Act, but when we undertook to deport them the government of Hong Kong refused to receive them because they were not citizens of that dependency and they were simply left on our hands. The regulation of the 8th of January, passed to meet that case, was put in force and was applied to the arrivals from the Sandwich islands and from other regions in the Pacific. It was in March that the large arrivals of Hindus from Hong Kong took place. The regulation was applied to these people, legal proceedings were taken by the transportation company to set aside the regulation, and it was set aside by the courts of British Columbia as not having been in proper form. The point taken was that while the Governor in Council had the right to exclude, he had not the right to delegate that power of exclusion to the Minister of the Interior as had been done by the terms of the regulation; therefore, the regulation was declared to be of non-effect and these people had to be permitted to land. We passed the regulation again so as to conform with the decision of the court and it is now in force, but we believe that this question is of such importance in the administration of our immigration law that it should be embodied in the law itself, and should not be dependent upon a regulation. Therefore the section which is contained in the Bill was drafted and is brought before the House for its approval. I might say that since the Bill was drafted some exception has been taken to the use of a certain word

in the latter part of the clause and it has been thought advisable to redraft the latter part of the section. I have an amendment here which I desire to propose and which has been approved by the Department of Justice. I would move :

That all the words after the word 'who' in the fourth line be struck out and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof: 'have come to Canada otherwise than by continuous journey from the country of which they are natives or citizens and upon through tickets purchased in such country.'

Mr. HAGGART. The object of the Bill is to extradite Hindus whose case is not otherwise covered by the regulations from British Columbia to the place of their origin. These Hindus, as the hon. gentleman has mentioned, are British subjects coming from either India or Hong Kong. Have we the power to extradite them for any other reason than for quarantine purposes ?

Mr. OLIVER. This provision is for the purpose of saving us the trouble of extraditing them. It is to enable us to exclude them under certain conditions.

Mr. HAGGART. Can you for any other purpose than that of quarantine exclude a British subject from coming into the country ?

Mr. OLIVER. That is a matter that I am hardly in a position to answer, but inasmuch as the immigration law has been on the statute-book since the session of 1906 and has been applied to a very large number of cases not only in excluding, or deporting, or extraditing, which is the word that my hon. friend uses, and has never been called in question, I presume that we have the necessary authority.

Mr. HAGGART. I doubt it.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend suggested that this provision was made especially to apply to Hindus. That is incorrect. It applies to all people. I instanced the case of the Hindus as being one in which it was necessary and desirable to apply the provision.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not quite understand the necessity of the legislation. The law as it stands at present is as follows :

The Governor in Council may, by proclamation or order, whenever he considers it necessary or expedient, prohibit the landing in Canada of any specified class of immigrants of which due notice shall be given to the transportation company.

The Governor in council, by order made on the 8th of January, 1908, undertook to delegate to the Minister of the Interior the power which was conferred on the Governor in Council by the statute which I have just read. The operative words of the order in council are as follows :

The Governor in Council is pleased to order, and it is hereby ordered, that whenever, in the opinion of the Minister of the Interior, the condition of the labour market in Canada is such as to make the application of section 20 of the Immigration Act desirable, or, whenever, in the opinion of the Minister of the Interior, other conditions exist which, in a special degree render necessary the application of sections 26 to 30 inclusive of the said Act, immigrants may be prohibited from landing or coming into Canada unless they come from the country of their birth or citizenship by a continuous journey and on through tickets purchased before leaving the country of their birth or citizenship.

Then the matter came before Mr. Justice Clements, of British Columbia, upon proceedings in habeas corpus, and Mr. Justice Clements did not set aside the order in council —of course he could not do that—but he declared that the order in council was not valid inasmuch as the Privy Council had seen fit to delegate to the Minister of the Interior a power which could only be exercised by the Governor in Council himself. And so the men, as I understand, were released on habeas corpus. I do not observe, nor have I heard from the Minister of the Interior that there has been any difficulty of such a character as would render this legislation necessary. If it is necessary well and good, but I have not so far been able to ascertain what the necessity is. The necessity could only arise if the words, 'any specified class of immigrants,' do not include the conditions which are provided for in this Bill. No such argument has been made so far as I am aware, and no such decision has been given, and therefore I am not yet able to understand the necessity for the legislation. In other words there would have been no difficulty at all in the court, so far as we know, if the Governor in Council had made the order in the proper way instead of delegating the subject to the Minister of the Interior. At the present time the Governor in Council has passed the necessary order and the matter seems to be provided for in that way. Why is it then that we are asked to pass this legislation ? I am not speaking by way of criticism, but entirely for the purpose of information.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The reason for the legislation as I understand it is this : under the Immigration Act we have power to exclude and to deport certain immigrants who do not come up to a certain standard either physically, intellectually or morally, and whom we deem to be unworthy of Canadian citizenship. We have power to deport Hindus or any one else if we are of opinion that they come within any of the classes I have referred to. But suppose a Hindu who was physically or morally unfit came from Hong Kong but not from India, we

could exclude him or deport him. We can send him back on the steamship which has brought him and the steamer would take him to Hong Kong but the Hong Kong authorities would say: That man does not belong to us and we will not receive him. It is to obviate this that the law makes it another cause of exclusion if the man does not come direct from the land of his origin on a through ticket. We are creating another cause of exclusion in addition to the causes I have just mentioned, and this being made a cause of exclusion the transportation company understands it and they bring such a man here at their own risk and we will have the power to compel the company to take that man back.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not see how it will assist the situation if that is the real object of the statute.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is the object as I understand it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Suppose an idiot or a person afflicted with a loathsome disease is taken on board at Hong Kong, you can now refuse him permission to land without this proposed statute. This Bill merely provides another reason on account of which he cannot land and you send him back in this case just as you did before. What is the advantage of it ?

Mr. OLIVER. As long as we are aware that he is subject to the exclusion conditions of the Act at the port of landing we can exclude him as matters stand at present and there is no difficulty. But suppose we are not aware of this and we allow him to actually land and afterwards we find he is physically or mentally tainted, or financially unable to provide for his own support, any of these are causes for exclusion or deportation. For instance, a perfectly healthy Hindu leaves India, he comes to Hong Kong, finds matters do not suit him there, and he decides to come to British Columbia. He lands in British Columbia a perfectly healthy man mentally and physically, and we permit him to land but conditions are such that he has no money, that he cannot get any work, and he becomes a public charge; he is subject to deportation under the terms of our immigration law, but if we undertake to deport him, under the terms of the law we arrest him, we compel the steamship company to take him on board, the steamship company takes him to Hong Kong and the Hong Kong government says: He does not belong to us, we will not admit him to our country and we will not allow him to land in Hong Kong. The only recourse in that case is that he must be brought back to Canada and allowed to remain in Canada. Under such circumstances we cannot enforce our own law in regard to our own country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the minister mean that this statute is intended to apply to persons who have landed in Canada ?

Mr. OLIVER. People who will land in Canada after the statute is passed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is not the reading of the statute at all. The reading of the statute is this: The Governor in Council may prohibit the landing in Canada. It does not deal with persons who having landed in Canada are found to be subject to such disabilities as would make it advisable to deport him. This statute is intended to prohibit certain persons from landing in Canada. I am sincerely trying to find out what good purpose the statute is intended to serve.

Mr. OLIVER. I am trying to explain it. I try to tell my hon. friend how the case arises which makes it necessary for us to adopt the principle contained in the Bill. I have shown that under the terms of our Act as it stands to-day we are not able to protect ourselves as it was intended that we should protect ourselves. If this Act is passed, the man who goes on board a ship at Hong Kong, with a ticket bought at Hong Kong, if he is not a citizen of Hong Kong, can be prevented from landing in Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The man who goes on board the steamer at Hong Kong may belong to one of two classes—he may be a perfectly good citizen, unexceptionable in every way, or he may be a person who is impecunious or idiotic or suffering from some disease on account of which we should exclude him. Is this intended to apply to one or to both of these classes. If only to one, to which one?

Mr. OLIVER. It is intended to apply to all classes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why is it intended to apply to a man who would be a perfectly good citizen of this country?

Mr. OLIVER. Because we want to be in a position to protect ourselves against the man who will not be a good citizen of the country—not necessarily because of any inherent defect in himself, but because of conditions which may exist, and which do not admit of his being able to make a living in Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. Within the last couple of weeks a German went on board a vessel at New Zealand and went to Vancouver; but he was not allowed to land because he did not come from the country of his origin. There was no contention that he was not a good citizen; but he was excluded, and was forced to go to the United States.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Is it the intention by this Bill to exclude from this coun-

try every person who does not come from the country of his origin? If so, it seems to me that you will get into a lot of trouble. Another thing: I notice that by the regulation people coming from Europe must come by way of Portland or direct to a Canadian port.

Mr. OLIVER. No, they may come through any port. Cases of hardship have arisen under the application of the regulation, because our officers have not thoroughly understood how we desired to apply it. But there is no difficulty whatever in regard to people who are coming to Canada through another country or by various lines of conveyance. It is quite customary for a man, say at a point in Central Europe, to buy a through ticket from that point to Canada. It matters not through how many countries he passes, we receive him. As he has a ticket from the country of his citizenship, we can compel the transportation company to take him back there, which we could not do if he had not that ticket.

Mr. SPROULE. The man I refer to was not a naturalized citizen of New Zealand, but he was a German who had lived there for several years. He was excluded because he did not come direct from Germany.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I think the object of the amendment brought in by the minister is quite plain.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. To exclude Hindus, that is all.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Yes, to exclude Hindus and all kinds of Asiatics, and all kinds of undesirable people.

Mr. SPROULE. Will it not exclude desirable classes as well?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Possibly if we gain in one respect we may suffer in another. In the case the hon. gentleman speaks of, I fancy the good sense of the immigration officer would allow the German to come in.

Mr. FOWLER. That is giving a good deal of latitude to the immigration officer.

Mr. MACPHERSON. If I or my hon. friend were an immigration officer, we would use the good sense the Lord has given us. We thought we had the positive power to exclude Orientals coming from India via Hong Kong.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What about the Japanese?

Mr. MACPHERSON. The arrangement entered into between Japan and Canada is working very well; we have no more Japanese coming into the country. That matter has been satisfactorily arranged—perhaps not as radically as some of us would have liked to have had it arranged, but it is working well. Just as the Japanese were making Hawaii a bridge, so the Hindus have been making Hong Kong a bridge. There are a considerable number of Hindu policemen in Hong Kong; and these men, while a good looking lot, are the most objectionable class of people we can get into our country. A good many of them while in Hong Kong lived on prostitution. The prostitutes of Hong Kong, the greatest shipping port in the world, stood in with them, and divided up their profits with them.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There must have been a large body of police.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How many thousands?

Mr. MACPHERSON. I speak of the first people who came. They are a most objectionable and undesirable class. The Hindus themselves do not want them. This clause will absolutely prohibit this class of people coming to our shores. It is purely and simply a restriction on Asiatics. The Japanese cannot come in by the Sandwich Islands or by Mexico. There has been a good deal of talk about these men having been British soldiers and wearing medals on their breasts. The men who managed to get over the order in council and furnish them with tickets purporting that they came from Calcutta, would be able to get silver medals for them without any trouble. I know very well that nine-tenths of them never saw any active service in India for the British empire. I think this clause is absolutely necessary if we are going to succeed in keeping these very undesirable people out of the country.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to ask the minister if it is not a fact that a great deal of so-called American immigration consists of men from Scandinavia who remain a few years in the United States and then cross over to Canada?

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. They became citizens.

Mr. FOWLER. Not necessarily, unless they took the oath of allegiance.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. They generally do.

Mr. FOWLER. I venture to say that a good many do not.

Mr. MONK. To return to the point raised a few moments ago by the leader of the opposition, what is the object of this legislation? Is it to add to the cases of exclusion those who come from somewhere else than their native country? At present we have a certain list of cases of exclusion and probably this Bill is intended to add to them. The Bill provides that:

30. The Governor in Council may, by proclamation or order, whenever he considers it necessary or expedient, prohibit the landing in Canada of any specified class of immigrants or of any immigrants who being natives or citizens of any specified country have come to Canada otherwise than by a continuous journey from that country on through tickets purchased there.

As I understand the present law, the fact that an English immigrant comes here from France is not a cause of exclusion, but it may be a cause for exclusion under this Bill. All that is required is a proclamation of the Governor in Council.

Mr. GALLIHER. As I understand it the difference is this: Take a Hindu coming from Hong Kong to Vancouver, he may be Vancouver he will be allowed to land at all. The steamship company will have to take him back. But if he is a desirable immigrant and comes direct from India to Vancouver he will be allowed to land though he may be deported later should he become one of the class subject to deportation. Then you can compel the steamship company to take him back to his own country and his own country is bound to receive him. You are consequently not in the position you would be in when deporting the same man who came from Hong Kong to Vancouver, because Hong Kong not being his native country, it would not be bound to take him back.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We may be going much further than the government intend. I am not going to discuss the question of Hindus or Japanese for the moment. It will be possible under this to have Hindus, British subjects from Hong Kong, deported or not permitted to land, and Japanese direct from Japan permitted to land. That is what it means if it means anything. It may be most desirable, and no doubt it is, to limit the immigration of certain classes, but it is necessary to see that we are not going too far. One hon. gentleman suggests that the enforcement or non-enforcement shall be left to the discretion of the immigration officers. I do not think that is very desirable.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I do not think I suggested that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I accept my hon. friend's assurance in that regard. But if such a suggestion has been made, I would be prepared to repudiate it. You cannot make laws and then invite your own officers to wilfully and knowingly break them. If this law is to be enacted, we must see that it is enforced in every part of Canada. What then will be the result? I agree with my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that it distinctly proposes to add an additional cause of exclusion at the discretion of the Governor in Council. That is to say, any citizen coming from any country other than that of his birth or citizenship shall not be allowed to land, although he may be in every other possible respect a most desirable citizen. You are aiming at a certain object, but you are accomplishing a good deal more than you aim at. Suppose Scandinavians go into the United States and do not become American citizens, and then propose to come and settle in this country, they are excluded by this order in council apparently because they do not come direct from the land of their birth or citizenship. Suppose these men have lived in the British isles a number of years and then come to Canada, they cannot be permitted to land under this order in council for the same reason. Germans coming here from the British islands or the United States would be exactly in the same category. Therefore, you are proposing a very drastic, comprehensive and far reaching amendment to our immigration laws. Your amendment may accomplish a certain purpose which you have in mind, but it may also accomplish some others you have not in mind.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This is evidently intended to get at the transportation companies.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Take the case of a Hindu who comes here from Hong Kong, you may send him back on the steamer and he will not be allowed to land at Hong Kong. I do not think this will help the matter. Why does the hon. minister not bring in a law covering that aspect of the case? This will exclude any man coming from any country other than that of his birth or adoption. Personally I would much prefer a Hindu who has served the empire in the armies of Great Britain to a galvanized Yankee who has been an anarchist in his own land and has come to the United States where he has done his best to disrupt that republic, and who, if he crosses over to Canada, seeks in many instances to disrupt the established laws of the Dominion. I must say that a Hindu who has served in the British army and has had the discipline of a soldier is much more likely to make a good citizen of Canada, much more likely to upbuild the welfare, morality and dignity of this country than many of the class of animals who are imported——

An hon. MEMBER. Order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No 'order' about it. Many of these are not worthy the name of human beings. But these people are admitted, while soldiers who have served in the British army are excluded, not allowed to land and turned adrift. I move in amendment the following:—

Always excepting such immigrants as have served in the regular or auxiliary forces of the empire under the British flag.

Mr. HAGGART. I have not yet had a clear explanation from the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) or the Minister of the

Interior (Mr. Oliver) as to the effect of this proposed law. I may be wrong in my law, but I stated—and I have seen no reason yet to change my opinion—that this parliament cannot deprive a British subject of his allegiance or of his right to land in this country except for certain causes. He must not be excluded under the quarantine laws—that is he must not be diseased, idiotic or subject to lunacy: Nor must he be a criminal. Nor must he be an indigent person—our right in this case is similar to that exercised under the poor law of Great Britain of removing people from one parish to another. As I understand the Prime Minister, the law applies only to these classes, but, according to the Minister of the Interior, it goes further. Under the principle stated by the Minister of the Interior, this parliament could exclude any one. It is proposed that the Hindus shall be excluded, not because they are Hindus; their crime consists in not coming direct from Hindustan, but in landing in a British colony on the way. I may have old-fashioned ideas as to the power of this country to deprive a British subject of his allegiance or of his rights as a British subject. I do not think that this parliament can do either.

Mr. MACPHERSON. How about Australia?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not care about Australia. I do not know about the Australian law, though it may be such as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macpherson) says. But my ground is that we cannot deprive a British subject of his allegiance or of his right as a British subject, provided he is not a criminal, is not physically or mentally diseased and has money to pay his way.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Does not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) think that the Canadian parliament is paramount in these matters? Has it not the highest possible powers within its jurisdiction?

Mr. HAGGART. That is the very ground I take—that the power is not vested in this parliament, but that this is one of the reserve powers under the British North America Act. I may be wrong in my law. But, suppose we had the power that is claimed, is it judicious or right for us to legislate against British subjects in any other part of the empire? Is it in the interest of this country or of the empire as a whole? While it is right that we should protect ourselves against immigration that is detrimental to the interests of the country, when a man is a good subject of the empire in one part of it, he has the right to all the privileges as a subject of the empire on landing in this country.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think on reflection, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart)) will agree with me that he has carried a principle which is very good in itself a little too far. He says that we have not the power to close the door of this country against a British subject except for purposes of quarantine. Now we have as much power over British subjects coming from across the sea as we have over those in this country. At the present time, if a man is insane, even though a British subject, we have the right to put him in confinement.

Mr. HAGGART. I admitted that principle—that idiots, lunatics, criminals and paupers might be excluded. I said that the common law of England provided for that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend stated that we had no power to exclude men except for purpose of quarantine.

Mr. HAGGART. I went further.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman will see that we have the power to exclude those who are physically tainted, section 28 of the Immigration Act provides:

> No person shall be permitted to land in Canada who is a pauper, or destitute, a professional beggar, or vagrant, or who is likely to become a public charge——

I think the hon. gentleman will agree to prevent the landing of persons of these classes. Very well. The Act goes on to say:

> —and any person landed in Canada who, within two years thereafter, has become a charge upon the public funds, whether municipal, provincial or federal, or an inmate of, or a charge upon, any charitable institution, may be deported and returned to the port or place whence he came or sailed for Canada.

Does the hon. gentleman admit that we have that power?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman admits that we can exclude paupers, criminals, and those physically tainted or mentally unsound, whether they be British subjects or not. Well, if we exercise this power, why do we exercise it? For our protection. The object of this Bill, as it has been stated, and as I tried to state it, is to create another cause of exclusion as recognized by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has given the reason for creating this new clause of exclusion. What is it? He says: The power vested in me is to prevent the entry of persons who are physically tainted, mentally unsound, criminals or paupers, and to send them back whence they come; but the power given me is nugatory unless the transportation company that brings such a person to this country can take him to the place from which he came. The transpor-

tation company has taken this immigrant on at Hong Kong. But, when he is returned, the authorities at Hong Kong refuse to receive him, and he is left between the two places like Mahomet's coffin hanging between heaven and earth. So, the Minister of the Interior seeks power to make effective the power that is given him. So far we understand each other. There is another question which the leader of the opposition has suggested, and that is whether we might not be going too far in this legislation, and whether we might not exclude another class of immigrants who ought to be admitted. That is a serious consideration. I do not know whether the Minister of the Interior has given his attention to it, but at all events it is a point worthy of consideration.

Mr. GALLIHER. Touching the last point referred to by the Prime Minister, I will state the situation. As we all know, British Columbia is the province that has suffered most by the influx of Oriental immigrants. It is not desirable in the interest of British Columbia or in the interest of Canada that a class of people who cannot assimilate with any part of our own inhabitants should be permitted to come in without restriction. That I think ought to be admitted by every Canadian. Now what was the case in British Columbia before the order in council was passed ? We found Japanese agents on the one hand and Hindu agents on the other, practically starting a syndicate for the purpose of flooding British Columbia with Orientals—because our province was the objective point of all the immigrants who came from those countries. We find on the one hand the government of Japan saying that if Japanese leave their country and go to Honolulu or any other point, they are beyond the jurisdiction of the Japanese government, it has no control over them. On the other hand, we find the Hindu coming in, not from India but from another point between his native country and British Columbia. Now that had to be got over. I say it was in the interest, not only of British Columbia but of all of Canada, that some measure should be taken by which that immigration should be stopped. Now I want to say that I have not been satisfied with what has been done, and I would have raised my voice time and again in this House if some means had not been taken to stop this wholesale influx. I do not care if the Hindu is a British subject. He may be a British subject, and have fought the battles of Great Britain on many occasions. He is a soldier and a good soldier, I admit all that ; and I have as much respect for a British subject as any other man in this House, and I think I am as good a British subject, too. But I do not think this is imposing a hardship on those British subjects coming straight from their native country to Canada, and if they do come direct and are desirable in every other respect, they would be allowed to land and become citizens of our country. But these men have been coming from Hong Kong, and why do they come ? They come simply at the instigation of these immigration agents who hold every man up who comes in, and levy upon him for bringing him into British Columbia. These men have inaugurated and are carrying out the profession of bringing immigrants into Canada, and reaping a benefit out of them in consequence. I say in all fairness, without wishing to reflect upon the Hindus, that they are not suitable citizens for British Columbia or for any other part of Canada ; they are not suited to the climate or to the work they are called upon to perform.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Won't they find that out ?

Mr. GALLIHER. We dont want thousands of them parading our streets trying to find that out. That is the position we take in British Columbia, and that is the position we will maintain.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And yet you will import Yankee hoodlums who are not even American citizens.

Mr. GALLIHER. I am afraid my hon. friend must have suffered severe treatment from a Yankee hoodlum at some time. A point was made by the leader of the opposition and answered by the Prime Minister, that this Act might be made to apply to other classes of immigrants than Orientals. I do not think we need have any serious cause for fear that any considerable number of people will be excluded who come from other countries, under the operation of this Act if it becomes law. I think that is looking ahead for trouble which is not likely to happen. I have looked into the matter carefully, and I do not think that we in Canada need have any great fear that there will be any appreciable number of citizens of the United States, or Germany, or France, or any other country who wish to come in here, and who will be excluded under the provisions of this law. I know of no other way by which we can keep out these undesirable Orientals, and I have thought the matter over a good deal, unless you are going to discriminate against one or more nations. But if you put a provision of this kind in the law, all nations are then treated alike ; and all we ask of any nation, whether they be British subjects, or Frenchmen, or Germans, or any one else, is that they come direct from their own country to Canada. This Act will stop the machine work that has been going on in the case of the Japanese and Hindus, and those are the people we want to stop. As a British Columbian I say, and I main-

tain, that whether they are British subjects or not—and I give them every credit they deserve as British subjects—British Columbia nor any other part of Canada is not a suitable country for Hindus, and it is not in the interest of British Columbia that they should come in in unrestricted numbers.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me that if we have a right to exclude British subjects for any reason whatever, either for mental or physical unsoundness, we have the absolute right to exclude them altogether. It is only a question whether it is judicious or not. For my part I sympathize with the evident desire of the Minister of the Interior to work out the problem that confronts him in this matter of immigration to British Columbia. I think it is very important that both sides of the House should address themselves to this matter, and endeavour to work out some way whereby this can be done without doing injustice to persons coming from other countries who may be desirable immigrants for Canada.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. From the observations that I have been able to make, and from what I have heard living in a province adjoining British Columbia, I agree with the hon. member for Kootenay that the Hindus are not a desirable class of immigrants, and from what we have been able to learn up to the present time that class of immigration should not be encouraged. But I rose to my feet chiefly to refer to a remark of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) who has said that certain Japanese settlements have been satisfactory. I must apologise for introducing this matter in a discussion of this Bill, but I do it because the Minister of Labour is in his seat. I observe in a despatch from Edmonton, dated March 20, in which it is stated that fifty Japanese families will arrive in Calgary in a few days. I see another paragraph in the same paper, under the heading 'Jap farmers may not come this season, Strong feeling against Asiatics makes promoter hesitate.' Now as I understood the statement in this House of the Minister of Labour on a previous occasion, an arrangement had been come to with the Japanese government under which only students, travellers, and those who came over to Canada to visit their relatives, were to be admitted into this country. I simply mention this for the purpose of ascertaining whether it has come to the attention of the Minister of Labour. I desire to know if there have been 10,000 acres of land sold to Japanese in Southern Alberta, if these families are about to arrive and if there has been that satisfactory settlement to which he referred some months ago how is it that these people are allowed to come in?

Mr. GALLIHER.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am aware that fifty Japanese families have been advertised to come to Canada shortly. All I know is that an understanding has been arrived at with the Japanese authorities, that the Japanese authorities have lived up to it until the present time, and I feel sure that the arrangement which has been made will be carried out conscentiously by both sides. From the reports I have received from British Columbia, from the evidence that I receive every day from the representatives of that province in the House, the question seems to be settled, and there is now no influx of Japanese labourers into British Columbia. I have reason to believe that from this day on we will never hear of any such influx as that which took place last fall.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I think it will take a little more than the subtle remarks of the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) to galvanize into life that Japanese corpse. I do not think we will have the Japanese question as a factor in western Canada from this time on; that is, if Japan lives up to its agreement. I do not want to say anything that my hon. friend takes exception to, but I think that his little attempt to galvanize into life that Japanese corpse, because, as I said, I believe it is a corpse, will fail. I want to take exception to what the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) has said. He speaks of the Yankee hoodlums who come over here. I know that the Americans who come to this country make a most desirable class of citizens, and I know that the Hindus or any other class of Asiatics are not wanted in Canada. That line of cleavage is well marked and I think upon that line we can proceed; that is if we are going to keep Canada a white country.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Do you not want to keep it more than a white country? Do you not want to keep it a decent country?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Yes, I do not think my hon. friend and I will quarrel about keeping it a decent country.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I would rather have a black gentleman than a white anarchist.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I would too; I am not talking against black gentlemen.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is a provision in the law against anarchists.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It is not enforced.

Mr. MACPHERSON. It would be applied to Americans as well as other people.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I had reference to the galvanized Americans, the riff-raff who live for a short time in the United States and then come into Canada.

Mr. MACPHERSON. A man who has been guilty of moral turpitude or of any crime is kept out of Canada. We know

very well that it is only the lowest possible caste that leave India and come to our shores. We do not get the Maharajas or the big people of India; they do not leave India on account of their caste.

An hon. MEMBER. We do not get any nabobs.

Mr. MACPHERSON. We do not get any nabobs. Some of them may have been soldiers. A man may be a first-class man and be a soldier and he may not be a first class man and be a soldier. Because a man has been a soldier it is no reason why we should admit him. There is no difficulty in getting a man to be a soldier in India because a Hindu would rather swell around in brass buttons than work. He does not like to work. Even if you are a British subject many times over and wear stripes and be a soldier that does not fit you to become a Canadian citizen of a type such as that to which we believe Canadian citizens should conform. I think we can never expect to maintain a high standard of nationality unless we keep the strain white. The white man may not be just exactly the kind of man that you would like to invite into your parlour; he may not talk the language or understand it, but his boys and girls are going to school, they are given education along the required lines and they are singing 'God save the King' and 'Rule Britannia' within six months after they come here.

Mr. HAGGART. Are you not in danger if you draw the colour line ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. I would rather draw the colour line now than draw it fifty years later. If you read the history of the United States you will find that when they were flooding the southern states with Africans the same arguments were being used then, and it took years of fighting and bloodshed and millions of money to settle that question and it is not settled yet. It is far better for us to settle it now in the way in which we are attempting to settle it.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I do not propose that the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) will get away with the insinuation that he has made that I am trying to resurrect the discussion on the Japanese question. That is not my intention. On the public Bills and orders there is a resolution of the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) and if I had any desire to discuss the question further I would reserve my remarks until then. I simply pointed out to the hon. Minister of Labour that there appeared in a western paper a report that fifty Japanese proposed to land in Calgary within the next few days, and that 10,000 acres of land had been acquired by these people, together with the further statement that they might not come this season because there was a strong feeling against the promoters of this enterprise and they hesitated to bring them along. If there had been a report that these people were coming to Vancouver instead of to Calgary the hon. member for Vancouver would have been the first man to get up in the House and try to find out if the report were true or not.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Since the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) has referred again to the number of Japanese who wish to settle near Calgary as agriculturists, I may say, in order to show that the Japanese authorities are living up to their agreement with Canada, that a few days ago the Canadian Pacific Railway Company applied to the Dominion government in order to ascertain if something like 300 Japanese would be allowed to enter the Dominion and take up land in the Northwest. The Canadian Pacific Railway authorities pointed out that the Japanese government would not object to issuing passports to the intending Japanese immigrants, but the Japanese government had stated that they could not issue passports unless the Dominion government would agree to it. That shows plainly that the Japanese authorities are living up to the agreement arrived at during the month of December last.

Mr. LENNOX. I want to call the government's attention to another matter in connection with the wording of this section. We have been dealing so far with the meaning of the last part of the clause which says:

> Any immigrants who come to Canada otherwise than by continuous journey from the country of which they are natives or citizens and upon through tickets purchased in such country.

As the leader of the opposition has pointed out that appears to provide for the exclusion of a class that was not provided for until now. But the first part of the section provides for something distinct from that, and it says:

> The Governor in Council may, by proclamation or order, whenever he considers it necessary or expedient, prohibit the landing in Canada of any specified class of immigrants.

Will the government explain what they expect that part of the clause to cover?

Mr. OLIVER. That is subsection 1 of the Act as it exists at present.

Mr. LENNOX. I know.

Mr. OLIVER. We are merely repeating that subsection in the new Act and adding to it the provision which is under discussion. The provision referred to has never been applied so far and the fact that we are including it in this amendment does not indicate any immediate intention of applying it. There are very serious objections under ordinary circumstances to the application of an exclusion law against any class of people, and yet there may be occasions arising when it is desirable that such a

power should exist. From the time the Act was first passed we have never seen fit to exercise it, but we think it desirable that the power should still remain. It would only be exercised as a last resort.

Mr. LENNOX. We are giving the Governor in Council pretty extensive powers by that provision, although it may or may not be exercised. If you take it in the ordinary sense the provision would cover quite as large a class of persons as are provided for in the concluding words of the section. It is true the section was contained in the former Act, but these words were in addition:

Of which due notice shall be given to the transportation companies.

These words are now omitted. Then we had a subsection in the previous Act which we are now repealing and it is worth while remembering that. Subsection 2 provided that the Governor in Council might make such regulations as are necessary to prohibit the entry into Canada of any greater number of persons from any foreign country than the laws of such country permitted to emigrate to Canada.

Mr. OLIVER. It is not intended to repeal that.

Mr. LENNOX. Under the provision that the Governor in Council may prevent from landing any specified class of immigrants, could the Governor in Council issue a proclamation that Japanese shall not land in Canada?

Mr. OLIVER. That subsection was considered last year, and in consultation with the Justice Department we were advised that it was not a proper interpretation to put upon the word 'class,' to apply it to a nationality.

Mr. LENNOX. I am not prepared to argue that there is not some ground for that limitation or qualification, but at the same time I do not think it is any too clear. If the Governor in Council could make an order preventing the landing of Japanese it would be in direct conflict with the treaty with them. But it certainly would apply to the Governor in Council making a proclamation precluding carpenters or artisans or any specific class. The Minister of the Interior says yes. Then if that is so it would enable you to exclude Japanese artisans, and as I understand it we have not reserved the right in the treaty to exclude any class of Japanese from this country. If that be so we ought not to enact legislation which is inconsistent with the treaty with Japan. It is not that I want to circumscribe or hamper the efforts of the government in any way to preserve British Columbia as a white man's country, for I think that is one of the most desirable things we could aim at, but I am merely calling the attention of the government to legislation from that point of view.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I can reassure my hon. friend that by the agreement arrived at in the month of December with the Japanese authorities, all labour, skilled and unskilled is excluded. That is to say, they will be allowed to come into Canada only if the Canadian government accede to the request made by them to land in Canada, but they are excluded by the terms of the arrangement. I stated so when the question came up before.

Mr. LENNOX. I referred to Japanese labourers or artisans merely for illustration. But suppose for instance under this power to exclude a specified class it should be proposed to exclude Japanese students?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. LENNOX. If it means anything at all it means that the Governor in Council may exclude a limited class coming from any country, and in that way it could be made to include a class which would bring it in conflict with the treaty relations at present existing between Canada and Japan.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The answer to the point of my hon. friend, which was well taken in one sense, is this. Under this order in council the minister can exclude any class. For instance, suppose capitalists should be excluded, how would that work? It could not exclude Japanese capitalists, because they could invoke the treaty, which is superior to a statute of this House, as was decided by the British Columbia court in the case under the Natal Act. It was provided in that Act that any person coming to British Columbia should be subjected to an educational test. Under that provision some Japanese were arrested and convicted; but upon habeas corpus they were released, upon the ground alone that the legislation could not apply to Japanese, because they were protected by the treaty. The court did not go beyond that point, and I think this answers the point raised by my hon. friend.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does not that place the government in another difficulty with regard to the words just now proposed to be added to the clause? The Prime Minister has stated accurately the effect of that decision, which amounted to this. Although the Natal Act might possibly apply to other nationalities, it could not apply to Japanese, not so much on account of the treaty, but on account of the Act of this parliament confirming the treaty, because provincial legislation with regard to immigration is always subject to legislation enacted by this parliament, and if it is repugnant to legislation enacted by this parliament, it has no effect. Does not the same objection apply to the words proposed

to be added? You propose to give the Governor in Council power 'to prohibit the landing in Canada of any specified class of immigrants or of any immigrants who being natives or citizens of any specified country have come to Canada otherwise than by a continuous journey from that country on through tickets purchased there.' I would be inclined to think that any order in council issued under the authority of this statute would be inoperative so far as Japanese subjects are concerned, for the very reason now given by the Prime Minister. Under the treaty subjects of the Empire of Japan have exactly the same right to enter, travel and reside in Canada as citizens of Canada have. Then you issue an order in council providing that persons coming under the conditions mentioned may be prohibited. That order in council may be very good as to all the nationalities of the world except the Japanese, but would it not be inoperative so far as they are concerned? Is that the way it is understood by the government?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is something in the point of my hon. friend. Though I think it might be met in another way, it is sufficient to observe at the present time that the Japanese authorities are aware that we attempt to exclude Japanese coming from Honolulu. They do not object to that. The Japanese authorities want their people to be treated in the same way as the people of any other civilized country, and any law which we pass applying to all nations they do not object to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The difficulty appears to have been overlooked by the Prime Minister and by the Minister of Labour, who spoke as if an arrangement with Japan would have the same effect as a treaty. The difficulty is that a Japanese subject coming to Vancouver and Victoria and being confronted by the order in council will simply take the same course as was taken not long ago—apply to a solicitor and procure writ of habeas corpus, and the court will decide that the order in council has no application to him, and he therefore cannot be deported. It will not be a question between the government of Japan and the government of this country, but a question of the individual rights of the Japanese coming to this country, and invoking the statute of this parliament confirming the treaty.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. If the legal interpretation given of the effect of the Japanese treaty is correct, then Japanese immigrants to Canada have a privilege which no British subject has. If it is true that no legislation of this House can supersede the terms of the treaty, then there is absolutely no control over the immigration of Japanese, and what is the good of an agreement with Japan? If that is the true legal position, the only alternative is to cancel the treaty. The spirit of the people of British Columbia is entirely against the immigration of Orientals. This legislation is no doubt extreme, but it is to remove an extreme evil; but if the legal opinion stated is correct that we cannot, by any regulations, orders in council or even legislation of this parliament, restrict or regulate the immigration of Orientals against the provisions of the treaty, then Canada has no control at all of immigration in the face of that treaty. I am not a lawyer, but that seems to me to be the situation, and the only proper conclusion is to cancel the treaty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to make myself plain to the hon. member for Nanaimo. Canada has, as I understand, very complete control of immigration by the very words of the British North America Act, which give us power to legislate in regard to it. We did legislate in regard to immigration from Japan when we passed an Act confirming the treaty made between Great Britain and Japan with respect to Canada. We could repeal that Act tomorrow. If we did repeal it, of course there would be an end of the treaty, because Japan would very properly take offence at that. We have agreed to confirm the treaty, and, having confirmed it, we could not, upon the principles of international usage, now pass an Act repealing the confirming Act of a year ago. We have now before us this statute, the terms of which might in their broadest signification be regarded as inconsistent with the Act of a year ago, especially with reference to Japan. They would not be held to be inconsistent, because in the Act of a year ago we were dealing with a specific subject, namely our relation to Japan, and this Act would not be held as repealing that Act because it deals with the whole subject of immigration. Therefore it seems to me that any order in council issued under this Act would be held, so far as Japan is concerned, to be subject to the Act of a year ago. That is all I intended to express.

Mr. LENNOX. I agree with the position taken by the First Minister that we can pass this statute, but that where it conflicts with the treaty, the treaty will have force and this will not have force. But what I was calling the First Minister's attention more particularly to was this. After passing an Act confirming a treaty, which prevents us from dealing with the Japanese question in this broad way, the question is whether it is wise for us to pass this Act without qualification. The First Minister says we are in effect tied hand and foot as regards Japan. I admit that. We cannot pass such broad legislation as this as regards Japan. I admit that. The hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) says that we cannot make laws upon this question. That being the case,

is it wise that we should pass this without qualification, without reference to the position in which we stand in relation to Japan? As the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) says, a Japanese subject coming here, if arrested, goes into the court, and pleads his right. He does not plead that right on the basis of the understanding between the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) and the Japanese government—we cannot set up that implied or verbal understanding—but what we are confronted with is the Japanese treaty, which over-rides the Act that we pass here, supersedes it, controls it and determines the rights of this Japanese subject. And he is released; that is the effect of it. Is it wise to enact legislation that, on the face of it, goes actually beyond what we have the power to enact? I directed my remarks in the beginning to the first part of this clause, but they apply equally to the second part, though I did not wish to deal with that, as it has been so fully discussed. Nevertheless, I thought it well to call the attention of the government to the unfortunate position in which we are.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I agree with my hon. friend, so far as I am able to understand the legal point that this is in conflict with the Japanese treaty and cannot be enforced against the Japanese. Of course, I am not a lawyer and cannot say whether that is the legal effect of the position or not. But I understand it as the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) stated it—that we have lost control so far as Japanese immigration is concerned and that this Act would be futile in that respect. Now, I wish to call attention to another point. It would appear, upon the face of this clause that, when the government pass an order in council, a certain thing may be done. What I would like to know from the minister is this: Will this order in council become operative at once, or is notice to be given to the countries concerned? Suppose the order were passed to-morrow, but that a week ago, several shiploads of immigrants started for Canada from different countries which might be affected by this order. These people lawfully embarked, and the transportation companies lawfully undertook to transport them to Canada. If this order becomes operative at once, great injustice will be done to transportation companies and to immigrants who have spent their money for tickets only to find on their arrival here that an order in council has been passed under which they are to be sent back to the countries from which they came. Is due notice to be given, and, if so, what length of notice, to the steamship companies and immigrants, before such a change in the law goes into operation?

Mr. OLIVER. In the first place, I am bound to say that this proposed legislation is to go into effect, not by being passed by the House, but by proclamation of the Governor in Council, and that it is the custom to give due notice before the passage of such an order in council.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the order in council be general or specific?

Mr. OLIVER. In any case, the order in council would affect the transportation companies and immigrants, and it is only right and reasonable that there should be notice. And notice has been given in the past and will be in the future. My hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) mentioned that in the Act as it stands there is a provision that due notice shall be given, and that these words are not contained in the measure as it stands now before the House. The reason for leaving out these words is that when they are placed in the statute, there is the question as to what 'due notice' is, and this might lead to very serious complications. Therefore, we believe it is better that the government should be trusted to give due notice rather than that words should be put in the statute that would be difficult of interpretation, and might render of none effect the intent of parliament and the action of the government.

In regard to the point which has been under discussion, raised by my hon. friend from South Simcoe—concerning which, perhaps, I have not the same license as members of the legal profession—I must say that the matter does not strike me as they have presented it to the House. It seems to me elementary that the parliament of Canada is supreme within Canada; that whatever parliament has done parliament can undo, that, if, last year, we passed an Act which gave certain privileges to certain people, we can, this year, pass as Act which does not give these privileges to these people, and that Act is valid so far as the courts of Canada are concerned and so far as it affects the people within the boundaries of Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is this intended as being pro tanto a repeal of the Act of last year confirming the treaty with Japan?

Mr. OLIVER. No. I am maintaining, as concerning the Bill before the House, that it does not repeal the Act of last session.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is what I contended also.

Mr. LENNOX. That is what we all contend.

Mr. OLIVER. But our friends pretend that the intent is to repeal——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, I did not.

Mr. LENNOX. On the contrary, I agreed with the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) when he said the treaty would be more powerful than this, that the treaty would prevail against this Act.

Mr. OLIVER. I have not been able to get my point understood yet. As I understand our friends opposite, they maintain that the Act of last session regarding the Japanese treaty stood effective against this Act which we propose to pass this session.

Mr. LENNOX. That is right.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, I say that the matter does not appeal to me in that way. As I said before, the parliament of Canada is supreme within the limits of Canada. The parliament of Canada passed an Act last session with regard to the Japanese treaty. So far as the people of Canada are concerned within the limits of Canada, an Act passed by the parliament of Canada at this session is effective and binding upon the courts of Canada, whether it is or is not contrary to the legislation passed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is what I asked—was this statute intended to repeal the Act of last session in that respect, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) said, 'no.'

Mr. OLIVER. I said, in my estimation. All these matters must be matters of opinion. In my estimation this does not purport to repeal ; but if it did, then I maintain that if this parliament passed it, it would repeal.

Mr. LENNOX. If appropriate words were used, it certainly would repeal, but appropriate words are not used.

Mr. OLIVER. I have rather missed the point of our friends argument or they have missed mine. My understanding is that if this legislation is passed, it will be effective. It will have effect in law and be binding upon the courts as it is expressed, without regard to the terms of the treaty passed last session.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend has said exactly the contrary. He has declared that this Act is not intended to repeal or affect in any way the Act of last year and therefore the order in council proposed to be passed must be subject to the treaty of last year. That is an absolute logical conclusion. You cannot get away from it. This Bill is not intended to repeal the Act of last year.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Because it is not necessary. The Japanese government have come to an understanding which makes it absolutely unnecessary.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am surprised that my hon. friend the Minister of Labour would repeat that twice. Does he not know that any Japanese coming to British Columbia can avail himself of that treaty, absolutely in disregard of any informal arrangement made between this government and the government of Japan? I did not think I would have to explain that even to any member who does not belong to the legal profession. There is a treaty between the two nations, which treaty is confirmed by the parliament of Canada. That treaty derives its force in this country altogether from the legislation of this parliament last year, and to suggest that the Minister of Labour and the Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs can repeal, by an understanding between them, the legislation confirming this treaty is so utterly absurd, that I would not think any one would for one moment entertain such a suggestion.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is a treaty binding upon this country and Japan, but we know that no Japanese subject can leave a port of Japan without the express authority of the Japanese government, and he cannot come to this country against that authority.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend has not been paying attention or he would know that that is not the point. I am speaking of Japanese coming from Hawaii. These are the men to whom the statute would apply and not those who come from Japan. I might point out what is absolutely obvious. These men coming from Hawaii to British Columbia could invoke that treaty with an absolute disregard of any arrangement made by the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Japan. The treaty between the Empire of Japan and this country has been confirmed by the parliament of Canada. It is the legislation affirming that treaty which binds Canada, and not any arrangement such as is spoken of by the Minister of Labour. How ridiculous would it not be for any counsel in a British Columbia court to argue, in opposition to a motion for the release of these men that the treaty which gives every Japanese subject the absolute right to enter, travel and reside in Canada has been repealed by an arrangement between the Minister of Labour of Canada and the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Japan, and therefore these men must be deported. Even a one year's law student, who valued his reputation, would not make such an argument as that.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Who suggested that ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understood the Minister of Labour to suggest it. I do not know what he did suggest, if he did not intend that. When the legislation was invoked, my hon. friend put forward the operative force of an arrangement made himself with the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Japan.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Not its operative force before our courts. What I say is that the necessity for such deportation will not arise, and consequently there will be no case before our courts and no necessity for invoking this treaty as against the arrangement with Japan. My hon. friend contends

that the treaty may be availed of by any Japanese subject before our courts. But what I reply is that such a possibility is a very remote one indeed. True there is the treaty, but there is also the understanding—not a verbal understanding, as suggested by my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) but a written one—with the Japanese government, under which no immigration can take place except in compliance with that arrangement. No Japanese will be allowed to leave Japan without a passport. My hon. friend suggests that a Japanese might come from the Sandwich Islands and not direct from Japan and might invoke the treaty before our courts. But he is still a Japanese subject, and if he came in contravention of the arrangement between Japan and Canada, he would be acting against the laws of his own country, and the Canadian government would be in a position to deport him.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That suggestion would be very valuable indeed if the laws of Japan were in force in Canada, but unfortunately they are not. It is the laws of this parliament which are in force in Canada. Therefore a Japanese subject coming from Hawaii can depend on the terms of the treaty because that treaty has been affirmed by an Act of this parliament. It would be absolutely idle to suggest that any arrangement, whether verbal or written, whether under seal or not, made between our Minister of Labour and the Foreign Minister of Japan, could have the slightest effect on the legal status of that man entering this country from Hawaii. It is absolute nonsense to suppose that such would be the case. Therefore the question comes back to the point from which we started a moment ago. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) admits, and properly admits, that this proposed legislation cannot and does not purport to repeal our statute of last year confirming the treaty between Canada and Japan.

Mr. OLIVER. What I meant to say was that it does not purport to repeal that treaty but it could if we wanted it to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Certainly this parliament can repeal the Act of last year but we are not doing it, and it is idle to discuss the effect of something we are not doing. Let us discuss what we are doing. We are simply leaving the Japanese treaty where it was when we passed that Act confirming it. Therefore any order in council put forth under the terms of this proposed legislation could not in the slightest degree affect the provisions of the Japanese treaty confirmed by an Act of this parliament.

Mr. MACPHERSON. It has been done in British Columbia by the courts there. Two Japanese were deported to the United States under that order in council.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am referring to the decision of the courts of British Columbia alluded to by the right hon. gentleman. We have arrived at the point where we are all agreed that this proposed legislation does not touch the Act of last year. There is but one point to be considered, a point mentioned by the right hon. gentleman, whether an order in council providing that persons not coming in by a continuous journey or on a through ticket, should be deported, would apply to citizens of Japan. The decision of the British Columbia courts indicates that such an order in council would be subject to the Act of last year, and that the operation of the Act of last year would exempt citizens of Japan from the operation of such an order.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is now six o'clock, and I have only this to say, that according to international law I think no treaty prevents one of the contracting parties from exercising the power vested in it to pass municipal regulations necessary for its own protection. For instance, though we have a treaty here, I am quite sure we can exclude a Japanese who is mentally or physically diseased, and if we can do that, we have power to do by legislation all that is necessary to carry out this provision of municipal law, and that is what we intend to do.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. A moment ago, the right hon. gentleman nodded his assent to the proposition of the hon. member for King's that because we have a qualified power to restrict these persons coming from the British isles, therefore we have power of absolute restriction—if he should attempt to apply this argument in the case of Japan, he would be confronted by the treaty.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have power to enforce our own municipal regulations for our own protection. At all events, that is the position we have taken on this question, and we believe it to be legal. I move the previous question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would have liked an opportunity to discuss this matter further.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would like very much to send this Bill to the Senate so that they may act upon it before they adjourn, the Senate adjourns to-morrow. This is very important legislation for British Columbia.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I want to say a few words more.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am giving the reasons why I wish to pass this Bill now, it is in order that it may be sent to the Senate, and may be sanctioned to-morrow, and come immediately into force.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The Prime Minister has not shown any necessity for the legislation.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I think there is need of immediate legislation, in the best interest of British Columbia. I trust the House will see fit to meet the Prime Minister's wishes so that this Bill may go to the Senate and become operative at once. There is a crying necessity for it. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to accept the responsibility of delaying legislation which will prevent these yellow people from coming into our province? What did the leader of the opposition say in British Columbia? He stood for a white man's country.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If the hon. gentleman is going to make a stump speech here, he is taking the best means of holding up this Bill. As a matter of fact I object to this Bill going through at the present time. The hon. gentleman was not taking a manly part in British Columbia on this question. We were standing here on this question. We were standing here in defence of a better citizenship.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot make a speech.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the House is not willing to consent to pass this measure now, we have nothing to do but to adjourn.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I want to put myself on record that I am in favour of a white man's country, and also in favour of a decent country.

Progress reported.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What legislation will be taken up to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Bill of the Minister of Inland Revenue and the two Bills of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Will this matter be taken up again to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, April 9, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

SIGNAL DUES AT HALIFAX.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 152) respecting signal dues at Halifax.

Mr. HENDERSON. Explain.

Mr. BRODEUR. The object of the Bill is to permit vessels having a tonnage of less than 150 tons to come into the harbour at Halifax without being obliged to pay what we call signal dues. There is a signal station at Halifax for the purpose of signalling vessels, but only those having a larger tonnage than 150 tons are signalled. We think that under these circumstances all vessels which are not signalled when they come into the harbour should not be obliged to pay the dues. The object of the Bill is for the purpose of abolishing dues in so far as these vessels are concerned.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—CONTRACTS.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What contracts and for what mileage, and the price at which each have been let, upon the eastern and western sections of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway?
2. What is the date of each contract, and the period set for completion?
3. What is the estimated cost of the unlet portions?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). It will take some weeks to give a reply to that.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you not get it from the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Commission?

Mr. GRAHAM. We are getting it as rapidly as possible, but it is not available here, and we have to try to get the information from different sources.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought the tenders at least were all submitted to the Transcontinental Railway Commission.

Mr. GRAHAM. Those having reference to the Transcontinental Railway part of it are.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like you to bring everything down.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, I can get it. But the question seems to cover contracts belonging to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and we may have some difficulty in getting that information.

Mr. FOSTER. That is right.

Question allowed to stand.

ASSESSMENTS ON POSTMASTERS.

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM asked:

1. What amount of money has been collected by the government from assessments made on the postmasters of Canada?

2. What have been the losses, and in which of the provinces have these occurred?
3. What is the amount of money on hand collected from such assessments?
4. Is it the intention of the government to reduce the assessment?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1.

Assessments on postmasters to 31st March, 1909		$ 94,529 21
Interest		7,941 00
		$102,470 21
2. Losses through postmasters:		
Ontario	$ 517 49	
Quebec	844 72	
Nova Scotia	192 25	
New Brunswick	201 37	
Prince Edward Is.	538 12	
Manitoba	16 00	
Alberta	259 00	
British Columbia	2,714 70	
Yukon	50 67	
	$ 5,334 32	
Premiums to guarantee companies	19,256 00	
		24,590 32

3. On hand 31st March, 1908.. $77,879 89
4. The department has not yet considered this question.

QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RAILWAY AND STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

Mr. LAKE—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. What was the last annual deficiency, if any, due by the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway and Steamship Company to the government, under their agreement, dated 5th August, 1889?
2. What was the total sum due on account of deficits according to the last annual adjustment of accounts?
3. What is the extent of any further obligations, either in cash payments or of any other nature, due by the government to the company during the continuance of the agreement?
4. What is the total number of acres of land retained by the government from the land grant at the present time as security against indebtedness by the company to the government?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance):

1. Excess paid by the government over amount earned by the company for year ending April 30, 1907, under the agreement referred to, $67,315.35.
2. The amount due by the company April 30, 1907, was $1,630,408.09.
3. Cash payments required under agreement after April 30, 1907, seven payments of $40,000 each or $280,000. Two of these payments of $40,000 each have been made since April 30, 1907.
4. 493,269.34 acres.

Mr. CHISHOLM.

EXPORTATION OF CATTLE TO AND IMPORTATION FROM GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. CHRISTIE—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. What number of cattle were exported from Canada to Great Britain during the years 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907, respectively?
2. What number of cattle were imported from Great Britain to Canada during the years 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907, respectively?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The imports into Canada from Great Britain and the exports to Great Britain from Canada of cattle during the twelve months ended June 30, 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907 respectively, have been as follows:—

Years.	Imports.		Exports.
	Horned cattle, dutiable.	Cattle for improvement of stock.	
	Number.	Number	Number.
1904	94	161	148,345
1905	72	60	159,078
1906	.....	119	163,994
1907	12	231	170,164

THE ALL-RED LINE.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. What tenders or proposals have been received to date by the government in connection with the All-Red Line, or a faster steamship service across the Atlantic, between Canada and Great Britain?
2. Has any correspondence or have any despatches been exchanged between the Canadian and the imperial government since the 1st of September, 1907, upon the proposed All-Red Line?
3. Is it the intention of the government to table the documents, if any exist, referred to in preceding paragraphs, before the House is asked to vote further subsidies to steamship lines?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). There is no correspondence of any kind upon the subject.

POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS REGARDING NEWSPAPERS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

Has the government received a resolution passed at a meeting of the Canadian Press Association asking that weekly papers be placed on the same basis in regard to carriage in the United States as the dailies? If so, what is the wording of said resolution?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

Yes. That the weekly section of the Canadian Press Association believes their pub-

lications are being discriminated against by the postal arrangements with the United States and that our executive in conjunction with the general executive be asked to urge such modifications as would place them on the same basis with the daily papers in regard to United States publications. I may add, with the leave of the House, that I received this morning a communication from the Weekly Section of the Canadian Press Association, and they are perfectly satisfied with the answer given.

PAYMENTS TO ECLIPSE COMPANY OF OTTAWA.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

What amount has been paid since 1896 to the Eclipse Company, of Ottawa, for supplies to every department of the government, by departments and years?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). A return containing this information was presented to the House on the 27th of February last.

WINFIELD BASIN DREDGING.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Was any dredging done at Winfield basin in the season of 1907? If so, who were the contractors, and what amount was paid therefor?

2. What was the nature of the material, and the quantities and price paid therefor per yard?

3. How many tenders were received for work, if tenders were asked?

4. Who was the inspector on behalf of the government, and upon whose recommendation was he appointed?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. (a) Yes. (b) C. S. Boone. (c) No payment has been made on account of this work.

2. (a) Rock, hardpan, clay, gravel and boulders. (b) Returns not completed. (c) Contract prices : $4 for rock, 65 cents for all other materials.

3. Tenders were called for by public advertisement ; one tender received.

4. W. Matheson. The appointment was made on the responsibility of the minister.

ILLEGITIMATE POSTERS.

Mr. BARR asked :

1. What officer of customs in the several ports of the Dominion is charged with the duty of carrying out item 1210 of the tariff, which prohibits the importation of posters and handbills depicting scenes of crime or violence?

2. Is the government aware that during the past few weeks posters of this character are said to have appeared upon many of the billboards of Ottawa?

3. Does the government know that posters of this description are at the present time said to be posted on boards on some of the leading streets of the capital?

4. What steps does the government propose to take to see that this provision in the tariff is strictly enforced?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. It is the duty of the appraisers at the several ports of the Dominion, when examining importations, to aid in carrying out item 1210 of the Customs Tariff, 1907, which prohibits the importation of posters and handbills depicting scenes of crime or violence. The duties of appraisers devolve on collectors at ports where there are no appraisers.

2 and 3. The local authorities are considered to have supervision over the character of posters appearing on bill boards at Ottawa, so that customs officers do not look after posters when exhibited on bill boards, unless their assistance is requested by the local authorities.

4. Customs officers are authorized and instructed to enforce the provisions of the customs laws concerning these posters, as far as practicable, and to co-operate with the local authorities in suppressing exhibits of posters which are prohibited from importation under the law.

The attention of customs officers at the port of Ottawa has been directed to this inquiry and the reply thereto.

RIVIERE DU LOUP WHARF

Mr. MORIN asked :

1. What is the total amount expended to date by the government in connection with the wharf at Rivière du Loup, province of Quebec?

2. What is the total amount expended to date on dredging and harbour improvements at Fraserville and Rivière du Loup, province of Quebec, since the 1st of May, 1898?

3. How many steamers have stopped and tied up to the wharf at said Rivière du Loup each year, during the last four years?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. The total amount expended prior to confederation was $170,129,35 ; the total amount expended since confederation to 1st April, 1908, construction and repairs was, $112,996.08 ; grand total, $283,125.43.

2. No dredging has been done since 1st May, 1898.

3. The wharf was transferred in 1891 to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I have no information as to this question.

Mr. TAYLOR. Better let the question stand until the Department of Marine and Fisheries completes the answer.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was informed that there was no information in the Marine Department as to the number of steamers. However, that part of the question may stand if the hon. gentleman desires.

Part 3 of question allowed to stand.

WHITE HEAD WHARF.

Mr. GANONG asked :

1. Has the government engineer made any report of the estimated cost of building a suitable wharf at White Head, Grand Manan, New Brunswick? If so, what was the estimated cost?

2. Is it the intention of the government to include an amount in the supplementary estimates to build this wharf?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. Yes ; estimated cost, $6,680.

2. The matter is under consideration.

SEAL COVE DREDGING.

Mr. GANONG asked :

1. Has the government engineer made a report of the estimated cost of dredging necessary to give access to the cove or harbour at Seal Cove, Grand Manan, New Brunswick? If so, what is the estimated cost of this work?

2. Is it the intention of the government to include an amount in the supplementary estimates to do this work?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. The government engineer has made a report on the improvement of Seal Cove harbour. He suggests that the requirements would be best met by the construction of a breakwater rather than by dredging.

2. The matter is under consideration.

LEONARDVILLE WHARF.

Mr. GANONG asked :

1. Has the government engineer made a report of the estimated cost of building a public wharf at Leonardville, Deer island, New Brunswick? If so, what is the estimated cost of this wharf?

2. Is it the intention of the government to include an amount in the supplementary estimates to build this wharf?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. Yes ; to rebuild and extend the existing wharf. The estimated cost is $8,800, including dredging.

2. The matter is under consideration.

GRAND MANAN TELEGRAPH.

Mr. GANONG asked :

1. Has an application been made to the government by any person, persons or company to take over the telegraph, cable or cables giving telegraphic connection between the Island of Grand Manan, New Brunswick, and the mainland? If so, who were the parties making the application?

2. Is it the intention of the government to consider any such proposition?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. (a) Yes ; (b) The Grand Manan Telephone Company.

2. The matter is under consideration.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

EASTER ADJOURNMENT.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That when this House adjourns on Wednesday, the 15th instant, it stand adjourned to Tuesday, the 21st instant.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would ask the First Minister if it would not be possible to make that Wednesday, the 22nd instead of Tuesday, the 21st ?

Mr. FOSTER. Why ?

Mr. EMMERSON. A great many of those living in remote sections in the east will find it impossible to be here in time for Tuesday unless they leave their homes on Saturday.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I may say to my hon. friend that I have followed the practice which has been invariable in such cases.

Motion agreed to.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH MR. JUSTICE CASSELS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I beg to lay on the table of the House further correspondence with Mr. Justice Cassels.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if he has yet completed the return in reference to Petit Rocher ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On making an inquiry of my deputy, I find that the answer given contained exactly the information which was asked for, that is, matters detailed on a certain page of the Auditor General's Report. If my hon. friend desires further information, and will be good enough to put another question, I shall be glad to give him the further information.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was not a question at all, but a motion for a return.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was for a return as to matters detailed on a certain page of the Auditor General's Report, and that return has been made and is complete.

Mr. J. D. REID. I wish to ask the Minister of the Interior when the return I asked for, in reference to Kananaski Falls on the Bow River west of Calgary will be brought down ?

Mr. OLIVER. I fancy it would be ready in a very short time.

Mr. FOSTER. That return with reference to the Yukon finances made by Mr. Beddoe has not yet been brought down.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend will admit that I have been diligent. As

far as I am concerned, I have brought down everything he wanted.

Mr. FOSTER. As far as the hon. gentleman's own department is concerned, I believe he has a clear slate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I see on the paper an order for a return showing the amount of blankets purchased since 1895. I understood that the Minister of Agriculture asked for a change of the wording and that the order was passed with that change. I should like to have the return.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). The hon. gentleman must have misunderstood. When the motion was made, the Minister of Militia was not present, but he had said on a former occasion that he wanted some change made and therefore the order did not pass. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in thinking that it passed as a notice of motion.

ALLEGED IMMIGRATION IRREGULARITIES AT HALIFAX.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I wish to ask the Minister of Interior whether any investigation is going on in reference to alleged irregularities in connection with immigration at Halifax, and if so, what information he has to give to the House on the subject?

Mr. OLIVER. There is an investigation going on at the present time. Mr. Blake Robertson, assistant supperintendent of immigration has been in Halifax. I am not sure that he has returned yet. We intend to follow the matter up, but I think it would be as well not to press for details until we have reached some conclusion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The information will be brought down when the investigation has been concluded?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there any further information with regard to the frauds which were mentioned in the House some time ago? The hon. minister will remember that one of the officers in Halifax, I think, was dismissed.

Mr. OLIVER. That is what I am alluding to. We have been investigating that matter. The assistant superintendent of immigration went to Halifax last week, and we hope to follow the matter to a conclusion. I think it would be well not to press for details until we can lay a conclusion before the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not pressing for information before the time the minister thinks it advisable to bring it down. What I was alluding to was a press report respecting an interpreter by the name of Bernstein.

Mr. OLIVER. With regard to that, Mr. Blake Robertson went to Halifax. He is dealing with both matters while there.

THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I ask when Judge Cassells will commence his investigation, and if he is to be appointed commissioner to investigate those cases in which intimations of wrong-doing were given by the commission, but no names mentioned? I would ask whether previous to that there is to be a departmental investigation into that same matter?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that the commission of Judge Cassells has been issued ; I cannot say when he will commence his investigation. I would suppose immediately.

Mr. FOSTER. And as to the second question I put ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot say.

INLAND REVENUE ACT—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 143) to amend the Inland Revenue Act—Mr. Templeman—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 4,

4. Section 141 of the said Act is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

141. The department may, under regulations made for that purpose, allow on the exportation of goods manufactured from, or a product or result of the process of manufacture of, articles subject to a duty of excise, and on which such duty of excise has been paid, a drawback equal to the duty so paid, with such deduction therefrom as is provided in such regulations and subject to the direction of the Governor in Council.

2. The said section 141 shall be construed as if it had been originally enacted as herein amended.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This has reference to the rebate given on cuttings. We began giving that rebate in 1901 under clause 141 of the Act. The Auditor General called attention to the fact that clause 141 as it now stands does not authorize the department to give this rebate. We submitted the question to the Minister of Justice and he confirmed the view of the Auditor General. This section 4 of this Bill is to provide for this case. Subsection 2 of this section is new, and, as my hon. friend will see, it is put in to legalize the repayments that have been made on cuttings. The necessity for section 141 will remain only so long as the present law is in force, as, after that, there will be no rebate on cuttings. But we have to legalize what has been done as well as what is to be done.

On section 5,—annual gauging of vessels in distillery.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The only change in this is the first line, where 'April' is substituted for 'July.' This is in consequence of the change in the fiscal year.

On section 6,—quarterly account of stock in bonded manufactories.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This also is necessitated by change in the fiscal year.

On section 7,

7. Section 266 of the said Act is amended by adding the following subsection thereto:

2. Every person who uses methyl alcohol, or spirits containing methyl alcohol in any form, in any pharmaceutical, medicinal or other preparation intended for external use shall affix to the vessel containing the said preparation a label stating, in black letters not less than one-fourth of an inch in height, the presence of methyl alcohol therein; and every person violating the provisions of this subsection shall incur a penalty not less than fifty dollars and not exceeding two hundred dollars.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The present prohibition of methyl alcohol is confined to articles intended for internal use. We add subsection 2 to section 206, and we do this in consequence of the large number of fatalities that have occurred throughout the country by the use, ignorantly no doubt, of methyl alcohol. We have taken the opportunity of this amendment of the Inland Revenue Act to make this change. We purpose—and I think there is a clause later on—to provide that the manufacturers of wood alcohol shall be licensed. This is done for the purpose of bringing them under the jurisdiction and control of the Department of Inland Revenue. We will charge the mere nominal fee of $1 for a license and will require them to label the barrels and receptacles in which wood alcohol is placed with the word 'Poison.' We think this is in the interest of the public and that it will safeguard the people from the use, ignorantly or otherwise, of wood alcohol.

Mr. FOSTER. What steps, if any, has the minister taken looking to remedy the complaint that has been made concerning the excessive cost of this alcohol which is the basis of so many preparations? I think we had a discussion in the House a year or two ago with reference to it, and the general idea was that the price of this material was very high compared with the price in the United States, where they have, by improved processes and by changes in the law, greatly reduced the cost of alcohol. I think the minister stated that he was making experiments in the same direction. I have letters in my hand setting forth the disability under which the druggists labour on this account. I would like the minister, if he can, to give a brief statement of what he is doing in that respect.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The question of providing denatured alcohol, as it is sometimes called, or methylated spirits, at cheap rates has been engaging the attention of the Department of Inland Revenue for a year or two. The department makes methylated spirits. It has kept this manufacture in its control for years for the purpose of safeguarding the revenue. The methylated spirits placed upon the market of Canada for many years, has been mostly of two grades, one being 50 per cent wood alcohol and 50 per cent grain alcohol, and the other being 25 per cent wood alcohol and 75 per cent grain alcohol. The cost of the grain alcohol as purchased by the department from distillers has been about 41 or 42 cents per gallon, at the strength used for methylated spirits. Up to the present time the cost of wood alcohol to the department has been $1.29 per gallon. We have put these two grades of methylated spirits on the market for a number of years at $1.10 per gallon and $1.25, the latter being the price of alcohol containing 50 per cent wood alcohol. During the past year we have reduced these prices until at the present time we sell No. 1 grade at 70 cents and No. 2 grade at 80 cents. We have been experimenting in the laboratory with spirits to see if we could not properly safeguard the revenue by using a smaller percentage of wood alcohol, and the consequence is that we have put on the market an alcohol at 65 cents per gallon. Now I have said that the price of wood alcohol up to the period of the termination of the last contract was $1.29 per bulk gallon. During the last year the price of wood alcohol, particularly in the United States, has decreased very materially. In the United States, my hon. friend must remember, until one year ago, the manufacturers had to use wood alcohol pure and simple, or if they used ethyl alcohol they had to pay the duty. Canada has been far in advance of the United States for many years in this respect; but two years ago the United States Congress passed a law authorizing licenses to distillers and others to take alcohol out of bond and denature it. They have done so, and they are placing on the market to-day a denatured alcohol of which about 90 per cent is grain alcohol and 10 per cent wood alcohol, and they are selling it at 40 cents a wine gallon, which, being one-fifth or one-sixth less in bulk than the imperial gallon, is after all not as cheap as one would imagine. At the price at which the department will be able henceforth to purchase wood alcohol, the market price in Canada to-day being, I think, something like 50 cents and upward, acording to grade, the reduction the department will make in the present price will be very material; and I think that, even with the disadvantages under which we labour in Canada of making cheap grain alcohol as compared with the distillers of the United States, we will be able to put on the

market before long a denatured alcohol at prices very little above those in the United States. Of the two grades of methylated spirits placed upon the market by the department for a long time, No. 1, with 75 per cent of grain alcohol, has been sold to manufacturers and others who enter into a bond that it shall be used only in their business and not be sold or transferred to others The other grade, No. 2, was sold to the public at large without any restriction whatever, the department feeling confident that an alcohol containing 50 per cent of wood alcohol was a perfectly safe article to place on the market so far as the revenue was concerned. This, Mr. Chairman, is the situation at the present time. We hope in the future to make considerable progress in reducing the price of methylated spirits. Up to the time that we could procure a cheap wood alcohol, after the termination of our contract, no effort has been made to remove the cost of denaturing, which I think is quite feasible. The wood alcohol now mixed by the department is all brought to Ottawa, upon which freight has to be paid, and I think it will be possible considerably to reduce the cost of denaturing before long.

Mr. FOSTER. Where does the minister get his wood alcohol? Is any of it made in Canada?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It is all made in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. I mean is any of it made in Canada that is not made under the supervision of the department?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There is no supervision, we are taking that power now. Wood alcohol, as a substance by itself, is made by the manufacturers of charcoal and others; it is free to any person to make it and place it on the market. We have no restriction over its manufacture. We now propose to take control over the manufacture of alcohol simply for the purpose of safeguarding the lives of people by compelling the manufacturers to put labels on every vessel to show that the contents are wood alcohol, because it is very often taken for something else.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the disability under which Canada rests as regards the superfluity of grain, the only disability that makes the comparison so much against us as regards the United States?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I think the disability as compared with the alcohol produced in certain districts of the United States is considerable. In the first place, I think the corn imported into Canada comes directly from the corn producing belt and has to pay freight. There is, I think, a small tax, something like seven and a half cents per bushel, on corn used in the production of alcohol. The distillers in the United States are located in districts where corn is grown in large quantities, and where coal for fuel is practically at their very door. It is a question whether, if we attempted to produce a cheap denatured alcohol, we would be able to remove that disability, so far as concerns alcohol used for denaturing purposes. That might be practicable without at all affecting the revenue or changing the taxes. There are many disabilities but these are probably the principal ones. The price of coal is another. When I asked distillers why they could not sell alcohol as cheaply as it is sold in the United States, they said that in southern Illinois, I think Peoria is the centre, they are near the corn fields and the coal fields and have facilities for producing alcohol at a very low price.

Mr. CLEMENTS. What is the difference in the cost at the present time?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I cannot give that information exactly. We are at present very much handicapped by reason of the excessive price of wood alcohol. I look forward hopefully to the possibility of placing denatured alcohol on the market in Canada at a considerably reduced price. At the same time the great object the people have in mind is a denatured alcohol that may be used for fuel, light or motive purposes. I give no opinion as to the possibility of that. The use of alcohol in competing with gasoline or petroleum is not likely to become general in Canada for some time to come. While it may be possible to produce alcohol in Canada much more cheaply than at present, it would have to be produced at one-half the price of to-day before it could be sold in competition with gasoline and petroleum.

Mr. FOSTER. What struck me was the possibility of people generally manufacturing their own alcohol and thus getting an extremely cheap motive power. I read some articles with reference to this in the United States and they seemed to have overcome the difficulty in regard to revenue and were able to produce a wonderfully cheap article for motive power and other industrial uses. I would like the minister to state whether this has been successfully carried out in the United States, and if so, why Canada could not do the same thing. My recollection is that they proposed to make the alcohol out of farm refuse of different kinds which is now practically wasted, but which is claimed under proper education could be converted into alcohol by farmers themselves.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The officials of the department have been in communication with the officials of the department in Washington with respect to the operation of their law, and their information is that it has not been successful in regard to the distillation of alcohol by farmers. All the denatured alcohol put on the market in the United States in the last twelve months

has been from the grain distillers. It was expected that there would be such a thing as agricultural distilleries, that any farmer might have a license, might have a small still, and under the supervision of excise officers distil his own alcohol from corn stalks or other similar waste products of the farm. However, this has not been accomplished in the United States. Our department have watched it with interest; we would very much like to have them work out this problem successfully before venturing along a line in which there is serious danger to the revenue unless the work is carried out under the closest supervision.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think I recollect a speech by the hon. member for East Kent (Mr. Gordon) on this subject some two or three years ago, and I was rather impressed with what he said with respect to the progress which Germany has made in the production of this article for purposes such as the hon. member has alluded to.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Germany is always pointed to as the country that has succeeded in producing denatured alcohol for fuel purposes, for driving motors, &c. A year ago, when the question was before the House, I read some of the reports in regard to the success of this alcohol in Germany, including the report prepared by a commission of the imperial parliament to investigate this question in regard to the effect of tax-paying alcohol on the industries of Great Britain as compared with the freer alcohol of Germany. I learned then, and I believe it is the fact, that Germany encourages by a subsidy the production of alcohol on the farm. Germany also imposes a tax upon petroleum. It encourages the production of alcohol by farmers to the extent of 6 cents or 7 cents a gallon. I do not think that policy would be acceptable in Canada. Then Germany has very cheap labour. The inauguration of the alcohol industry in Germany was due to agrarian politics. There were very large areas of poor land and many poor people, and they were encouraged to go on these lands to grow potatoes and manufacture alcohol. It was not altogether a question of producing cheap fuel, it had something to do with the settlement of poor lands in Saxony and other provinces of Germany. A large quantity of alcohol is used in Germany for fuel and light purposes, which is made from potatoes. I do not think we desire conditions in this country which would enable us to obtain the same measure of cheap alcohol; I understand that unless our farmers are prepared to grow potatoes at a price of about 10 cents or 12 cents a bushel they will not be able to produce alcohol to compete with the present price of petroleum and gasoline in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to call attention to the situation that is created in that way. Perhaps I might bring that out by reading an extract from a letter received by myself. It is as follows:

> There is a matter of very considerable interest to ourselves——

These people are chemists and druggists.

> —as well as to the drug trade generally that has already or will in the very near future be brought to the attention of the House . . . . and that is the question of the exorbitant prices we are obliged to pay for alcohol for use in the arts. The manufacturers are obliged to keep this article in stock for three years in order to comply with the regulations. We consider this absolutely unnecessary when the alcohol is used for manufacturing purposes, and this fact adds practically 50 per cent to the actual cost of the spirit, without, of course, considering the question of government duty.

That is an assertion which is worthy of some consideration. They make the flat statement that it is not necessary to keep this alcohol for three years maturing in order to prepare it for use in the manufactures. If it is a fact that it need not be kept so long there should be a great reduction in price. Whether that is practicable or not is a question which remains for the minister to consider.

> A denatured alcohol is manufactured and sold in the United States at 39 cents per gallon which illustrates the fact that a spirit can be manufactured and sold, if there were no duty to pay and it had not to be kept for three years, at from 40 to 50 cents per gallon, imperial measure, with a very good profit. Of course, the government duty is placed high enough so as to prevent any spirit being imported.

In the general policy of the country, which is to aid and enlarge manufacturing interests as greatly as possible, here is one manufacturing interest which, upon such a statement of the case, seems to be placed at a disadvantage in its competition with respect to articles coming from other countries and the manufacturers of which have a cheaper basic article to commence with. Has the minister looked into the point as to whether it is necessary to keep alcohol maturing so long for this purpose? If it is not, of course, there may be some cheapening in that respect. It does seem as though they state, prima facie, a case which is worthy of consideration. The department gets out a great many bulletins, some of which are not very interesting. It would really be interesting if the officers of the department would look into the processes which have been started in other countries and for which great claims have been made, and once in a while summarizing the results of these experiments in other countries. For instance, it would be very interesting if they would summarize in a short bulletin the results of the experiments which have been made in this line and show the

relative progress as between ourselves and other countries which may set the people thinking, and which may be a spur to inventive genius outside of the Department of Inland Revenue as to the ways and means by which some similar effects may be produced in this country. But, I would ask the minister in reference to these two points that are referred to here, first, as to the cost of alcohol for manufacturing purposes.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I think my hon. friend is probably mixing up two things. Denatured alcohol or methylated spirits is used for manufacturing purposes. It may be used if we can get it cheaply enough, for fuel and light, for driving motors and things of that kind. But what my hon. friend refers to is pure grain alcohol——

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, that is right.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN —for chemical purposes. An order in council was passed years ago permitting the use of grain alcohol by paying fifteen cents a gallon for the manufacture of anything in the process of manufacture of which the alcohol was destroyed or was so changed that it could not be recovered. That is the law to-day. When the motion of my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) was up for discussion the other day, the question arose as to whether we could not permit the manufacture of several other articles, chloroform being one, and I submitted the proposition to the chemist of the department. I am advised that he has made a report in which he says that some of the articles that it is proposed to manufacture in Canada might be permitted to be manufactured with perfect safety to the revenue, but that there are several others that my hon. friend from Winnipeg thought that we might manufacture with perfect safety to the revenue that I am advised could not be so manufactured. We cannot permit grain alcohol to go into the possession of the manufacturing druggists of the country to be manufactured, unless in the process of manufacture the alcohol is either destroyed or so changed that it is worthless and cannot be recovered. To that extent only can we encourage manufactures that require alcohol. So long as they change the alcohol and so long as it cannot be restored to its original character as being a potable article, the department will permit the use of alcohol for paying fifteen cents a gallon.

Mr. FOSTER. That might be extended beyond what it has been.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes, I am advised that it might be extended to several important articles. But, the complaint made by the writer of the letter to my hon. friend that grain alcohol has to be kept for three years in the warehouse without being sold under this clause is entirely wrong.

Mr. FOSTER. Under that clause probably it is.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It is quite possible under this clause for any manufacturer to get alcohol out of the warehouse the day after it is manufactured. There is no need of maturing it for three years. Possibly the writer of the letter only takes alcohol that has been three years maturing and for which he pays $1.90 a gallon as many of the druggists throughout the country do.

On section 8,—application for license to manufacture tobacco.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There is no change in this clause, except that the three last lines of the present Act are dropped.

On section 9—New section 275—fee for license——

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Under the law as it is now there are three different licenses, with fees of $50, $65 and $75 respectively. It is proposed that in future there shall be but one license, with a fee of $50.

On section 10—New section 278—notices to be posted up in tobacco manufactories—

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The change in the notice is due to the fact that there will be but one license, as there will be no question whether the tobacco is imported or Canadian.

On section 11—New section 279—duties of excise on tobacco.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This clause provides for the changes made in the duties. On manufactured tobaccos and snuffs, the duty is to be 5 cents a pound. At present the duty on snuff is 25 cents a pound.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Does the duty of 5 cents a pound apply to the ordinary twist which the tobacco grower sells to the manufacturer ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. In the province of Quebec, there has been no tax on twist.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There has always been a tax. There is no change in that respect.

Mr. CLARKE. There is no duty on the tobacco that a man grows for his own use.

Mr. FOSTER. Do I understand that a man is not liable for duty on what he manufactures for his own use ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The law for years has provided in section 325 that a man may manufacture for the use of himself and his family to the extent of thirty pounds in a year, without paying duty.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the department able to keep track of that fairly well ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I think so. As far as my knowledge goes there has been no abuse of that provision.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister ever find some abnormally large families ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Occasionally, especially in the province of Quebec.

On subsection (g)—duty on cigarettes—

Mr. BLAIN. Is there any change in this?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The duty is changed from $3 to $2.40 per thousand.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the minister, now that he is changing the regulations regarding the manufacture of tobacco, cigars and cigarettes, what the policy of the government is in respect to the cigarette question. I think this would be a favourable opportunity for the government to state their position, in view of the fact that the House some time ago adopted a resolution in favour of prohibiting the manufacture, importation and sale of cigarettes in any part of Canada. I have been waiting for the government to make some pronouncement, and I expected, when this Bill was introduced the government would be prepared to announce their policy. I am quite anxious to know how far the government will disregard the votes of the people's representatives on this question, more especially in view of the fact that some members of the cabinet expressed themselves in the House in favour of it. I am quite sure that the hon. minister, in the preparation of this Bill, gave some consideration to this question and has not disregarded entirely the wishes of the people as expressed in this House.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This Bill is simply for the purpose of changing slightly the method of collecting duties on tobacco and cigars, and therefore is not one on which we can properly discuss the policy of prohibiting the use of cigarettes.

Mr. SPROULE. You could introduce a clause in this Bill providing that in future no cigarettes may be manufactured or sold.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am rather sympathetic with regard to the discouragement of the use of cigarettes by our youth, and I believe that something ought to be done on that line by means of an amendment to the Criminal Code. I am not quite prepared to admit that the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of cigarettes would be the proper course. At any rate this is not a Bill on which we can discuss that question.

Mr. BLAIN. That is a very nice statement from my hon. friend the minister, but the people would rather have the minister do something practical to carry out their wishes than merely express sympathy. I would draw his attention to a letter complimenting the government for granting rather special favours to the cigarette manufacturers in Canada rather than carry out the wishes of the people's representatives. As a result of the discussion in the House a short time ago, a cigarette manufacturer in Montreal sent his compliments to each member of the House with a box of cigarettes and a letter.

Mr. BRODEUR. I did not get any.

Mr. FOSTER. That is another grievance for you.

Mr. BLAIN. The letter is as follows :

Montreal, Canada, March 17, 1908.

J. W. Daniel, Esq., M.P.,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir,—We take the liberty of transmitting to you to-day a sample of our cigarettes. We have factories established at London, England; Cairo, Egypt, and New York. This sample is from our new Canadian factory in this city and which we are enabled to operate satisfactorily, due alone to this legislation of your honourable House which abolished the sale contract system of the Tobacco Trust. While the tobacco trade do not as yet altogether realize the freedom of trading you have extended by your Act, and while a certain detrimental fear still exists, due to the past and present conduct of the monopoly, a better state of trading prevails and an independent house can operate in this market.

We wish to acknowledge the fact to-day, with thanks.

Respectfully yours,
PHILIP MORRIS & COMPANY,
Limited,
Henry Miles, President.

Mr. CLARKE. That is not the result of this legislation.

Mr. BLAIN. I am not saying it is, but I am trying to find out whether the government are going to make any statement. I placed a resolution on the Order Paper in the early part of the session. In 1903 a resolution was passed binding the majority of the House to stand by the government in the abolition of the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes. From time to time, action was postponed and we are still waiting for the happy day when the government will feel strong enough to carry out the wishes of the people. A resolution was discussed some few weeks ago in this House but not put to vote as some supporters of the government talked it out. I thought that was a favourable opportunity for the government to express itself. It seemed to be apropo then, but the government did not take advantage of that resolution and were not prepared to make a statement. It will not do for my hon. friend to confine himself to saying he is in sympathy with the movement. Such sympathy does not go very far. What we want is that the minister should give ex-

pression to that sympathy in the form of legislation. Possiby the First Minister, who received the large deputation on this question which filled one of our committee rooms may be able to enlighten us. It is my duty to ask the government what their policy is and what answer they propose to give to the hundred thousand petitioners who have been asking for some special legislation on this line. Whether the government have forgotten their pledge it is not for me to say, but I want to draw the attention of the minister who has charge of this Bill and of the right hon. gentleman to the large number of people who, from year to year, have been asking the government for legislation in conformity with the resolution. I would like the government to make a statement to-day or to declare when they will be prepared to state their policy on this great moral question. It is useless for me to point to the evil effects as these have been discussed in the press and in this House. What the people want to know is the policy of the government.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think that on this question of cigarette smoking, we all sympathize with the idea expressed by my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) so far as the youth of our land are concerned. It is very unfortunate that young people are induced to smoke cigarettes. I think some legislation should be passed for the purpose of doing away with this evil as far as possible, and I would agree with my hon. friend in supporting any legislation wisely designed to that end. The Bill now before us is not for the purpose of legislating in that way, but has to do with the raising of the public revenue. In some respects, the duty on cigarettes has been increased, which, I take it, is a step in the direction that my hon. friend wishes. I sympathize strongly with the idea that we should have legislation to prohibit young people from smoking cigarettes, and merchants and dealers from selling cigarettes to such people.

Mr. FOSTER. Was this increase in the duty made with the idea of mitigating the evil?

Mr. BRODEUR. I say the duty was increased, and this would tend to decrease the consumption.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that the purpose in the mind of the government when the duty was decreased?

Mr. BRODEUR. The main purpose was to equalize the revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought that from what the minister said—and I do not see why he should say it unless it had that bearing—that the government had the idea of mitigating to some extent this bad practice of using cigarettes when it increased the duty. It appears, however, that this was merely a word that escaped the minister's lips, and that it did not express an idea which was in the mind of the government or of the Minister of Inland Revenue when the duties were increased. It might be better if we did not make these assertions unless we meant them, as they might be interpreted by those outside in a wrong way. I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) would be the last man in this House to put it in that way to get the benefit of a wrong interpretation of the object in view in fixing this duty. I think we ought to have more from the government on this subject than we have had. It seems that we have no other opportunity. I was not present when the resolution of my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) was moved and debated. Had I been here I would have supported him as I did on a former occasion. While there was a sympathetic reception of that resolution on both sides of the House, the resolution seems to have been side-tracked by one of the devices well known to parliamentary practice and now stands where it is impossible, as I understand it, to recover it during the present session. I think my hon. friend from Peel is quite within his rights, when a chance opportunity comes in the form of legislation on this very subject, to ask the government to say what they would have said if this discussion had been allowed its course and had come to a conclusion either by a vote or by a statement made by the government and withdrawal of the motion if the statement were satisfactory. Really, this matter does merit consideration on our part. I do not suppose that you could find a single educationalist in the country who would not tell you that there is scarcely any more deleterious agent at work in depreciating and weakening the intellect of the youth of our country than this insidious habit of cigarette smoking. I think that educationalists will agree with that and that they are more and more pressing forward this idea. I do not suppose you will find a reputable physician who will stake his reputation on the statement that cigarette smoking is beneficial to the health of the young—or of anybody, though the grown person, with fibres set and full growth attained, might smoke cigarettes without receiving any very great injury. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) will know that the highest military authorities in Germany and Great Britain have sounded a note of warning concerning the effect of cigarette smoking upon the morale and upon the physicial fibre of the militia and soldiery of their respective countries. In fact, cigarette smoking cannot be proven to be beneficial in any way, and, from all these sources of which I have spoken, we have warnings as to its deleterious effects. Now we spend a lot of money to bring desirable immigrants to this country in order that we may increase the population of Canada. It seems to me we ought to very seriously consider whether we can keep

those that are born in our country and grow them up to the best stature of manhood and womanhood by removing deleterious agencies such as the cigarette is acknowledged to be. Why should we, on the one hand, spend money to bring in foreign adults to add to our population, and, on the other hand, allow an influence of this kind to neutralize our efforts by injuring those born in our midst? The matter of revenue is something, but revenue cannot be compared in importance for a moment with the health and well-being of the people. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) knows, from the deputations that have waited upon him—and also, no doubt, a great deal of correspondence has reached him—that there is a very widespread interest in this matter throughout the country. I think it may be stated that the best people of Canada are in favour of mitigating as far as possible, and, if possible, prohibiting, this practice in our country. It would be a great help if the Prime Minister could translate his sympathies and that of his friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) into words that would be hopeful and helpful to the important section of the population which is trying to minimize these evils. I think this is a golden opportunity for a word of sympathy if nothing further can be had.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will approach this question upon the very lines stated by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) himself. But, I may preface what I have to say on this occasion by stating that in this matter I am absolutely disinterested. I do not use tobacco in any form. If I were to follow my own inclination, I would have no hesitation in prohibiting cigarettes, cigars, smoking tobacco and chewing tobacco as well. But that would be going further perhaps, than would be acceptable to the great majority of this people. Coming to the observations of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) he has stated that this is a golden opportunity for the government to state their policy on the question brought before the House by my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) in his resolution to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes throughout the length and breadth of the land. This is no opportunity at all, I may say, by the way. This Bill is for the purpose of readjusting the excise duties upon tobacco, and has absolutely no connection with the question that has now been brought before the House, the question that was discussed a few days ago on the motion of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain).

The hon. gentleman asked what opinion I entertained on the subject. When the debate took place some time ago I stated my own view, and I have stated it before. I agree with the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Foster) that the use of cigarettes by boys is injurious, that is admitted, and seems to be beyond doubt. He has stated also that the use of tobacco or cigarettes by mature men is innoxious. Now if this form of tobacco is injurious to the mature youth but is not noxious to the mature man, would my hon. friend conclude that we should prohibit the use of tobacco to the mature man as well as to the youth? I do not think that would be logical. If the use of cigarettes or tobacco in any form is innoxious to the mature man what reason can there be for depriving him of that comfort? Tobacco as has been very often said, is the luxury of the poor man. Does the hon. gentleman contend that under such circumstances we should deprive him from the use of tobacco, that we should stop its use not only to the person whom it injures but also the person whom it does not injure? I think the remedy suggested by my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) is too radical, it goes too far, because he wants to prohibit the use of tobacco to a class of people whom it does not injure.

Mr. BLAIN. Keep in view the fact that it is only cigarettes, not tobacco or cigars, that I propose to prohibit.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Exactly, and I take the view of the hon. member for Toronto, that cigarettes, while they are injurious to the mature youth, are absolutely innoxious to the mature man.

Mr. FOSTER. My right hon. friend has misunderstood me. I did not say, at least I did not mean to say that the smoking of cigarettes was innoxious to the mature man; my own opinion is that it is noxious instead of being innoxious. What I said was that it had less effect upon the mature man than upon a younger person. But I do not subscribe to the idea that the smoking of cigarettes is altogether innoxious to the mature man; in fact my citing the opinions of military men as to the harmful effects of cigarettes upon soldiers, was proof that I took the ground that they were noxious and harmful to men.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Perhaps I misunderstood my hon. friend, but I gathered that much from the way he emphasized the fact that the use of the cigarette was not so harmful to a man whose muscles were knit and set as it was to a mature youth, and I thought he had come to the conclusion that it was innoxious to the mature man. At all events, so far as I am concerned, I cannot see how tobacco in one form can be more injurious than in another form. I have never heard any reasoning that convinced me that tobacco used in a paper envelope is more noxious than tobacco used without any wrapper at all, for instance, when used in a pipe. The great mischief which I see in the cigarette is its cheapness. When I was a youngster, if a boy had five cents he invested it in candy; but in these days when a boy has five cents

he goes and buys a package of cigarettes. This is the great mischief in the use of tobacco. Does the hon. gentleman think that tobacco itself, which is certainly injurious to the mature youth, whether in the form of cigarettes, cigars or pipe tobacco, should not be allowed to the mature man ? For my part I believe that tobacco in any form is dangerous to the mature boy and should not be allowed. But does my hon. friend believe that there is more danger in the use of tobacco in the shape of a cigarette than in any other form ?

Mr. FOSTER. To the boy, yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Why to the boy than to the man? Does the hon. gentleman believe that if a boy smokes a cigar the effect will not be the same as when he smokes a cigarette?

Mr. FOSTER. He will not be so prone to smoke a pipe.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Exactly. As I said the peculiar danger of the cigarette was its cheapness. I must say—I have said it elsewhere to a deputation of ladies who came to interview me upon the subject—that it grates upon my feelings when walking the streets of a city to see a boy with a cigarette in his mouth, and I am tempted, like my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson), to take the cigarette away and to say : My boy, you should not do that. In fact a few months ago, in the city of Quebec, I met a little lad with a cigarette in his mouth, and I took it away from him and said : My little fellow, you should not do that.

Mr. BERGERON. What did the boy say?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say that the boy was rebellious to my good advice. But I repeat the cigarette is a form of tobacco which is undoubtedly injurious to the boy, but which is perfectly innoxious to the man. My hon. friend from Toronto will not say that a cigarette is any more injurious to a man than a pipe, and he wants to take away from the man the privilege of smoking cigarettes in order that he may preserve the boy from smoking them. That seems to be going too far. I believe there is legislation in every province forbidding or prohibiting the sale of cigarettes to boys; there is legislation in every province preventing boys from indulging in that most mischievous pastime or recreation of smoking cigarettes. It seems to me therefore that we already have sufficient legislation in that regard without asking this parliament to interfere. The proposition seems to me absolutely illogical, I say this with all due deference to my hon. friend, because it seems to me we are going further even than the premises of my hon. friend would logically carry him. I believe moreover that in this matter more can be done by domestic education than by legislation and that the way to treat a boy who has a cigarette in his mouth is to give him a good spanking.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the right hon. gentleman has overlooked one important factor in connection with the danger of cigarettes and tobacco. If I understand him correctly, he holds the opinion that the boy who smokes cigarettes is not more injuriously affected than if he smoked a cigar.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is my view.

Mr. SPROULE. If the tobacco were treated in both cases absolutely the same, I would say that that view might perhaps be correct. But the fact is that tobacco which is manufactured into cigarettes is treated with other narcotic poisons as well as nicotine, while tobacco made into a cigar is not so treated. For instance the tobacco used for the cigarette is often steeped in a solution of opium so that it has the same effect on the boy as the smoking of opium has on the Chinaman, or a solution of belladona, which is an injurious narcotic poison. That is why, I believe, cigarettes are generally regarded as more injurious than tobacco or cigars. Whether the attention of the Prime Minister has been called to it or not that fact should not be left out of consideration. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) express strong sympathy for the people who desire to prevent the manufacture of cigarettes. Their position reminds me of the story of the man who had no milk or food for his cat and felt so sorry for it that he petted it and sympathized with it and stroked it a great deal. The result was that the cat died, it needed milk, not sympathy. In the same way I feel it will be a long time before these reformers derive any benefit from the sympathy of these two ministers.

I have always understood that a unanimous expression of opinion by this House was practically a command to the government to enact legislation. A similar motion to that of my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) was adopted two years ago and I believed that the government are in duty bound to take note of it. What are the government going to do ? As to whether or not this is an opportune time for the enactment of this legislation, the Minister of Inland Revenue says that this is only a Bill to change the Inland Revenue duty and it is not an opportune time to prohibit the manufacture of cigarettes. Could we not just as easily say by a clause of this Bill that cigarettes shall not be manufactured or sold as that the rate of duty on certain articles shall be charged. Did we not say that certain articles such as oleomargarine should not be manufactured in the country? By the same parity of reasoning this would be an opportune time to absolutely prohibit the sale of cigarettes as well as to

change the rate of taxation on them. If the government do not desire to go that far surely it is not too much to ask them to state to the House what their policy is.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend has advanced a reason in support of this proposal which, if it is true, throws a flood of light upon this question. He has explained why the use of cigarettes is so deleterious, not only to boys but necessarily to mature men also. The reason is that it has been found in the army in Germany and in England that the use of cigarettes was deleterious. This is easily understood if it be true that in the preparation of cigarettes there is introduced not only tobacco but also such deleterious poisons as opium and belladonna. If it be true that there is placed upon the market and offered to the public for consumption a preparation containing opium and belladonna, then we know the cause of the evil and it is not difficult to apply the remedy, and the remedy should be to make a criminal offence to introduce certain deleterious substances into cigarettes or any form of tobacco. If it is true it is certainly a consideration which we should not overlook, this practice should be made an offence.

Mr. SPROULE. I have only to say that in the country of the right hon. minister's origin, it is stated in the medical works that it is an absolute fact and has been the custom for a long time.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. In respect to the statement that cigarettes are adulterated by the introduction of poisons to strengthen the tobacco, within recent months complaints were made to the Inland Revenue Department to the effect that certain cigarettes were doctored up by the use of narcotics of some kind. A collection of cigarettes was made, they were thoroughly analysed by Mr. McGill the chief analyst, and his report was made that there was nothing in the cigarettes save tobacco, he could find no other deleterious substance whatever.

Mr. SPROULE. That may be true with regard to the Canadian manufactured article, but of course I am not speaking as to that, I am speaking of the imported article.

Mr. BARR. Did he examine the paper ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It must be remembered that there are ten times as many Canadian cigarettes as imported cigarettes on the Canadian market. However, I shall have a further collection of cigarettes made and a very close examination conducted. I have often heard that the paper is so prepared that it is obnoxious. Possibly that is so and it may be that some cigarettes do contain a narcotic ; I know myself that they certainly have a different flavour.

Mr. BLAIN. The right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has stated that my position on this question is rather illogical. He states that the resolution which I had the honour of proposing, if carried by the House and legislation enacted embodying its principles, would prohibit altogether the use of cigarettes by all people in Canada. The right hon. gentleman himself forgot the point that a large portion of the cigarettes, the portion which we complain about, is used by boys under sixteen years of age. I believe that the grown up people of Canada, who wish to smoke their pipe or cigar and possibly some of them their cigarette, would be quite willing to forego any desire to smoke cigarettes in order to abolish this evil from the land in the interest of the rising generation. The government have been taking one position in the House and another position in the country. Those of us who are interested in this question are confronted, on the one hand with the statement of some minister, and on the other hand, with the statement of some other minister in the country when they are engaged in elections. Let me give a reference to what the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) stated when this question was up in the House last session. In the discussion page 4077 of 'Hansard' that hon. gentleman said:

> It may be that the reason that these provincial and local laws are ineffective is that the provinces have not sufficient power to control the evil and that it is necessary, in order to control the evil that the law should be passed by the supreme authority of the land, and should be equally effective and equally enforced and equally drastic all over the country. For this reason I would be tempted to support a resolution and a law on the lines herein indicated. I feel, however, that perhaps there has not been that fair effort on the part of the inferior powers in this country to accomplish the end.

Further on, when the discussion was closing, the Minister of Agriculture stated (page 4079 of Hansard) :

> If my hon. friend should propose this motion in the early days of next session, before Christmas. I should be glad to do all I could to put through a measure which would prevent the use of cigarettes by young people. Therefore, unless my hon. friend should amend this motion so as to make it read next session instead of this, I cannot support it. I hope a Bill of this kind will be brought in next session and passed unless we can find other means more effective than those now in force to lessen this evil.

The Minister of Agriculture was speaking for the government as I understood him. He said, in order to get rid of the resolution for the time being, that he would be very glad next session to support a resolution along the lines of the resolution that I had up for discussion at that time and which was again debated in this House a few weeks ago. I regard this as an

important question. It is all very well for ministers of the Crown to stand up and say that they sympathize with this movement but the people of the country expected the government to face this question and to legislate upon it. It is either right or wrong that the young people of Canada should smoke cigarettes and if the right hon. gentleman had the power to take the cigarette from a boy and chastise him upon the street in the city of Quebec, he would not fail in the greater duty which confronts him and his government. The right hon. gentleman must remember some of his ministers have stated that they are in favour of legislation of this kind, they have the power to put upon the statute-book legislation that will drive out this evil and protect the youth of Canada and I think it is the duty of the government to do that this session. We have been waiting for it since 1903. Long prior to 1903, when the Liberal-Conservative party were in power, all through the province of Ontario, the Women's Christian Temperance Union held meetings, passed resolutions, requested some candidates for parliament to make a pronouncement upon this question and gave expression to their belief that when the Liberal party came into power they would drive out all these evils which were such a burden on the hearts of the members of the Women's Christian Temperance Union particularly in the province of Ontario. It was the same way with regard to the liquor question — another moral question. The right hon. gentleman when in the city of Winnipeg, promised the people prohibition if the people voted for it and every province except Quebec voted in favour of it. Yet, the right hon. gentleman pushed it aside. Nothing has been heard of it since. They were going to abolish the bar in the House of Commons, and the hon. Minister of Agriculture the other day, in one of the provinces, stated that he never knew a bar was open in the House of Commons.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BLAIN. It was the Bar of Justice, I suppose, that he was referring to. We had this government coming into power, trying to carry out the pledges that they gave to the people on moral questions, and they suggested moving the bar from the House of Commons over to the Senate. Everybody knows that there is a bar in the House of Commons where you can get liquor. I am told they put a door keeper on the bar the other day to keep messengers out and let members of parliament have more room I suppose. As to whether that is right or wrong, Mr. Chairman, I have nothing to say, and I only touch upon this question as it affects the great moral questions upon which pledges were given by the Liberal party when they were out of office and seeking the votes of the people. Now, they have been in office since 1896. In 1903 a resolution was introduced by a supporter of their own calling for the abolition of the manufacture and sale of cigarettes. That resolution was carried by a handsome majority. The Women's Christian Temperance Union and the supporters if this great moral movement went away perfectly satisfied. They said : Of course, possibly the government will not have an opportunity at this moment to carry the resolution into effect by legislation, but at the next session of parliament it will be done. From 1903 down to this moment we have had nothing except resolutions discussed and statements from one minister or another to the effect that at the next session of parliament they will be glad to assist in placing upon the statute-book legislation prohibiting the manufacture and sale of cigarettes.

Now, when a minister of the Crown has a Bill touching this very question the government say : We are not ready to give any promise ; we have no policy, and they really have no policy except that stated by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) who informs us that they have decided to put up the duty a little higher. The hon. gentleman suggests that possibly that will satisfy those who are in favour of legislation upon this subject. We expected an announcement to-day, and I may say that the right hon. gentleman will not satisfy his own friends, hundreds and thousands in number in every province, who believe that this is a great evil and that the time of parliament could not be better taken up than in discussing and placing on the statute-book something to drive out the evil. I pointed out in this House a few weeks ago that during the nine months ended March 31, 1907, there were 275,000,000 cigarettes consumed by the people of Canada. In so far as those were consumed by grown up people I have not very much to say. All I can say is that I believe that grown up people some of whom smoke cigarettes, would be quite willing to join hands with the government and to say that in the interest of their boys and girls and in the interest of the future of Canada they would be prepared to set that aside and confine themselves to the smoking of pipes and cigars. This is a golden opportunity which I expect the government to take advantage of in order to make a statement as to their policy upon this question. I do not suggest that they should legislate on it in connection with the Bill before the House, but what I do say is that they should make a statement to the people of Canada and the members of the cabinet who pledged their support to this proposition should see that

the government do something on the question. The people of Canada will not be satisfied with promises made occasionally in the House or on the hustings when a by-election is going on. But in view of the fact that a majority of this House in the session of 1903 voted in favour of the proposition and that a majority of the people of Canada are in favour of legislation on the question, it is the duty of the government to make plain to the people of Canada at this session what their policy is—whether it is in favour of legislation or is opposed to legislation. Then the people of this country will know what the position of the government is.

Mr. FOSTER. If I understand this legislation, its object is to do away with all distinctions, so that the purchaser will not know whether he is buying the product of the foreign leaf or the Canadian leaf.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The object of the legislation is to permit foreign tobacco and Canadian tobacco to be used together in the one factory and the one package, and there will be only one stamp which will indicate the tax paid.

Mr. FOSTER. Your imported raw leaf and Canadian leaf go into the same package, and you cannot tell by the label whether the package contains mixed tobacco or foreign tobacco only or Canadian leaf only.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That is the effect.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the object?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Its object is to permit the use of Canadian tobacco in all packages. One of the handicaps of Canadian tobacco has been the rebate of the duty when cuttings of foreign tobacco were exported. The factories using foreign tobacco could not use Canadian tobacco because we could not allow a rebate on the cuttings of Canadian tobacco. That was a great handicap on the use of Canadian tobacco. Another handicap was the stigma attached to the reputation of Canadian tobacco, which formerly was not so good as the imported, and the use of a distinguishing label kept up that stigma. But Canadian tobacco is greatly improved to-day and is susceptible of greater improvement, so that I do not think this handicap should be continued as it would be by our continuing the use of a special label. The great object is to have Canadian tobacco used in common with the tobacco of any other country in the same factory.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister says the object is to remove the handicap on Canadian tobacco. Would he have been equally as correct if he had said that the object is to remove the distinction between tobacco imported in the raw leaf and made in Canada and tobacco made from the Canadian raw leaf? Would not that be equally specific and true? The minister admits that the opinion so far has been that the imported raw leaf is superior to the Canadian? By this legislation he is not only endeavouring to take away the handicap from the Canadian raw leaf but to give it the advantage in so far as that preference has to be considered?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I claim that Canadian tobacco has suffered serious disadvantage, and I want to remove that disadvantage.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not an authority on tobacco; but if any one is, it ought to be the minister. Is it his opinion that the Canadian is equally as good as the imported tobacco?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I would not claim that speaking generally, but I do claim that there is grown in Canada a considerable quantity of tobacco as good as any imported into Canada except the finer grades of Cuban tobacco. We know that there are great possibilities in Canada for the growth of good tobacco. The great question in the production of first-class tobacco is the harvesting of the crop and the curing of the weed. These are things concerning which our farmers have much yet to learn, but all the tobacco imported into Canada, whether in the manufactured state or in the raw leaf, is not good tobacco. There are many inferior cigars imported, and many of the Canadian cigars are better than even some of the imported cigars from Cuba.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course we must compare equal grades. What I gather from the hon. gentleman is that in his opinion Canadian tobacco is not better than the imported. I am not personally interested, but I know it is an objection to this legislation that you are obliterating the difference which absolutely exists and are trying to give an advantage to the Canadian product which it does not intrinsically possess. I am willing to go a fair distance in giving the Canadian product an advantage, but that may be carried a little too far. Has my hon. friend squared himself with the cigar manufacturers on the question of this one label? Have they not protested? I have a protest under my hand.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This legislation has been talked about for some time, and at first there was considerable opposition from the cigar manufacturers. That was largely due to the fear that the change in the colour of the labels would, in some way or other, affect their particular trade. They considered the label as indicating a particular brand, whereas all it proved is that the duty has been paid. But they have recently realized that their fears in that respect were groundless. We had delegations here repre-

senting the Hamilton and London Cigarmakers. Representatives of these firms stated that, if we did not by this legislation increase the duties paid, they had no objection to the adoption of one label. The manufacturers, generally, I think, take that view. To some extent, the cigarmakers—the workmen—have objected.

Mr. FOSTER. Have they withdrawn that objection ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No, I cannot say so. That objection has come principally from the city of London. I have not heard much of it from Montreal or from cities west of London. These men say that by the use of Canadian tobacco, which, they say, is cheaper and inferior, a lower grade of cigars may be made that will be sold at prices less than the cigars they are making, and consequently the wages paid the cigarmaker will be smaller than those now paid. I must say I do not fear anything of that kind. Smokers choose cigars on their merits and not on the label.

Mr. FOSTER. I received this from one union :

We, the cigarmakers of Union 27, Toronto, strongly protest against the alteration of stamps on cigars as being inimical to our interests as cigarmakers.

That is a sample of many that I have received. My object was to find out whether the minister had talked this matter over, and whether the union makers of cigars were fairly well pleased and had accepted their programme.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I think that some of the union men in London and probably Toronto and other places have the view that the change to one label will affect the making of cigars. I think that many cigarmakers are quite satisfied, but the telegram read by the hon. member from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) shows that some are not.

Mr. BEATTIE. I believe the change in the stamps is going to affect the cigar trade very much. The minister hardly puts it fairly. He knows that with the change to only one stamp any man who goes into a store who is not a good judge will have no idea of what he is buying. He cannot tell whether it is Canadian or partly or wholly foreign leaf.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is the same to-day. The buyer of a cigar with a black stamp which would be supposed to be manufactured with foreign leaf may contain Canadian leaf.

Mr. BEATTIE. There is a special stamp for the foreign.

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. BEATTIE. That is my understanding. There is a black stamp for the foreign cigar.

Mr. BRODEUR. The cigar that bears the black stamp may be made of Canadian tobacco provided they pay on the Canadian tobacco the same duty as would be paid on the foreign leaf. So the black stamp does not convey the assurance that it is a foreign leaf cigar.

Mr. BEATTIE. I thought that the stamp showed which was the foreign leaf cigar.

Mr. BRODEUR. Only the blue stamp.

Mr. BEATTIE. Very well. But that blue stamp is to be done away with. Consequently, if I go into a store to buy a cigar I have to depend altogether on the merchant —I have to take his word. I am not a heavy smoker of cigars, though I smoke a little, and do not pretend to judge by the appearance of a cigar, but depend upon the stamp. Why do we in sending our apples abroad stamp them according to the grade, No. 1, No. 2, or No. 3? Is it not to protect the consumer? Our apples are to go to a foreign market, but the cigars we consume ourselves. I think the change is simply made for the purpose of forcing the Canadian consumer to smoke Canadian tobacco without giving them the means of knowing what it is they are buying. I have sympathy with everything Canadian and would be glad to assist in putting the Canadian leaf on the market, but at the same time if a man wants a foreign cigar he has a right to get it and to know what he is buying. London is a very important place for the production of cigars. I believe it is the second largest in Canada. The hon. minister knows that what I say is correct.

Mr. DUBEAU. Referring to section 13 of the Bill, I would like to know if the manufacturer, upon the payment of the rates and duties mentioned in the section, shall have the option of placing on said tobacco and cigars when offered for sale the uniform stamp?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I think not.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I have sympathy with the remarks made by the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie). It seems to me that the attempt in this Bill is to facilitate the sale of Canadian leaf as foreign leaf. If we are to encourage the use of Canadian leaf—and with that I am thoroughly in sympathy—I think it should be done openly and above board, and no advantage taken by a shuffling of the stamps which will confuse the consumer. I think the hon. member for London is right in saying that purchasers of cigars, as a rule, are guided by the stamp on the cigar, which stamps are supposed to indicate whether the cigars are of foreign or of domestic leaf. If the government wish—and I presume they do —to encourage the use of Canadian leaf, in my opinion the proper way is to do it openly by increasing the duty on imported

leaf, thus giving an advantage to the home-grown leaf in a proper and straightforward way. But that is not being done under this Bill as I understand it.

The hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie) has stated that many men cannot judge at sight whether cigars are of foreign leaf or home leaf. It is too late, after a man has smoked a cigar, for him to say: Well, that was Canadian leaf and I bought it believing it was foreign leaf. He has smoked the cigar and found it was not up to the quality he expected, and makes his complaint afterwards. There should have been a proposition made by the government, in my opinion that would have covered the case a little better than that, a proposition that would have been at the same time open and above-board. My suggestion would be that instead of raising the excise it should be left at 25 cents, and that the duty on the foreign leaf should be increased to 10 cents. That would make in all 35 cents, and would have given the home product an advantage in the duty which would have brought about I think an increased consumption in Canada of the home grown leaf. I am convinced that would be a right policy to pursue, and the government should not have endeavoured to bring it about by a shuffling of stamps so as to deceive the purchasing public. The public should understand what they are getting, but they cannot understand unless there is something on the box to indicate whether it is home or foreign leaf, or partly home and partly foreign. No change that will deceive the consumer is justifiable by the department. The government should increase the duty on the imported foreign leaf. That might increase the revenue also, and would place the article on its own merits before the people, and it would be left for them to say whether they were prepared to pay the higher price for the foreign leaf or to take the home grown at a lesser price. I believe that the view expressed by the hon. member for London will be the view of the large majority of cigar manufacturers in Canada, and I trust that the government will reconsider their proposition.

Mr. CLEMENTS. In my opinion the customs duty should have been raised and the excise should have been lowered. I never took the ground in the past, and never believed, that the use of one stamp only would benefit the grower to any extent; at the same time I cannot see where it is going to affect him in any way. So far as I am concerned I am prepared to buy cigars on their merits. So far as I know, I do not think any other country in the world brands their cigars as we have been doing.

Mr. MONK. We who represent counties where tobacco is grown do not look upon this measure as one intended to improve the growing of native tobacco, but as the removal of a grievance. I know of no other article which is stamped, as in this case, with stamps of different colours. Our view was that the government, by putting a different coloured stamp upon the Canadian tobacco, encouraged the prejudice which for many years existed against that article. There is no doubt that for many years there was not much improvement in the cultivation, the curing and the preparation of Canadian tobacco, on account of the prejudice existing against it. It was then probably that the different coloured stamps were invented; and now that the cultivation of Canadian tobacco has so greatly improved, we consider that the use of these different coloured stamps is a grievance. I do not think the government was wrong in removing that grievance. It seems to me that the government is not called upon to indicate to the purchaser the kind of tobacco that he is buying. The object is to collect revenue upon a specific article; it is not the duty of the government to indicate to the purchaser that he is buying Canadian or foreign tobacco, it is for the purchaser to assure himself of the quality. I think the customs duty on foreign tobacco at the present time is high enough. The manufacturers or cigar unions who have protested against this measure, when they come to realize the object of the demands that have been made for a uniformity of stamps, will either withdraw, or at any rate diminish the force of their protest. I think it proper to make this statement, because this is a grievance which we have sought to have removed for more than fifteen years. I do not see that any valid reason has been given why we should brand, so to speak, the Canadian product with a specially coloured stamp which, under the circumstances I have indicated, is harmful to the industry.

Mr. GALLIHER. I am glad to see that the Minister of Inland Revenue has taken this course with regard to these stamps. I brought that matter before the House in 1903. A portion of the district I then represented, namely, the neighbourhood of Kelowna in the Okanagan district, grew a very excellent quality of tobacco, I think if not the best, at all events one of the best qualities of tobacco grown in Canada. The soil there is particularly well adapted to the growing of good tobacco, and after the removal of this discrimination against Canadian tobacco as proposed by this Bill, I think that industry will flourish and become important. I agree with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that the branding of Canadian tobacco with a green stamp, with the prejudice that existed against it, was a discrimination and a notice to all the world that it was an inferior tobacco that was being manufactured into cigars. After all, a man will smoke the cigar that he likes, whatever be the colour of the stamp. I am a smoker myself, and I think a fairly good judge of cigars, and I have found many imported cigars that I considered of inferior quality, and they are

not improving in late years ; although there are some cigars that are keeping up to the standard of their brands pretty well. I am glad to see that the Minister of Inland Revenue is proposing to abolish the discriminating and distinguishing stamp which I complained of in 1903.

Mr. GANONG. Is it not a fact that in the United States they have a distinguishing stamp for imported cigars?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. So far as we know, they have but one stamp.

Mr. DUGAS. As bearing upon this question, I would like to read an article which I find in the Canadian Cigar and Tobacco 'Journal' :

The only other demand is that the present regulations requiring separate factories for the production of this class of goods and separate, distinctive stamps for Canadian, combination and foreign leaf products be abolished, and the regulations so simplified with a single stamp and single license, as to permit the manufacturer to use Canadian tobacco in any desired manner.

It has been contended in the past that these regulations were necessary to prevent the public from being deceived as to what leaf was contained in the particular brand they purchased, and it is contended by the farmer that the practical result is to close the doors of nearly every factory in Canada to his leaf, and by the green and pink stamp to also put a badge of inferiority on his tobacco when it is offered to the prejudiced public.

Looking into the subject one is first confronted by the fact that no country in the world so stamps its own produce, and in the United States, to which we are always prone to turn for illustration, all tobacco products, whether made from American leaf, solely from foreign leaf, or from both in combination, one factory only is necessary, and only one revenue stamp is issued. Why, as a matter of plain common sense, should a manufacturer have to go to the enormous expense of equipping a separate factory and organization before he will be permitted to manufacture the product of his own country? To an impartial observer having no personal interest involved, the proposition seems as absurd as it is unjust. Every one in the trade knows only too well that this law has prevented the experimental use of Canadian tobacco in cigar factories and has effectively closed the doors of 235 cigar factories to the farmer who searches for a market for his crop. Little wonder then that no cigar leaf is grown in Canada to-day, when the factory door is closed to its use. There must necessarily be demand before there can be supply, and the market must be opened before this type of leaf will ever be grown in commercial quantity.

The other contention as to the necessity of green, pink and black stamps for the protection of the public seems equally hypocritical and absurd. Is Canadian tobacco more injurious to health that the public must be protected? One would almost think it was a poisonous article that must be labelled so that the public could discriminate and purchase a non-poisonous article. Do we protect the public by a yellow stamp against the cigar made in a mold, and sold. by inference at least, as hand-made goods? Do we, or should we, place a purple stamp on the clear Havana cigar to show its superiority over the seed and Havana product? Do we place a white stamp on the cigar made from American leaf, and which also reaches the public as a presumably Havana filled cigar? This solicitous interest in protecting the public cannot but bring a cynical smile to all familiar with the trade, and the time is ripe for us to discard such a hypocritical cloak. The consumer has an absolute protection in every cigar and every piece of tobacco he purchases, and that protection lies in the trade mark or brand under which it is sold. If the quality suits his palate, he purchases again, and factory regulations and separate stamps are quite unnecessary for his protection. Canadian tobacco will die out just as soon as it does not satisfy the public taste and it will increase in consumption just so far as it pleases the consumer. It is but fair that all handicaps should be removed from it, and it be given a clear field, free from triple factory obstruction and with reasonable protection to prove its worth. This freedom and this protection must necessarily precede and not succeed the demonstration of its worth. The law of supply and demand is arbitrary. The demand must precede the supply, and the conditions must be made favourable before the demand can be created.

Mr. BEATTIE. You stated in that article that in the United States they do not designate the cigars made in that country by different stamps. As a matter of fact the stamps are entirely different both in colour and in shape on an imported cigar and a domestic cigar.

Mr. CLARKE. It is not a different stamp on tobacco manufactured there.

Mr. BEATTIE. Entirely different in colour and shape on a domestic and a foreign cigar.

Mr. CLARKE. You are referring to stamps on cigars manufactured in the United States and cigars imported.

Mr. BEATTIE. The stamp on cigars manufactured in the United States is entirely different from that on imported cigars.

Mr. CLARKE. That is entirely different from this.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. F. O. DUGAS (Montcalm). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, just before recess at six o'clock, I was quoting the opinion of a paper which is considered as an authority on the subject, and the protests of the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie) seem to me to have been unwarranted. That paper is known to voice the interests of all to-

bacco manufacturers in Canada, not only of those being the Canadian leaves, but also of those working foreign tobaccos. The hon. gentleman will admit that his friends, whose opinions he claims to expound here, have on other occasions, shown greater faith in that paper than he, for one, exhibits to-day. Thus, I find that the friends of the member for London, are only too glad to advertise their goods through the medium of that publication. Messrs. Line, McDonald & Co., of London. Ont., consider that there is no better means to insure the sale of their products. They are large cigar manufacturers. In the number for September, 1905, the firm of Line, McDonald & Co., have the following advertisement :

This label is no new one to you, Mr. Retailer. It distinguishes that box in your show case from which you sell more cigars in a day than from any other box in your store. That is, if you are one of those dealers who handle the El Cielo. If you are not one of them, you are one of a very small minority. It will pay you to join the majority of Canadian tobacconists and get your share of the trade in those exceptionally fine 10 cent cigars.

In the same issue, I find some correspondence from London wherein the quality of the tobacco manufactured by Line, McDonald & Co. is extolled :

Mr. R. D. McDonald, of Line, McDonald & Company, returned this week from Great Britain and Europe, whither he went ten weeks ago a member of the Canadian Manufacturers' touring party. That the pleasureable, no less than the business side of the extended journeying, appealed to the well-known cigar manufacturer one need but to see his ample form, to which he added, while away, some 25 pounds. Mr. McDonald is fully convinced of the proud place Canada holds in the heart of the motherland.

And further on, in the same correspondence, Tuckett & Co. are put in evidence :

Tuckett & Company's employees and their friends, to the number of four hundred, spent a day together at Port Stanley last Saturday week. It was their annual picnic, and the day passed in games and boating, with an inspection of lunch baskets at regular intervals of the hill.

And further on :

The Jap cigar is meeting with enormous favour throughout the west. The war has brought the name of the plucky Jap to the top, and at the same time has made the choice Jap cigar to be noted from end to end of the Dominion. There is talk in the air of a large increase to the factory here.

In another issue of the same paper attention is given more particularly to London tobacco manufacturers :

As for the fair itself, it was an excellent exhibition. In the main building Tuckett & Company showed the art of making Marguerites to the thousands of visitors. How their package goods are put up are also demonstrated, ten or twelve experts being engaged. The exhibit created so much interest, the aisles were often impassable.

Almost every number of that paper contains correspondence from London, Ont.

The extracts which I have previously quoted show conclusively that there is no reason to retain any longer the three distinct brands on tobaccos manufactured in Canada. However, it may be well to quote a few more extracts from the same paper :

The prejudice of the public with reference to the imported and domestic products of every class is well-known to be deep-rooted. Our population is mostly alien, and from other shores. They have been educated to the goods of their home country, and in their eyes this foreign article is necessarily the best. We must strip each article of all foreign marks and compel the consumer to distinguish the best article solely on merit instead of by prejudice. The 'Journal' frankly admits that for years it has opposed Canadian tobacco, and its opinions have changed solely by force of fact and evidence that it cannot dispute. The tariff of 1896 was thought absurd. We now see its wisdom and deem it in the best interests of every cigar and tobacco manufacturer in this country that we now take a further progressive step.

There is just one more phase of the question that we cannot refrain from touching on before closing. For years Canada stood still, and our best blood crossed the line to become citizens of another country. Quite recently a new era has opened. Canada is waking up as a nation; population is migrating to our shores; capital is looking favourably to our vast undeveloped resources; new railways are being pushed across our continent and a general national spirit is awakening. We have never known such prosperity and progress in Canada as we have to-day. Have we, then, whose lot has been cast in the cigar and tobacco industry, not a duty to perform to that industry—and to our country? If we can contribute our little mite to the upbuilding of Canada by assisting in the creation and development of a leaf tobacco industry within our Dominion, that will supply the greater proportion of the tobacco requirements of our people and give that much more wealth to our farmer and our nation, is not our duty clear?

The hon. member for London possibly found the views of that paper more in accordance with his own, in 1897, when he was opposing the enactment of a duty of 10 cents per lb. on foreign leaf, but the tobacco manufacturers whose interests are voiced by this paper, have come to understand what great benefits would accrue to those engaged in the growing and manufacturing of tobacco from the use of a uniform brand and insist on its being adopted in place of the three distinctive brands. I will go further. The prejudices which existed at the time as regards Canadian tobacco are fast disappearing; and the proposal now before the committee, if adopted, will likely have the effect of gradually doing away with them.

What has been the trend of events since

1897, when a duty of 10 cents per pound was enacted on imports of foreign tobacco ? Considerable progress has resulted therefrom. In 1897, tobacco manufacturers consumed only a half million pounds of Canadian tobacco, while to-day the quantity has enormously increased, six million pounds of Canadian tobacco being utilized by our manufacturers, a fact which never occurred heretofore.

Improvement is noticeable not only as regards quantity, but also as regards quality. In 1901, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) with a view to developing the exports of Canadian tobacco towards foreign markets, instructed Mr. Labelle, of Saint-Jacques, in the county of Montcalm, to prepare and forward to Belgium samples of Canadian tobacco. These samples were examined by the most competent experts, and these experts have prepared a report setting forth the results of their investigation. Extracts from that report I propose quoting here.

But before proceeding any further, I may say that the samples of tobacco sent to Belgium had not been properly put up. The Department of Agriculture had decided to forward these samples of Canadian tobacco in the manner in which they were then put on the market, that is to say, without any special care. Nevertheless, the Belgian experts found that the quality was good, and that our product was such as to find a market in their country.

I shall now quote the opinion of Messrs. Nyssens Brothers, of Antwerp, Belgium. The samples then forwarded had been put up in separate cases each bearing a distinctive number :

No. 7. The Granville Yellow is the best grade of everything. This tobaco although somewhat wild and nondescript has been well cured and has retained a nice sweet flavour and it will be very well for a cutter. The sorting is defective, though, still such sort of tobacco will sell easily.

Our general impression after we have given this tobacco all our attention and a thorough test, is that some good tobacco can be raised in Canada, but your people lack experience and ought to be educated to produce a good leafy sound tobacco, for cutting and chewing.

If your people will simply look at what is done in Virginia and in the west, they will very soon come to the conclusion that almost all the tobaccos are re-dried as they come out of the farmer's hands, and in this way they retain their natural colour and they acquire this sweet honey flavour which is so much liked now-a-days by all the smokers.

Such was the estimate made in 1901 of our tobaccos forwarded to Belgium under very unfavourable conditions.

In 1903, the government resolved to send further samples of Canadian tobacco to Belgium, and even to London, England. On that occasion, the hon. Minister of Agriculture instructed Mr. J. Blaise Dugas, of St. Jacques, a tobacco planter of wide experience, to go to Europe and obtain from merchants there statements as regards the quality of our tobacco. Mr. Dugas returned to Canada a few months later, with numerous statements obtained from experts in Belgium, London and Liverpool. I shall quote once more from the report of Mr. Edward Nyssens, of Nyssens Brothers, of Antwerp, Belgium, president of the Board of Trade (tobacco section), and president of the Belgium tobacco syndicate :

Case No. 1, lot 1. Fair quality is a heavy type, will make good cuttings' for pipe tobacco being pretty leafy. Would advise growers who have suitable soil to cultivate this type which can only be used here for smoking, as manufacturers of chewing tobacco use a cheaper article sweetened and prepared to sell cheap.

Case No. 2, lot 1. More care should be taken in sorting. There are very good leaves in this lot. The quality should be uniform throughout and not mixed.

Case No. 3, lot 1. I believe these two crops are about the best in the lot of eight first cases. It would make cigars. It has a good appearance generally for a mixed lot and it is in very good condition.

Case No. 4, lot 2. Good for Canadian tobacco. I would recommend you to grow seed leaves for cigar manufacture.

Case No. 6, lot 2. This is a good Canadian type. It has body and to its grower's credit it has been well taken care of. Would also encourage the culture of this type when soil is suitable. It is my experience as a tobacco grower that the soil has a great deal to do with the quality and general appearance of the product.

Case No. 8, lot 2. This is a fair lot, has good aroma. It might make cigars as I remarked before I would advise you to plant seed leaf when soil is suitable. Be careful not to break or tear a leaf while harvesting your crop. Torn, spotted or ragged leaves lower the value of the good causing it to be graded as No. 2 or lower.

I shall now quote the opinion of Mr. Oscar Visser, importer of leaf tobacco, of Antwerp, Belgium, who also examined these same samples of tobacco, by himself, all these experts acting separately when making their inspection of our tobaccos :

Case No. 5, lot 1. After testing some leaves consider it burns well but has been handled too dry and consequently is somewhat broken. Know comparatively nothing of culture but let your growers try the cigar types and improve their methods of preparation. There is not a great difference between Connecticut and Havanas.

Case No. 7, lot 4. This is the best of the four lots. It burns well and has good aroma. Would suggest you doing as I am told they do in Wisconsin and other states i.e., have the crops well selected. Cigar tobaccos sell for good prices, the balance for 'cutters' at any price obtainable.

Case No. 8 lot 2. With care in selection of types, Canadian growers can produce an article very suitable for this market. They should learn to prepare the tobacco properly.

Another Belgium expert thus expressed himself :

Case No. 2, lot 1. Canadian tobaccos are of good quality. It burns well, the ashes are white and this is a good point in its favour.

Mr. Henry Pauwels, of Antwerp, ex-president of the Board of Trade, stated, after examining these same samples :

Case No. 2, lot 1. If well attended to Canadian growers should make more money in seed leaf. The competition is much greater in cutting types as there is a much larger quantity of it produced. We buy cutters from the United States of America for four and five cents per pound, and can get all we want of it at this price. In the lot you are showing there is more seed leaf than cutters and it could be wonderfully improved by sorting. Sixty pounds of good sound tobacco is worth more money than seventy-five or eighty pounds of mixed.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) Will the hon. member allow me to put him a question? Are those extracts from the report of Mr. Mireau ?

Mr. DUGAS. (Translation.) No, from that of Mr. Blaise Dugas.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) What is the date ?

Mr. DUGAS. (Translation.) 1903.

Case No. 4, lot 1. Fair colour and very suitable for cigars. The leaves shrink in fermenting and become darker, but care should be taken not to ferment tobacco too much as it is likely to injure it.

Case No. 5, lot 1. Good for fillers only. Contains some good leaves. Havana and Connecticut are seed leaves. This lot smells well and would make good cutter. It is much easier to find 'cutters' than cigar tobacco and consequently the former is much cheaper. Once again I tell your growers can do well in tobacco if they only have the desire to do it.

Case No. 6, lot 1. This tobacco is considered too good for chewing here. Chewing tobacco must be cheap. It is a good 'cutter' and contains some good cigar leaves but nobody will sort it for you. It all sells as 'cutters' when not sorted.

Case No. 6, lot 2. Good brown colour, burns well and is similar to lot one. A brown, glossy, thin leaf that has body which does not tear in handling is the best. The size of the hands makes little difference.

Case No. 8, lot 1. Fair average quality, has good large leaves and burns well. I honestly believe Canadians can produce an article which would be very suitable for the Belgian market.

Case No. 8, lot 2. Good seed leaf. Had this lot been fermented it would have been a shade darker and would have been better liked. It is one of the best lots.

After obtaining the statements of opinion which I have just mentioned, Mr. Blaise Dugas proceeded to London, and Liverpool, England. There also he submitted to the inspection of experts the samples of tobacco which he had taken along with him. I shall quote herewith some of the evidence thus obtained. The statement of Mr. Muller, of Messrs. W. O. Muller & Co., of London, is as follows :

The samples you are showing here are much better and would sell now if it was stripped, for London market, all tobacco must be sorted and stem taken out, sorted as to colour and size of leaves, 20 or 22 inches is considered good. No objections to larger leaves, colour brown, texture fine and strong appearance glossy and silky, packed when fermented and dry. In cases of 250 or 300.

In order to give your tobacco industry a footing, it needs some organization controlled by planters or others. I heard that in New South Wales and other States of Australia, the governor has interested himself. Can not say exactly in what way. Once a start made, it would be easier matter. Do careful preparation both in sorting and fermenting and ere long buyers and exporters will come to you.

As your tobacco is now, it is not ready for London market. Might be on the continent, Liverpool or Bristol markets. Have no doubts that with more attention to the sorting and fermenting you may do good on English markets. In all cases, manufacturers will not handle unstemmed or unfermented tobacco.

It was several years before Wisconsin tobacco was as good as now. We pay it 25 cents per pound binder.

I am of opinion that with proper knowledge, Canadians can produce a tobacco very acceptable for this market as I remark in your samples some very good leaves.

Should your government desire more information regarding the exportation of tobacco to London we would be pleased to correspond with them. Our references are The Chartered British North Borneo Company and our bankers are Cline, Mills, Currie & Co., bankers.

It may have been noticed that exporters are instructed to take the stem of the tobacco leaf. The reason is that there is a duty of three shillings per pound levied on tobacco. The stems being of no use, it is clearly advisable to do away with them and thus avoid paying duty uselessly. Hence the request.

The opinion of Mr. John K. Gilliat, of the firm of J. K. Gilliat & Co., of Liverpool, is as follows :

We have never seen Canadian tobacco before.

And further on :

We should be pleased to receive a sample case of your tobaccos, 100 pounds, in hands assorted and tied as suggested above.

Your tobaccos would undoubtedly look better if they were put up properly for export. We prefer large heavy leaves in cutters and a few holes in the leaves does not impair the value very much.

I quote herewith the opinion of Mr. C. S. Clark, of the firm of William Clark & Sons, of Liverpool :

We buy most of our stock from Henderson Company, Kentucky. Most of the tobacco used by us has the peculiar wood smoke smell remarked in Bulgium. Yellow briar is mostly used by us, we prefer good sound heavy tobacco which goes into cutting and cigarette mixture. We do not want heavy types fermented, but seed leaf should be. Selected as to colour and size of leaf.

Canadian growers should send for experienced hands from there or send some one to learn their methods of drying and curing. Tobacco is put on market after being inspected in co-operative warehouses and sold on guarantee samples from inspectors.

As to seed leaf, we favour Wisconsin and Pennsylvania, it pays better and is of easier sale than heavy cutting types. You may learn from them something to your advantage. We buy in Janesville, Wisconsin. We would like to hear from Canadian growers again. There is an increasing demand for cheap brands of tobacco all over England, and should they be disposed to sell at prices others do, they can certainly have their share of the exportation business. They should make the coarse types as heavy as they can and assort and form the seed leaf.

The statement of Mr. Frank Goodwin, of the firm of Edwards & Goodwin, of Liverpool, is as follows :

Heavy tobaccos need not be fermented, but should be stemmed for our market.

The samples we see are quite acceptable, but they should be made heavier, it would pay the growers better; they cannot be too coarse as long as they burn well. We deal in Kentucky. Tennessee and Ohio cutting types, Kentucky, Tennessee and Ohio cutting types, unstripped and stripped. Your tobaccos should be sorted into cutting and cigar leaf, as they are we cannot quote it at over 4½ in Some of your samples we recognize as seed leaf and almost too good for cutting purposes, but we have no demand for cigar tobaccos. To make cutters, let it be as heavy as possible.

Another British expert, Mr. Bransome, of Liverpool, says :

The smell of hickory wood is much liked in tobacco for cutters. This smell is obtained by burning the wood in slow fire whilst drying the tobacco, but cannot give full information as to how it is done. You must not expect to jump to the first rank as exporters because there are a good many things to be learned from experience by you. You should adopt the American methods of curing and sorting. The hands should comprise from 10 to 15 leaves tied close to end of stem, and for sample put up in a package of about four pounds tied with good twine at five or six inches in the butt end, attach a tag to each sample of four pounds describing the type as the case may be. Seed leaf make good cutters, but are not heavy and cannot pay growers as well as when fermented and prepared for cigars.

From the above I draw the conclusion that there is no reason to maintain the distinction made heretofore between Canadian tobaccos and foreign tobaccos in the matter of brands.

The paper from which I have quoted before recess makes the following further remarks, in an editorial dated October, 1905 :

Taking the primary query as to whether Canadian tobacco has proven its claim as a marketable commodity, we can turn to no more conclusive evidence than statistics. In 1896, the fiscal year prior to the 10 cent tax on foreign leaf, we find that the manufacture of Canadian leaf amounted to only 590,283 pounds, and on referring to the returns for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, we see that 4,986,565 pounds of Canadian and combination tobacco have been made and sold. Comment is unnecessary, the figures completely answering the questions.

Admitting then that the slight protection granted in 1897 has resulted in this wonderful development and expansion of the Canadian tobacco consumption, the wisdom of the government's policy in imposing that tax in the interest of agriculture must be frankly admitted, despite the views held by practically all the trade at the time the tax was imposed. This trade opinion is now undergoing a complete change, in the face of the evidence steadily forcing itself upon all.

The question as to whether Canadian tobacco is improving in quality, and can undergo sufficient further improvement as to warrant prospects of still further increase in consumption in future and its ultimate use for cigar purposes, is a matter having important bearing on the issue, and is a speculative subject that can be reasoned only by deduction. It is evident to all who have had an opportunity of inspecting and following the successive crops of tobaccos in western Ontario and Quebec, that they have improved materially in quality. This is due solely to the better knowledge gained by the farmer through practical experience in planting, cultivating, curing and handling his crop, and in view of the tobacco history of the world, it seems only fair to assume that this progress will continue and texture and quality of leaf be ultimately grown that will compare favourably with such types of foreign leaf as those with which they are intended to compete.

The history of almost every type of leaf now popular in cigar and tobacco manufacture is practically the history that Canadian tobacco is now making. Sumatra was once a coarse, heavy, rank tobacco. Wisconsin was once inferior to the present Canadian cigar leaf. Connecticut is a story of complete evolution to its present fine texture and quality. Shade-grown Florida Sumatra has within the past three years passed from rank failure to marketable perfection. In the face of these facts, combined with proofs staring us in the face of what Canadian tobacco has already accomplished under the encouragement of a very meagre protection, can we any longer, as fair minded business men and loyal Canadians, decry the product of our own soil?

Is further protection now desirable and opportune? The farmer echoes an emphatic yes. It is for the trade to say whether the interests of our own business will be damaged by giving our agriculture the free hand and open door it desires to go on with the work, of gathering from our own soil, some of the leaf for which we now send abroad, and keep within our own country, for the benefit of

Canadians, the immense capital now paid to the farmers of the United States. Does it really matter to us whether the duty on cigars and tobacco be levied on the raw leaf or on the finished product in bond, so long as the total taxation is not increased? If it will benefit the farmer and keep a dollar in our own country where it remains in constant circulation, is not the policy sound and wise? Wherein does it make the slightest practical difference to the manufacturer or dealer in cigars and tobaccos?

I have, I think, amply proved that Canadian tobacco can replace most foreign tobacco in our factories. From positive information in my possession, I do not hesitate to say that the Canadian products in their present condition, will compare favourably with the average foreign article on our markets. I do not contend that our tobacco is better than any tobacco produced in the United States. Tobacco requires special soil and climate. Each state of the American Union has its specialty. It is the same in Canada. In the province of Ontario the climate is better adapted to specialty of tobacco that is not grown in the province of Quebec. I allude to the 'Burley' tobacco which is very long and of heavy texture, suitable to the manufacture of chewing tobacco. So far, our chief tobacco industry has been the manufacture of chewing tobacco, and the Ontario planters have, in consequence, been more favoured than those of Quebec. Manufacturers buy all they need in Ontario, and when they can find no more in that province they go to Quebec. In the province of Quebec the tobacco grown is a light tobacco, suitable to the manufacture of cigars, and according to the opinion of Belgian and London and Liverpool experts, Quebec tobacco, properly cured, would produce excellent cigars.

Not long ago, planters from Ontario and Quebec gave valuable information before the Agriculture Committee of this House. They proved beyond cavil that we produce tobacco quite suitable to our own market and also to foreign markets, if the curing is properly done.

The marvellous results I have just pointed out are altogether due to the customs duty of 10 cents a pound put, in 1897, on the manufacture of foreign tobacco.

I have no doubt that the changes now made will have a still more favourable effect upon this industry. According to the proposed legislation, American tobacco, before being delivered to the manufacturer, will pay a duty of 25 cents instead of 10 cents per pound, being a total duty of 27 cents on the American article, before it is manufactured, whereas Canadian tobacco will enter the factory free and pay a duty of 5 cents only after it has been manufactured. The result will be the establishment of an intermediate industry such as exists in the United States. In that country, between the planter and the manufacturer, is found the packer or rehandler. The latter buys the tobacco from the planter when it is ready to be cut from the stem and, in his own warehouse, classifies and sorts it. When tobacco is suited to the manufacture of cigars, it is subjected to the test of fermentation. If the leaf is suitable for pipe use or for chewing purposes it is treated in a different manner. The need of such intermediate industry is now being felt in this country.

The hon. the Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur) replying to an objection raised by a member of the opposition, remarked that to-day any one smoking a cigar apparently manufactured from foreign leaf, could not be sure that no domestic leaf entered into its composition. My information on this point enables me to state positively that not 90 per cent of the manufacturers now professing to make cigars from foreign leaf use Canadian tobacco in the manufacture of their product, but without saying so.

I remember having met a considerable number of cigar manufacturers, when the Tariff Commission was sitting in Montreal; I was in attendance with a delegation of Canadian tobacco planters from the county of Montcalm. The views of my friends did not agree with those of the manufacturers, and in the course of a rather lively debate, several manufacturers of foreign leaf cigars admitted that they put into their goods a considerable proportion of Canadian tobacco.

I may state that Mr. Cusson, of Montreal, a manufacturer of imported leaf cigars, is ready to undertake the intermediate industry of which I have spoken, and to establish a packing warehouse in the county of Montcalm for the selection and preparation of tobacco. I am also aware that Mr. Payne, of Granby, who accompanied a deputation here last winter, is likewise anxious to enter into the same business.

Last year Mr. Cusson, expecting that the present Bill would come before parliament last session, purchased in the county of Montcalm over half a million pounds of tobacco suitable for cigar making, and he engaged an expert from Connecticut who submitted it to the proper curing process for that purpose. A couple of weeks ago Mr. Charland, an expert brought over from France by the government to disseminate information in the growing and treatment of our tobacco, laid before the Agriculture Committee cigars made by Mr. Cusson exclusively from Canadian leaf; the members of the committee smoked and enjoyed them. These cigars were unanimously declared to be of excellent quality and to compare favourably with the so-called foreign leaf cigars.

I remember that a manufacturer of American leaf cigars, who attended the sitting of the committee, smoked some of these cigars and found them so good that he was ready to wager that they were not made from Canadian leaf. This is the best proof

that can be given in favour of our national product.

When Mr. Bas Dugas returned from his trip to Belgium and England, bringing with him the expert reports of which I have spoken, he was sent to Wisconsin, with Mr. Denis, of Rouville, to study in the field, the cultivation and curing of tobacco. He brought with him samples of tobacco grown in the county of Montcalm ; these he exhibited to experts in different establishments asking for an opinion. From what Mr. Dugas says, these experts would not believe that this was a Canadian product, but supposed it had been procured from one of the local drying sheds.

I will now quote an article printed in the 'Journal of Agriculture' of the province of Quebec. It must be remembered, as Mr. Labelle stated before the Committee of Agriculture two weeks ago, that tobacco is an artificial rather than a natural product. It must go from the planter to the packer and sorter who alone is able to prepare it for the market. This intermediary sorts and selects the natural product and prepares it for consumption. This is what we find in the 'Journal of Agriculture' of August last :

Dried and fermented tobaccos. Dried tobacco which has not yet been subjected to fermentation no more deserves the name of smoking tobacco than unfermented grape juice deserves the name of wine.

In dried tobacco, the nicotine forms part of the organic composition of the plant, it becomes disengaged during combustion and emits strong and acrid fumes often of a disagreeable and repulsive odour.

On being subjected to fermentation, the dried tobacco undergoes important and radical changes which give it its full value.

Fermentation improves its tecture, colour, and flavour, makes it easier of combustion, and rids it of its acrid and biting flavour, its aroma becomes more marked but softer and finer. At the same time, the nicotine is partially eliminated and what remains is disengaged from the organic matter, so that fermented tobacco while more fragrant and perfumed, is really not so strong, and is pleasanter and healthier than dried tobacco.

Most agricultural products have to undergo fermentation before being fit for consumption : wheat flour, for instance, must be fermented with yeast before yielding good bread ; cheese is the product of fermented curds ; flax yarn is the product of flax fiber rotted that is to say fermented, &c., &c. Smoking tobacco worthy of that name, forms no exception to the rule, and we propose, in this study, to describe a rational method of fermentation employed in the United States and which deserves the best attention of our northern tobacco growers.

Our tobacco must therefore be put to the test of the curing, as the paper I have quoted explains. As may be seen, the intrinsic value of the product does not depend so much upon the cultivation of the plant as upon the subsequent preparation it must undergo.

I am pleased to be able to state that thanks to the measure now before the House, this industry will be considerably improved. It well deserves the attention of the government, for the tobacco growing industry is one of our important industries.

Before the Agriculture Committee, inquiry was made as to the total production of tobacco in Canada. Certain witnesses have stated that in their opinion it reached ten million pounds per annum. I have reason to suppose that their estimate is below the mark. In support of this view I will take up the census returns of 1901. We find there that in four of the counties of the judicial district of Joliette, the figures go beyond five million pounds, divided as follows :

	Pounds.
Montcalm	2,589,446
Berthier	246,016
Joliette	1,098,158
L'Assomption	1,615,075
	5,548,695

I should add that part of the crop was already sold.

As everybody admits, tobacco culture is one of the most lucrative in agriculture. No crop in this country gives so good a return. Consequently the government is right in heping those who are engaged in it.

Before closing, I would like to reply to a remark made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). When the resolutions upon which this Bill is based were introduced, the hon. gentleman gives his full approval to the government measure, I am pleased to say. But he goes further and expresses some regret that the Bill was not introduced sooner. I agree with him in that, and indeed the counties of Montcalm and Joliette have long been asking for this legislation. I am inclined to believe that if the government did not act sooner, the cause may be found to a certain extent, if put in the attitude of the member for Jacques Cartier, at least in that of the Conservative party to which he belongs. If we examine the policy of the Conservative party before 1897, and later on, on that question, we find that a great change for the better has taken place in their attitude. Let us hasten to the remarks made by Sir Charles Tupper, then the leader of the opposition, with respect to an item of $2,000 asked for by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) for the purpose of experimenting in the cultivation and the curing of tobacco. The amount asked for was quite small.

This is what he said :

I do not myself know much of the subject, but I am convinced that the Hon. Minister, after the debate which has taken place, must have come to the conclusion that it would not be very wise to press for the adoption of this item. After such varied expressions of opinion, I do not think it is necessary to know much about tobacco culture to come to that

conclusion. I would respectfully suggest the withdrawal of the item.

The present hon. leader of the opposition also has shown himself hostile to the commendable dispositions of the government with respect to the improvement of tobacco culture. I will quote part of his speech from the 'Hansard' of 1901, page 1469 :

Well, I will give the hon. gentleman a suggestion with respect to the taxes. Let us look at what the taxes on the people are. In the first place, there is a tax on tobacco, which is very large, and which has been increased by hon. gentlemen opposite. I find that we take out of the people, in taxes on tobacco, in customs, $486,000, and in excise $3,281,000. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that possibly the duty of tobacco, which was increased by them might be reduced to the former amount.

In 1903, the 17th of April, the leader of the Opposition again referred to the subject :

There is another consideration which I would like to present to the House. If, as members of the government claim, the present tariff is a revenue tariff, why is the taxation continued at so abnormal a figure? Why does the government take from the people, for example, $1,000,000 more in excise duties on tobacco and $500,000 more in customs duties on sugar than would have been taken under the tariff before 1896 ? And why does the Minister of Finance retain the duty on breadstuffs which he regarded as so unjust and oppressive that while premier of Nova Scotia he moved the following resolution with regard to it.

Why is it necessary that they should have surpluses to boast of—surpluses of from $14,000,000 to $16,000,000 ? They could get clear of a large portion by extending the reduction of duties from molasses to sugar. They could also make a reduction in the duty on tobacco, which would prove an immense boon to almost every man who contributes to taxation.

Such has been the stand taken by the Conservative party every time the government has wished to do anything in the interest of the tobacco growers. I have no reason to doubt the government's firmness nor to question their good intentions with respect to this important industry, but it is fair to suppose that the government might have acted more prominently, had the hon. gentlemen sitting on your left, shown themselves as well disposed as they are to-day.

I might refer to another fact in this connection; at the time of the general elections of 1904, as is the custom, both contending parties sought to influence public opinion by means of campaign literature. One Conservative campaign pamphlet contained the following :

Put this in your pipe and smoke it.

Under Liberal rule and as a consequence of that rule, every consumer of tobacco in Canada pay $4.75 more in the shape of taxes.

How is the consumer of tobacco, under Liberal rule, affected by the taxing of this article ?

Let us compare the taxes on tobacco collected under the present government and those collected under Conservative rule.

Liberal rule. Taxes on tobacco 1897-1902.	
Excise	$23,485,642
Customs	2,661,875
	$26,147,517
Conservative rule. Taxes on tobacco 1891-1896.	
Excise	$17,875,401
Customs	1,709,958
	$19,585,359

Increased taxation on tobacco under Liberal rule, during a period of six years, $6,562,158.

The male population of Canada is 2,571,708.

If fifty per cent of the male population of Canada makes use of tobacco, how does the increased duty on tobacco affect each consumer?

Under Liberal rule, each consumer of tobacco has to pay in taxes on tobacco $19.

Under Conservative rule, he had to pay only $14.25.

Under Liberal rule each smoker paid in taxes on tobacco $4.75 more than he did under Conservative rule.

This increased taxation of tobacco does not in any way diminish the consumption, it is quite useless in this respect, as government statistics themselves prove.

Last year the government boasted of a surplus of $14,000,000. That is to say, they took from the ratepayers and from the pockets of the people $14,000,000 more than the public service required.

The budget receipts showing a surplus over the senseless expenditure of the Liberal government, why should they, over and above that, tax tobacco consumers to the extent of $6,562,158 since their accession to power ?

Think over this as you quietly smoke your pipe by the fireside.

The Conservatives paid for their faults in 1896.

The Liberals cannot escape from the punishment of crimes far more serious than those of their predecessors, and as for the government that succeeds them, it must be judged by its works. In short, let the people condemn any government until it is proclaimed to the world that public conscience in Canada is awakened.

I have given these quotations simply to explain the stand taken by the opposition and to show to what extent they have carried their hostility towards tobacco planters and the tobacco industry.

In spite of the contention of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier that the government should have introduced this measure sooner, I may say, speaking here as the representative of the county of Montcalm, which takes credit for being the cradle of the tobacco growing industry in Canada, and whose population is directly interested in the industry, that the government have done about all that could be expected of them in this matter and that the county of Montcalm owe them a debt of gratitude in that respect.

Before submitting such a measure as is now placed before us, the government required information on the present conditions of the cultivation of tobacco and the tobacco

industry, as well as on the best methods to be adopted, with a view to securing the full development of that industry.

Those who have studied this matter know that when the government framed the tariff of 1897, imposing a customs duty of 10 cents a pound on foreign tobacco, the foreign tobacco manufacturers protested against that duty, and said to the government: You must pay no attention to Canadian tobacco; it is a product unfit for consumption and which cannot be improved. In support of this statement I need refer to no other authority than that of the 'Canadian Cigar and Tobacco Journal.' Referring to the increase of 10 cents in the duty on American tobacco, that journal declared that the government had committed itself to an absurdity. This meant that the paper representing the interests of the tobacco manufacturers had no confidence in the quality of our Canadian product. The government was therefore bound to seek information before making a move in that direction.

Let us recapitulate: In 1898, the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture, in spite of Sir Charles Tupper's opposition, obtained $2,000 for experimental purposes. In 1901, samples of tobacco were sent to Belgium. In 1903, other samples were submitted to Belgian and English experts. In 1901, the government appointed a commission, presided over by hon. Justice McTavish, to inquire into certain difficulties in connection with the tobacco industry. At that time, a powerful company, the American Tobacco Company, threatened to control the whole Canadian trade. Judge McTavish's report established that the methods of that company were detrimental to the Canadian tobacco trade. He states, however, that the conduct of the company was not illegal, and that there was nothing in our statutes to restrain it. It will be remembered that this company entered into contracts with merchants, the latter undertaking to sell no other articles but those supplied by the company, failing which, the company would refuse to sell them its products.

The following are the conclusions of Judge McTavish's report:

Your commissioner finds, as the result of the inquiry:

1. That the contract system complained of by the petitioners does in fact exist and is in general use in the cigarette and tobacco trade in Canada.

2. That the provisions of the contracts in question are not illegal, either under the common law or under any statutory law heretofore enacted by the parliament of Canada.

3. That the manufacturers of cigarettes and of Canadian tobacco other than the American and Empire Tobacco Companies are at a disadvantage in the distribution of their goods, and in the prosecution of their business generally, by reason of such contract system.

The extent to which legislative control over the freedom of contract should be exercised, and how far the rules of the trade can be interfered with by statutory enactments, without injury to the public interest, are, in the opinion of your commissioner, questions of policy for the consideration of parliament.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

In 1904, the Hon. the Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur), who was at that time Minister of Inland Revenue, carried through a measure which put an end to these contracts.

In 1904, the government sent a commission composed of planters to Wisconsin to study the tobacco industry in that state.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) Did that commission ever make a written report, and was such report ever placed before the House?

Mr. DUGAS. (Translation.) I do not know.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) Was that report ever brought down and printed?

Mr. DUGAS. (Translation.) All I know is that I have a copy of it. At all events, the delegates came back with this information, that our tobacco was as good as that of Wisconsin, and the only thing missing to it was the proper curing to make it suitable for the manufacture of cigars.

Later on, in 1905, being encouraged by his reports on the superior quality of our product, this government caused Mr. Charlan to come from France, where he had been an officer of the French government in an establishment affected, preparation of tobacco. Mr. Charlan has approved himself a man of absolutely practical knowledge. Since his arrival in this country he has been through the different planting districts. He has given very practical instructions on the way of producing and curing Canadian tobacco, and more particularly on the selection of varieties suitable to our soil.

In 1906, Mr. Charlan having reported that tobacco grown in the province of Quebec was of good enough quality to make cigars with, this government empowered him to purchase twenty thousand pounds of tobacco in the counties of Montcalm, L'Assomption, Joliette, Berthier and Rouville in order to make it undergo the necessary fermentation.

An arrangement was made between Mr. Charlan and a Montreal firm, the Dominion Tobacco Company, the principal shareholders of which are Messrs. Goldstein, who undertook to have that tobacco submitted to the fermentation test. These gentlemen being confident in the result of the experiment Mr. Charlan wanted to make. It was understood that after the fermentation experiment that the tobacco would be bought by Messrs. Goldstein who took upon themselves to supply all necessary hand labour. The agreement was that if the tobacco was depreciated as a result of fermentation, then the government would cover the difference in the cost of that tobacco. Far from being depreciated, the tobacco was

better, and the Goldsteins have been fully satisfied with the result and have kept the tobacco.

From the consumer's point of view, the government policy has been altogether favourable. Before 1897, there were consumed in Canada 18,000 pounds of tobacco, half a million pounds only being produced in this country, whereas to-day 6,000 pounds of Canadian leaf are used in manufacture.

What has been the effect of that evolution in the industry? The most important result is this: in 1897, when American tobacco was the only one on the market, the average price the consumer was obliged to pay for tobacco was a dollar a pound; but, since the Canadian leaf has been introduced in the manufacture, the Canadian leaf has taken the place of that much of the foreign product and the price of tobacco has gone down to an average of fifty cents per pound. So it is that where the consumer formerly used to get one pound of tobacco for a dollar, he now gets two pounds. He therefore pays fifty per cent cheaper than before.

Under these circumstances I am glad to see this House is almost unanimous in approving this measure of the government. I am quite sure the country will be highly satisfied with the policy of the government in this matter. I am also of opinion that this measure will be ranked amongst the best—and they are many—this government has adopted in the interest of the citizens of Canada.

Mr. M. MARTIN (Montreal, St. Mary's). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak on the Bill now before the House, but my hon. friend from Montcalm (Mr. Dugas) has made the statement a while ago that the Montreal cigar manufacturers, most of them at least, were using Canadian tobacco in their factories. I may say that the hon. member is misinformed. I do not believe there are more than one or two cigar manufacturers licensed for the manufacture of imported tobacco who make any use of Canadian leaf. A moment ago Mr. Cusson's name was mentioned. At all events, if two or three manufacturers are using Canadian grown tobacco for making cigars, it is without the knowledge of the cigar-makers' union which would surely not allow them to use its label. The deputy minister being present, I would ask him to let me know how many licensed imported tobacco manufacturers do substitute Canadian tobacco to the imported leaf. The deputy minister beckons he does not know if there is any. For the information of this House, I may say there are not more than one or two of them.

My opinion has always been that Canadian tobacco is the best in the world for smoking and chewing, but without having any intention of basing my judgment on my twenty-three years' experience, I may venture the statement with the two hundred other cigar manufacturers in Canada that Canadian tobacco is unfit for the manufacture of cigars. In 1897, when the government placed a ten cents duty upon foreign tobacco, the effect of that measure was to cause the establishment of new factories such as the American Tobacco Company and the Dominion Tobacco Company, but not of cigar factories.

From our own experience of it, we know that we have never been and will never be able to produce anything like Havana, Sumatra, Brazilian and Hyara tobaccos for cigar making, and these are the leaves that are mostly used in that branch of manufacture. Let us see what happened in the United States. In spite of the McKinley Bill raising to $1.85 per pound the duty on the Sumatra leaf, there were imported into that country last year 40,000 bales of Sumatra tobacco representing 7,000,000 pounds, although the price of tobacco had been raised to about $5 a pound. All this was intended to encourage the production and consumption of American tobacco; however, Wisconsin and Connecticut leaves are still sold a great deal cheaper than before the adoption of that $1.85 duty, which goes to prove that in the United States they cannot do so without certain varieties of foreign tobacco in the manufacture of cigars. And what happened there will happen just the same in this country.

True that in the United States large quantities of cigars are made with domestic tobaccos, but it is equally true that those cigars have no value whatever and are sold at between eight and twelve dollars a thousand.

I do not see why I should be against this measure if I thought it was a good one. If Canadian grown tobacco was suitable to cigar making, as a manufacturer I would save twenty-three cents on every pound manufactured. This goes to show that like all the other cigar manufacturers in Canada I am satisfied that we will never be able to substitute Canadian tobacco to the Havana or other imported leaves used in the manufacture of high priced cigars.

All this agitation is due to two or three Montreal manufacturers having in stock between 1,000,000 and 1,500,000 pounds of tobacco, and who are already boasting that, thanks to this very change, they will realize enormous profits as soon as the new law is adopted. By the imposition of this 28 cents duty, a good many manufacturers having in stock one or two millions of cigars will see themselves obliged to suspend their operations because they will have to pay a double rate of duty on account of their being obliged to pay 28 cents before the manufacturing process and $6 per thousand on their stock in excise bond, according to the old law. Therefore, I say the manufacturers will be compelled to suspend their operations while they get rid of the stock they

usually keep on hand. That is what I shall have to do myself.

Canadian tobacco is good for pipe smoking and chewing, but as regards the manufacture, it will never be able, as I said before, to replace the Havana and Sumatra leaves. The appearance of a cigar is not the only thing to be cared for; there are also the taste and the flavour of it. One day, as I was passing in Montreal, I met an hon. member who offered me a cigar. I told him that was one of our good ten cent cigars. He then replied to me that I was smoking a cigar exclusively made with Canadian leaf. Being unable to ascertain myself what kind of tobacco that cigar was made of, whereas I had smoked about the whole of it, I decided to come back to Ottawa the following day in order to appear before the Committee on Agriculture. There and then I asked Mr. Charlan, the government expert in this matter, if he would kindly give me four or five cigars like the ones that had been distributed to the members of the House the previous day. That gentleman answered me that he had none in the committee room, but that if I was willing to go to his room he would let me have four or five; and this he did effectively when he handed me a box of 'Capitol' cigars. Moreover, I asked him to give me one half of the same tobacco contained in the cigar tendered to me; this he did also. Then I said to him: 'You are sure the tobacco you are giving to me is the same as the one contained in these cigars.' He immediately answered no, because the leaf in the cigar was not as long. I should say so, for the leaf in the cigar in those cigars was not more than five or six inches long, it was the 'Havana' leaf, while the tobacco he was handing to me was the 'Columbia' leaf, the length of which is usually between twelve and fifteen inches.

I have unpacked those cigars in the smoking room in the presence of five or six hon. members, and I then stated before them that I was prepared to give my affidavit that those cigars were made with 'Havana' leaf. I am still ready to swear the same thing. True there was before the Committee of Agriculture a box of cigars exclusively made with Canadian tobacco, with the exception of the coating that was made with Sumatra leaf, but it was not at all the same cigars as had been distributed to hon. members of the House the day before. I have myself manufactured some thirty cigars with the tobacco Mr. Charlan had handed to me, but the cigars so manufactured are far from having the taste, flavour and strength of those made with imported leaf like the ones he had given to hon. members the day before.

As a conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me venture the hope that I am mistaken in the few remarks I have just offered, but time will tell.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I have only a few words to say. The hon. member for St. Mary's (Mr. Martin) has just been, as it were, the instrument of Providence, and this goes to prove the existence of an immanent justice that cannot be escaped.

The hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Dugas), who represents a population deeply interested in the growing of tobacco, was not content with giving us very valuable information which, for my part, I have listened to with the most unremitting attention; he has thought fit to go further and spoil his speech in making an attack against the Conservative party which, I think, since 1896, has always given its effective support to every measure proposed by this government for the improvement of this industry. And at the very moment the hon. member for Montcalm has just been so upbraiding the opposition, the hon. gentleman who sits beside him and belongs to the same political faith declares himself against the measure, while all the hon. members on this side of the House, who represent counties interested in the culture, have given their support to the government.

I may be allowed to point out some of the remarks offered by my hon. friend from Montcalm. He has told us that Mr. Blaise Dugas had been sent to Europe in 1903. This gentleman has made a report, some extracts of which my hon. friend has given us. That report shows that we have in England, in Belgium, Holland and other European countries an unlimited market for our tobacco provided it is properly prepared and packed up as it should be. What has become of that report made five years ago? Mr. Blaise Dugas, I think, has found it very difficult indeed to get the reimbursement of his travelling expenses. Even after five years, the government has taken no action whatever on that report.

All those who have some knowledge of the question know that what we need first of all is a market for that product. We are in a position to produce every year a great deal more than the five or six million pounds of tobacco now sufficient for home consumption. If we have no foreign market, the price goes down and the growers as well as all those interested in that industry are affected and discouraged.

Mr. Blaise Dugas' suggestions should have been put into practice without delay, that is shipments of tobacco should have been made to Europe in such conditions as pointed out by people he has conferred with. Yet nothing has been done since 1903. The report has remained buried in the records where it had been thrown aside, and none of the suggestions therein contained has ever been put into practice.

Does my hon. friend from Montcalm (Mr. Dugas) consider that any useful steps have

been taken for the improvement of that industry? He has told us of the shipment made to Wisconsin the year after. We have no report, no printed report of that shipment. These gentlemen, we are told, have reported that our tobacco is worth that of Wisconsin, which finds in Europe an easy and profitable market, and, according to my hon. friend, is an excellent tobacco. Ours was wanting fermentation. What has been done since in order to give our tobacco the required curing, so that it might compete with the Wisconsin leaf on the European markets? Nothing that I know of.

Unfortunately, my hon. friend (Mr. Dugas) has deemed it expedient to introduce politics in what was a most interesting lecture on this question. Ever since I occupied a seat in this House—even before the hon. member came here—we have year after year asked for the abolition of the distinction between stamps. We asked that from the hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur) when he had charge of the Department of Inland Revenue. Twelve years have passed without anything being done. The hon. member for Montcalm thinks the measure now under consideration, putting an end to such distinction, is a just and fair measure. Why then have they waited twelve years to introduce it? Was it delayed by the opposition? No, it is these gentlemen who, like the hon. member for St. Mary's, were opposing that measure and have prevented the accomplishment of an act of justice. It is due to their influence if, during all that time, justice has been delayed in its course, and to-day, when elections are near at hand, it is at last felt necessary to do justice to those who have been asking for it in vain for twelve years.

The hon. member for Montcalm then indulged in reflections upon Sir Charles Tupper, who thought the amount of $2,000 asked for by the government was going to be frittered away in making experiments. For my part, I have no doubt that those $2,000 have been of great use. When Mr. Blaise Dugas and the delegates to Wisconsin came back that amount should have been spent in putting their suggestions into practice.

This government, it must be admitted, oftentimes appoints commissioners. When they report favourably, they are lauded to the skies, when they denounce wrongdoing, the report is pigeonholed in the department. As an illustration, I can mention the report of the Transportation Commission, which is completely left in oblivion. What will happen with that of the Civil Service Commission?

Does the hon. gentleman from Montcalm know what was said by Hon. Rodolphe Laflamme, then Minister of Justice in the Mackenzie administration, and at the same time member for Jacques Cartier, where tobacco is grown. He said, to use his own words, that there was nothing in that industry, that Canadian tobacco was a stinky stuff and that the industry could never succeed in this country.

Such was the opinion expressed by one of the leaders of the hon. member for Montcalm. And this afternoon, was the hon. gentleman in this House when the right hon. leader of the government, answering the remarks of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) relating to the prohibition of cigarettes, stated that he was not a smoker, and, speaking for himself, he would feel disposed to prohibit absolutely the use of tobacco in this country? Canada is perhaps afflicted with a prime minister too near to perfection. If he even did so much as to indulge in a smoke with a pipe or a cigar, we might have had that remedy sooner.

The hon. member for Montcalm this afternoon has found fault with the hon. leader of the opposition, because in 1901 and 1903 he protested against the heavy increase in the burden of taxation, giving as an illustration the duty on tobacco. Where does my hon. friend find in those statements of the hon. leader of the opposition that he was opposed to a measure protecting the production of Canadian tobacco. If in 1901 and 1903, the hon. leader of the opposition complained of the increased taxation generally and of the duties on tobacco in particular, the only conclusion to be drawn from those statements is that a reduction of those duties would have fostered the industry which, according to the hon. member for Montcalm, is of such an import for this country.

My hon. friend (Mr. Dugas) has alluded to the experiment conducted by Mr. Goldstein, of Montreal. What has been the result? We do not know. The only thing we know is that Mr. Goldstein is a staunch Liberal and from what was said by my hon. friend, I suppose that he has been given charge of 20,000 pounds of tobacco, and said that he was quite satisfied.

What has been said by the hon. gentleman about Mr. Blaise Dugas' trip in Europe establishes the merit of the suggestions made in this House since 1896, asking for the employment of experts from Connecticut to teach our farmers how to cure our tobacco for the European markets.

The verbal report—it has never been printed—of the agents sent in Wisconsin by the government was never followed with any practical result, and has been totally ignored.

I have congratulated the hon. Minister of Agriculture for having secured the services of Mr. Charlan, who has furnished valuable information on that industry. But, as I have said the other day, until we become experts in the way of packing, curing and shipping tobacco, we cannot expect to have a profitable market for this product.

If five or six million pounds of tobacco will answer the demand for home consumption, it is quite obvious that if our produc-

tion reaches fifty million pounds we must find an outlet for the surplus, and up to this date the government has done nothing in that direction.

Therefore, it ill becomes the hon. member for Montcalm when hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are opposing this measure to find fault with those who for many years before him had been advocating the interests of this industry.

On the question : Shall the preamble be adopted ?

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) what he would think of a proposal to prohibit the importation of cigarettes into Canada ? If the government are not prepared to make a statement on the main question as to the total abolition of the manufacture and sale of cigarettes, what would my hon. friend think of a proposition to prohibit the importation into Canada of cigarettes ?

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid the proposition is hardly involved in the Bill before the committee and I would not care to offer an opinion on the subject in this manner.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 135) to amend the Immigration Act.—Mr. Oliver.

LAND TITLES ACT.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 113) to amend the Land Titles Act.

Mr. LENNOX. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would briefly explain the objects of the Bill.

Mr. OLIVER. The object of this Bill is to provide for the holding of land in the interest of church organizations in the Northwest, or in that part of the country where the administration of the rights in regard to land is in the hands of this parliament. At the present time there is no provision for the holding of church rights by any organized body in that territory ; so that, it is desirable that there should be legalized the holding of church rights which must be especially legalized by Act of parliament in all that part of the territory which is outside of the Yukon, and by special Act of the Yukon legislature within the Yukon Territory. The circumstances are such that it would be right and proper that a general provision should be made that would apply to all cases and that would govern the holding of church property according to the terms of this Bill. It has no application except in what is called the Northwest Territory and the Yukon Territory.

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

On section 1—lands belonging to churches and congregations—

Mr. SPROULE. In the case of a church that has a bishop, would this enable trustees or a congregation to hold lands, or would it be incumbent upon them to pass it over to the bishop?

Mr. OLIVER. According to the wording of this section there is an alternative right. The bishop may hold the church property, the congregation may appoint trustees to hold it.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose that according to the rules of the church the bishop only can hold the property and the congregation desire it to be held by trustees, whose authority would then prevail?

Mr. OLIVER. If it is the rule of the church that the property should be held by the bishop and not by trustees, the Act would give the bishop the necessary legal authority to hold it. The Act also provides that in the case of those churches which have no bishop, the property may be held by the congregation or by the trustees of the congregation.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the Land Titles Act apply to the different provinces of the Northwest or only to the Northwest Territories outside of the organized provinces?

Mr. OLIVER. To the territory which is called the Northwest Territory, which is outside of the organized provinces, but including the Territory of the Yukon.

Mr. SPROULE. But it does not apply to Saskatchewan and Alberta?

Mr. OLIVER. No. Those provinces pass their own laws with regard to land titles.

Mr. SPROULE. But you handle the land, and when you sell or homestead it don't you give a title to that land?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, but as soon as the land passes into the hands of private owners all further transactions with regard to it are subject to legislation of the provinces under their jurisdiction over property and civil rights.

Mr. SPROULE. When you sell or give away the land, don't you give a title to it under the Land Titles Act ?

Mr. OLIVER. We give a title, but that title has to be registered under the Land Titles Act of the province for use in future transactions.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you not give a deed of the land under the Land Titles Act which we are dealing with here? Is there one Land Titles Act for the Northwest Territories and the Yukon and different ones for Saskatchewan and Alberta ?

Mr. BARKER. If I understand this Bill, its purpose is to provide that in the territories outside of any province, where a bishop already holds land on behalf of his church, or where trustees of a congregation hold land on behalf of their church, upon their ceasing to hold office or dying, instead of the property going to their heirs or being in the clouds, it goes exofficio to the next bishop or to the trustees appointed in succession to the previous trustees without any conveyance.

Mr. SPROULE. I was asking if the same rule applied to the new provinces.

Mr. GALLIHER. When the Crown gives a patent to a piece of land that patent is taken by the party to whom it is given to register it under the Land Titles Act of the province.

Mr. LENNOX. The Land Titles Act, as it is in the revised statutes, is, I presume, intended to apply to all Dominion lands wherever they are.

Mr. OLIVER. It will apply to all Dominion lands until they pass from the Crown. There is no title to those lands until they have passed from the Crown. This Bill is to apply to lands which have passed from the Crown in the Territories which have no local government handling the Land Titles Act.

Mr. LENNOX. This Act applied to Saskatchewan and Albert until they were set apart as provinces.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. The difficulty I find is that there is no application defined in the Act. It is simply called a Land Titles Act, and we must conclude that when it was passed it applied to all lands over which the government had control and could not apply to any lands belonging to any of the provinces. This is an amendment to the Land Titles Act, and I presume could not apply to any property which has been acquired from the Dominion government in any territory which has become organized by the establishment of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Any land already vested in any church in those provinces is not controlled by this amendment.

Mr. SPROULE. There is one point I would like explained. The amendment says :

123a. The bishop of any church, or any trustees for any church, or any congregation of any church, holding land for the purpose of such church or congregation shall respectively, with regard to such land and any dealings therewith, be deemed to be a body corporate and politic——

That is the first statement. Then it goes on to say:

—and land so held shall devolve respectively upon the successors in office of such bishop or upon the successors in office of such trustees duly appointed in manner by law or by such church or congregation prescribed.

It repeats that the land shall be held by the successor in office of such bishop or by the successors in office of such trustees. but it does not refer in any way to any congregation or church.

Mr. OLIVER. I am advised that the congregation does not cease to exist as do trustees or as does a bishop. The congregation continues without intermission, and therefore there is no need to provide that there shall be successors to the congregation.

Mr. LENNOX. The congregation being a continuous body is a reason why there is no provision as to their successors in office ; but there being no provision in this amendment for the devolution of property from a congregation, why mention the congregation at all ?

Mr. BARKER. Whoever drew this Bill wanted to provide for the case where there were no trustees. If the property was vested in the members of a congregation as such, and some of them died, the estate might pass to the heirs at law. This Bill purports to make them a body corporate and politic, so that when a member of the congregation dies or retires, and his successor comes in, the title at once passes to his successor.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACT—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 142) to amend the Bills of Exchange Act.—Mr. Aylesworth—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). The object of this section is to correct what, I apprehend, has been simply a printer's error in the Bills of Exchange Act as it appears in the present revised

statutes. It has been the law for many years, as this statute, when first passed declared, that any holder of a promissory note or bill of exchange who endorses it, by the act of endorsing it, precludes himself from disputing certain things with regard to the bill or note—precludes himself, for instance, from denying the genuineness of the bill or the regularity of its drawing and the genuineness of the signatures that were upon it when he so endorsed it. But it was not as against the wide world that he, by endorsing, precluded himself from making these denials ; it was only as against men to whom that negotiable paper might subsequently pass. That is to say a man who endorsed a bill of exchange or promissory note by his act of so endorsing it closed his own mouth against the possibility of ever afterward saying that that bill was not a genuine bill so far as the men who took it from him or relying upon his signature were concerned. Accordingly the provision of the Bills of Exchange Act previous to the revised statutes, was that the endorser of a bill by endorsing it is precluded from denying to his immediate or a subsequent endorsee that the bill was, at the time of his endorsement, a valid and subsisting bill and that he had a good title thereto. By some error the word 'endorsee' is printed 'endorser'—the final 'e' is made an 'r,' and, accordingly, the law for the last fourteen months has been that a man by endorsing a bill of exchange precluded himself from denying, not to those who came after him, but to his immediate or subsequent endorser—if one can understand what that phrase means—that the bill was genuine and that he had a good title to it. It is a pure misprint, so far as I can understand. No one had thought of changing the law that has been the established law for many years, and it is to restore it to what it was prior to this revision of the statutes that I am proposing to change the word from 'endorser' to 'endorsee,' which it was as the Bill was passed fifteen years ago.

Mr. SPROULE. If there was anything irregular, the redress would be against the original maker, I suppose ?

Mr. BARKER. I understand clearly that this Bill does not in the least change the law as to bills of exchange as the law has been held by the courts in the past. The object is merely to get rid of a printer's error. We all know that there have been most intricate questions about this doctrine as to how far a man adopts signatures on bills of exchange, and it would be very dangerous if any attempt were made in an Act of parliament, without very grave consideration, to alter the law as it has been interpreted by the courts in the past. I understand the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) to say that there is no intention to alter what the courts have held in the past on this subject, but merely to make the statute conform to the former holdings of the courts.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. My hon. friend (Mr. Barker) understands the situation exactly. This Bill is not to change the law at all, but to restore what has been the law, always I may say, this amendment being necessary because the law was inadvertently changed in the revision of the statutes by a printer's error.

Mr. LENNOX. Do I understand the minister to say that he knows, as a matter of fact, that the statute from which this was revised was as it is now proposed to make the law read ? I recollect the law as being the same as the minister says it was, but I also assume that the minister has looked back to see that the statute from which the revision was taken was in the form which he suggests now—that the word was 'endorsee,' not 'endorser.'

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I am restoring the condition that existed prior to the revision. When my attention was called to this error, I at once went back to the original Bills of Exchange Act and found that the word there was 'endorsee,' and had always remained 'endorsee' until the new revised statutes were struck off, when it was printed 'endorser'—I imagine purely by a printer's error.

Mr. SPROULE. I asked the Minister of Justice a question. I do not know whether he thought it worth while to deign to reply to it or not, but I would like an answer before the Bill passes.

Mr. MACDONALD. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) would state the question again.

Mr. SPROULE. The question is this : Suppose that the original maker did not pay the bill and the endorser was obliged to pay it because of his endorsation, and suppose that the contention was set up that the bill was an illegal one, could the endorser, having paid it, have recourse against the original maker and the people who collected it ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. This section does not touch that question at all. This merely relates to the effect of a man endorsing. The effect is to close that man's mouth against disputing the genuineness of the bill which he has endorsed—it closes that man's mouth so far as those who come after him, and whose title, therefore, depends upon his signature, are concerned, but not as to other people. It does not affect one way or the other the principle of law which has been referred to, that the endorser may fall back upon the maker, just as one en-

dorser may fall back on those who have gone before himself.

Mr. SPROULE. I asked the other question because I presumed the Minister of Justice would be a competent authority to give us the status of the endorser.

Mr. MACDONALD. I understand my hon. friend's question is as to whether this amendment will affect the rights to which the endorser of the Bill would have to proceed against the original maker. I understand the Minister of Justice states that this Bill does not affect these rights in any way; it only deals with the status of the endorser and the subsequent party into whose hands the Bill may come.

Mr. SPROULE. I asked in addition the question what rights the endorser would have to collect from the original maker, I am asking what the law would be.

Mr. MACDONALD. The Minister of Justice suggests to me that the law remains as it always was in that respect, and that the man who puts his name on the back of a bill as an endorser or the party who eventually pays the bill to any person who may be the holder, always has recourse against the original maker, and that right is not affected.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

WINDING-UP ACT—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 144) to amend the Winding-up Act—Mr. Aylesworth—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. LENNOX. I have been looking at the amendment and at the original Act, and I am not able to discover much difference. The word 'taking' is put for the word 'making,' otherwise they seem to be the same.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The object of the Bill is to make clear beyond peradventure what the law is. This legislation is suggested by the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal of Manitoba, who, notwithstanding the interchange of one or two letters on the subject between himself and the Department of Justice, continues to feel, as he says, considerable doubt. This Bill is not intended to make the slightest change in the law, but to make the law perfectly clear. It has been for many years the law under the Winding-up Act that the beginning of the winding-up of a company supersedes any execution which may be outstanding against the company, unless that execution has been completely carried out by the payment of the money over to the execution creditor. That being the law, when this section came to be re-enactetd in the revised statutes it was divided into two subsections, and provided, just as the Bill now under consideration provides, first, for the case of an execution placed in the hands of the sheriff against the real or personal property of the company, and next for the case where the property of the company is seized by way of an attachment, or by the registering of a memorial, or by making a garnishee order. The section as printed in the revised statutes is divided into two subsections, and making the first subsection as it were an independent provision by itself, possibly not depending as it was of course intended to depend, upon whether or not the execution has been completely carried out by payment of the money, but apparently an absolute declaration that no charge on the property should be created by delivery to the sheriff of any execution, or by seizure or levy by the sheriff upon the property of the company. So it makes, as it were, a distinct enactment that under the Winding-up Act you could not create a lien upon the property of a company by issuing an execution and the sheriff seizing. The true interpretation of the section, as it stands in the revised statutes to-day, is, I think, that it is only where there is a winding-up, and the winding-up actually begun before the levying under execution is completed, that the law declares the issuing of the writ should not create a lien or charge upon the property. But the possibility that doubt might arise as to the interpretation of the section is the reason for seeking to make the law abundantly clear. As I say, one learned judge at any rate tells me that he finds great difficulty about it, that it seems like an absolute declaration of the law, as it stands in the revised statutes, that the issuing of an execution against the property of the company does not create any lien or privilege upon that property in favour of the creditor. The section in the amended Bill now under consideration has simply been recast in such a manner as to make it abundantly plain that what the law is declaring is that no lien or privilege is created by putting an execution against a company into the sheriff's hands unless, before the winding-up begins, that execution is completely carried out and the money paid over.

Mr. LENNOX. I think I understand the object now. But there is another point I call attention to. In the revised statutes we have the words 'or by the issue or making of any attachment or garnishee order or other process,' and in the new statute we have the word taking' instead of the word 'making,' 'or by the issue or taking of any attachment.' Is the word 'taking' intended to be used or is it a mere accidental change?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I think the word has been changed to 'taking' advisedly. In the revised statutes it was declared that no lien or privilege should be created upon

the property of the company by the issue or making of any atachment or garnishee order. The word 'making' is now changed to 'taking,' I think advisedly, as I find the word 'taken' at the end of the subsection. The phrase might be changed by putting in the word 'out' after 'taking.'

Mr. LENNOX. That would be an improvement.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I have no objection.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. The motion will be made for Supply. I understand the Prime Minister arranged that this motion should be made to afford the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) an opportunity to discuss the immigration question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That was for Tuesday.

Mr. FIELDING. The motion will be made for Supply in any event, and the estimates of the Minister of Public Works will be taken up.

Mr. MONK. The understanding I had with the Prime Minister is that the motion on immigration would be taken up on Monday.

Mr. FIELDING. The motion for Supply will be made anyway.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, April 10, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 153) to incorporate the Saskatchewan Power Company.—Mr. McCraney.

Bill (No. 154) respecting the Board of the Presbyterian College, Halifax.—Mr. Law.

Bill (No. 155) respecting the Pontiac Central Railway Company.—Mr. Brown.

Bill (No. 156) respecting the Northern Bank and Crown Bank of Canada.—Mr. Guthrie.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I rise to a question of privilege. I am informed by a telegram from British Columbia that the Victoria 'Times' has reported me as having opposed in a recent debate in this House legislation for the protection of white labour in British Columbia against Asiatic labour. I desire to say that that statement is absolutely and utterly untrue.

DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance in the absence of the Prime Minister whether or not there is a departmental investigation proceeding in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. and whether that investigation is being carried on by the examination of witnesses under oath. The question was put the right hon. the First Minister yesterday who replied that he was unable to say. I venture to suggest that this matter is one on which the government should have some information and of which information the House should be possessed.

Mr. FIELDING. My right hon. colleague the First Minister left the House a moment ago to attend His Excellency in the Senate Chamber. In his absence I could not make any definite answer but my hon. friend will have his answer later.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to bring the matter to the attention of the First Minister ?

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly.

THE ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the secretary of His Excellency the Governor General the following communication:—

Ottawa, April 10, 1908.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Administrator, will proceed to the Senate Chamber this afternoon at 3.15 o'clock, for the purpose of assenting to such Bills as have passed the Senate and the House of Commons.

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

The Hon.
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

A message was received from His Excellency the Administrator by the gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows:—

Mr. Speaker,—His Excellency the Administrator desires the immediate attendance of

your honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly Mr. Speaker, with the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

And having returned.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that his honour the deputy of His Excellency the Governor General had been pleased to give in His Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills :—

An Act respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the London and Lancashire Guarantee and Accident Company of Canada.
An Act to amend the Inland Revenue Act.
An Act to amend the Immigration Act.
An Act to amend the Act relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies.
An Act to amend the Bills of Exchange Act.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go in Committee of Supply.

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS (West Kent). Before you leave the chair, Sir, I desire to make a few remarks which I had not the opportunity of making the other day on the budget debate. I consider that I should take advantage of the present occasion, as otherwise I would not be doing justice to the constituency I have the honour to represent and a large section of our people in the district of Ontario. The tariff question, to which I propose to address myself, is one of the most important pertaining to this country, and I am sure it is one regarding which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) found himself in a difficult position this year. Unless we have a proper tariff revision, the people are not getting justice, and I wish to point out that, under the present tariff, a large section of our people, especially in the western portion of our country, are not getting that justice to which they are entitled.

When the tariff changes were brought down by the Minister of Finance a year ago, I expected, as one representing the farmers of this country that the farmers would be given an equal share of protection with the manufacturers and corporations. I believe in protection so long as it is proper protection ; and I believe that, on the average, in a general way, our manufacturing concerns and corporations are fairly well protected. But I have contended in the past that the farmers have practically no protection whatever, and, even though I may be alone in this, I state unhesitatingly that if I had the framing of the tariff I would put prohibitive duties on all agricultural products that compete with our own. In this I have in mind particularly the nation to the south of us, because they are our greatest competitors so far as farm products are concerned. Being a farmer myself and having an interest in farm land, why should I say we should have a prohibitory duty on farm products? For the reason that we in Canada are exporters of practically every article on our list of farm products. Why, then, should we have to contend with the importation of millions of dollars worth of American farm products right here in our own markets ? I remember how the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) before he became Prime Minister used to declare in every district where he spoke that if he and his party came into power they would cut across the border, and with their sunny ways, would make an arrangement by which we should get a mutual exchange with our American neighbours, not only of agricultural products but of other products as well. But these sunny ways have not fulfilled their promise ; on the contrary the changes have been rather to our detriment than in our favour since this government came into power. I will not take up time quoting in detail the difference between the Canadian and American duties. It will be enough to say generally, as I have stated in the past, that the American duties are about two and a quarter times as high as our duties against them. They have practically prohibitory duties against Canadian farm products entering their market. If this is to continue, then, as Canadian farmers, we should have the same protection against their products coming into this market. In other words, the Canadian farmers should be given the home market in his line just as, generally speaking, the Canadian manufacturer is given the home market in his line. The tariff as arranged a year ago seemed to me a tariff arranged to bleed the people for revenue. The necessaries of life are unduly taxed to the disadvantage of every mechanic and labourer in Canada. And what is the position of the farmer, especially in the section I have the honour to represent ? Before the great Northwest was opened we were able to grow wheat and coarse grains and make money on them. Of late years we have found it imposible to grow these things to advantage in competition with the west. So, we are compelled to grow those products that are especially suited to the climatic conditions of that section. We grow corn, beans, tobacco and similar farm products. On the first occasion when I had the honour of addressing this House, I protested that we had not fair protection on beans. When the tariff changes came down last session, while it was found that friends of the government in the manufacturing interest were protected, especially members who sit on the government side of the House and their friends—a point with which I hope to deal more fully later on—the interests

of the farmer were practically altogether neglected. Only two changes were made for the benefit of the farmer, so far as I can see. The duty on beans was raised from fifteen cents a bushel to twenty-five a bushel. The American duty against our beans is forty-five cents a bushel. I have contended, and still contend, that, instead of fifteen cents a bushel against American beans, we should have at least sixty cents a bushel to offset their conditions and the freight rates against our beans going into their country. Had the government taken the interest of our farmers into consideration, instead of twenty-five cents a bushel they would have given us at least fifty cents a bushel protection on our beans. The other item was potatoes. We had a protection of fifteen cents a bushel as against twenty-five cents against us on our potatoes going into the United States. The government gave us an equal duty upon our potatoes.

I have always protested, even in the first session I was in this House, against having the bonding privileges on American pork coming into this Dominion. The Minister of Agriculture saw fit to annul the bonding privilege, which, I say, is a step in the right direction. I have contended that, instead of two cents a pound duty on American pork, we should have a duty of five cents per pound which is the rate of duty which they impose on our pork going into their market.

I was glad to hear the Minister of Finance state in his budget speech that a large deputation of farmers waited on the government the day previous, asking for more protection against American pork coming into this country, and I remember he stated that there might be some consideration given to them. I want to say that if that consideration is given the Canadian farmer, it will only be carrying out the ideas I advocated the first day I entered this House, and which I advocate now. I say that if the Canadian farmer were given an equal protection with the American farmer in this respect, you would be placing him on the right footing and you would be giving him the justice which he deserves. Take for instance tobacco. I have advocated more protection on tobacco with a persistency which possibly has sometimes wearied this House; and I am glad to think that while the legislation which passed this House last night was not drawn in the manner I would like it to have been, still it was in the right direction, although it does not give the Canadian tobacco growers in this country the benefit which they should have. Some hon. gentlemen who may not be acquainted with the situation of the tobacco industry may think that prior to this legislation we had ample protection upon tobacco. Now, I want to say, and it has been proven before the Agricultural Committee and in various ways, that in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec we grow tobacco equal to any that is imported from the other side, and the reason it was not used more generally was owing to prejudice, and nothing else. I regret the government have not seen fit to place the same customs duty upon American raw leaf tobacco that the Americans place upon ours. Had this government done so, I am sure it would not have been any detriment to the consumer in this country, and it would have been a great advantage to that growing industry, which if properly fostered, would become one of the most prosperous industries in my section of the country at least.

Then take the corn question. When this government allowed, as they are allowing today, 15,000,000 to 18,000,000 bushels of corn to be dumped into this market free of duty while we are not allowed a reciprocal privilege, I say that that quantity of corn takes the place in our market of the coarse grains which the farmers of this Dominion are well able to raise profitably. If our government had said to the American government: If you will give us a fair exchange in certain natural products, if you will give our farmers your market for beans and barley in return for the market we give to your corn, that would have been a fair exchange. You may call it free trade if you like; if that is free trade then I am a free trader in regard to some of the natural produtcs of Canada and the United States. I would give 100 per cent for 100 per cent, I would not give 200 per cent for 50 per cent, as our government are practicaly doing to-day under existing conditions. I must say that if some further protection is not given to the Canadian farmer, if the price of the goods he has to buy is not lessened to some extent, then I say as a farmer myself that I do not know what is going to become of the farmers in the section of the country I have the honour to represent. I will say this, I am prepared to make the statement on the floor of this House, that I do not believe there are two farmers out of every 100 in the province of Ontario to-day who, if they took an inventory of the cost of their farms and the cost of the machinery they have to buy to run it, and if they allowed themselves a salary of $300 a year—certainly not a princely salary as compared with salaries drawn in corporations and manufacturing concerns —I say that if he allowed himself $300 a year, besides what he has to pay to meet his ordinary expenses, there are not two farmers out of every one hundred who are clearing 3 per cent on their investment, and I know whereof I speak. Take for instance the pork packing concerns of this country, If it is fair that they should make 100 per cent profit, as they do in some cases, or 50 and 60 per cent profit in other cases ; that some of the manufacturing concerns, the farmer should be placed in a position where they can make 8, 10 or 12 per cent upon their investments—is it fair, I say, to place

the farmers in a position where they can make only 3 per cent upon their investment? I am aware that the western farmers do not favour protection upon manufactured goods. But I venture to make this statement, that if the western farmer was given the Canadian market for his products, possibly he would not be so averse to protection upon the manufactured goods which he has to buy. But he has a right to protest against more protection upon the goods, upon the implements which he is compelled to buy, at the same time that he has to sell his farm products at a much less price than he could get for them if he had the home market to himself. Now I have heard the statement, I think in one of the by-elections, that this government was a farmer's government. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that is about the greatest joke that has ever been sprung in this country. Take for instance the French treaty. I would be one of the first to support our French compatriots in securing a treaty with France if I was sure we would be getting some benefit in return for the privileges which we give to France. But to my mind this French treaty is a one-sided treaty, beyond any doubt. Take agricultural products, they are practically prohibited in the French market, while at the same time we have to pay a large subsidy to steamship lines, and lose about $600,000 revenue yearly. I cannot see for my part how we are going to get any advantage from this treaty.

There is another grievance that we in Ontario complain of, particularly the manufacturers, and that is that we have to pay so heavy a duty upon our coal. Our manufacturing concerns, especially in the province of Ontario, where no coal fields have been opened up, are obliged to compete with manufacturers in districts where coal is plentiful. I should like to see, in the interest of the manufacturing industries of Ontario at least, coal placed on the free list, so as to enable these manufacturers to produce cheaper than they can at the present time. Such a change would not only be in the interest of the manufacturers themselves, but it would mean that the consumer, the farmer, the labourer and the mechanic would get the articles which he required at a lower rate. Take the case of gas companies, for instance; the gas companies of this Dominion import yearly 170,000 tons of coal annually, upon which they have to pay a duty of 53 cents per ton. In the interest of the gas companies, to say nothing of the farmers and the manufacturing concerns, it would be an advantage if we had free coal, because it will enable them to supply the consumer with a cheaper article.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) is held up to us as being a farmer himself and as having a personal knowledge of the needs and interests of the farmers. I have nothing personal to say against the Minister of Agriculture only I think that he is deserving of censure because I do not think that, as the minister representing the great body of agriculturists in Canada, he has not held out for their interests as he should have. I think the ministers in charge of other departments have rather outwitted him in that they have been able to get more money voted to be expended in their departments than the Minister of Agriculture has been able to secure to be expended in the interests of the farmers. Last year $5,500,000 were spent on the public works of the Dominion, whereas upon the great agricultural class, which represents the most important interest in this Dominion, $500,000 was all that was spent. If the Minister of Agriculture would take into consideration the speech that was delivered by my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder) the other night, it would be well for the farming community, because if he followed the advice of my hon. friend from Dundas, he would do justice to the farmers. It will be remembered that the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) made the retort, during the course of my hon. friend's speech, that there was a difference between farmers, that one was a farmer and the other was an agriculturist. I would apply the term 'agriculturist' to the Minister of Agriculture, and if there is any one individual in this Dominion who has 'done' the farmers properly I believe it is the Minister of Agriculture who has so completely failed to look after their interests. The hon. member for South Wellington was in no sense justified in applying that term to my hon. friend from Dundas, because, as everyone in this House knows, my hon. friend from Dundas is an actual farmer. There is a large piping concern in the city of Guelph and I understand that the member for South Wellington has an interest in it. In this respect he has been playing the part of 'agriculturalist' in so far as he has been 'doing' the farmers of this Dominion. Lapwelded piping is largely used throughout the Dominion, especially by the farmers, and there is no lapwelded piping made in this country. Two years ago I gave expression to the belief that under these conditions lapwelded piping should come into the Canadian market free of duty so that it could be supplied to the farmers at the lowest cost. When any article is not manufactured in Canada, I care not what it is, it should come in practically duty free so that it can be given to the consumer at the very lowest cost. When any article is not manufactured in Canada, I care not what it is it should come in practically duty free, so that it can be given to the consumer at the very lowest price. When any set of manufacturers come to the Canadian government and show them that they are prepared to invest enough capital to manufacture an article in suffici-

ent quantity to supply the Canadian demand, I should always be Canadian enough to favour giving them a proper amount of protection to enable them to make a success of the industry. In the large piping concern to which I have already referred, they make nothing but butt-welded pipe, which is not suitable to the requirements of farmers and others and which will not stand the test as well as lapwelded pipe. Under these circumstances, I claim that instead of raising the duty from 17 per cent to 35 per cent, it should have been allowed to come in free until some of our manufacturers give evidence that they want to go into the manufacture of that article, and show the government that they are prepared to make it in sufficient quantity to supply the Canadian market. If the Minister of Agriculture wants to properly represent the great agricultural class, instead of adopting legislation which in many cases has been a great detriment to the farmers, he should look after their interests with respect to the questions with which they are especially concerned and see that they receive that consideration from the government to which they are entitled. Upon two occasions in this House I offered the suggestion that there should be a rigid inspection of wire fencing. Our farmers in the west, in Ontario, in Quebec, and especially in the older provinces, purchase yearly hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of wire fencing. While I believe that all the wire fencing, as far as the wire itself is concerned, is about of the same quality, I can show you in the district from which I come fencing which was purchased by farmers twenty years ago which is good fencing to-day and which has proved a good investment to the farmers who bought that fencing. I can show you hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of fencing that was bought two or three years ago which is practically useless to-day from rust, and one of the reasons for this condition is that it has not been subjected to that rigid government inspection which should be insisted upon by the Minister of Agriculture in order to protect the farmer and which has been undertaken in other instances.

The farmers are in this position simply because the manufacturers are not using the proper galvanizing for the fencing. It is the duty of the Minister of Agriculture to see that a proper inspection is made so that every rod of fencing should be stamped and the farmers in buying it would know that they were purchasing a proper article. The minister should afford such protection as this to the farmers instead of pretending to protect them as he has done, for instance, in the pork regulations. If these pork regulations had been carried out to the letter in the section from which I come, not one farmer in ten now raising pork would be raising it. When the regulations were introduced, the pork manufacturers took advantage of them to beat down the farmers and then we have a protection against American pork of only 2 cents a pound, so that every farmer in Canada to-day, especially in the pork raising sections, has been compelled to sell his pork at a price from $1 to $1.50 a hundred less than he can possibly raise it for. There is not a farmer in Ontario to-day who, if put upon his oath, could say that he has sold 100 pounds of pork this year at a profit. I know whereof I speak, I know something of the raising of pork, I have been careful in feeding but this year had I sold the grain which I fed to swine and given the hogs away, I would have been $500 better off than I am. As I have said, the farmers are placed in this position first by the pork regulations, and second by the insufficient protection against the inroads of American pork upon this market. It should be absolutely prohibited instead of being permitted to usurp the Canadian market.

I have protested against the policy of the government in regard to cold storage. In my section the climatic conditions are such that fruit ripens practically two weeks before it does in any other part of the Dominion, and in such a section the government could well afford to establish several large cold storage plants to demonstrate what it is possible to do by means of a proper cold storage system. Such an example would force others to go into it and that would be accomplishing something for the farmers. I believe that such a government cold storage plant could be run at a profit to the government as well as to the very great advantage of the farmers of that section of the country. Last year parliament voted $1,000,000 to assist in the establishing of cold storage throughout Canada. Thirty per cent of the cost of the plants was to be given as government aid. In my section no advantage has been taken of that provision to any extent. It shows that the business men do not consider it a fair business proposition ; they do not care to invest 70 per cent of the cost and have the government control their establishment. As I have said, if the government bore the whole expense they could well afford to build several large cold storage establishments in sections of the country where they are most needed. They would be an advantage to the farmers, to the canners and to manufacturers generally. Mr. Guthrie in replying to the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) who had compared certain Russian markets with the Canadian markets, spoke in strong condemnation of the Russians. He is one of those who support a government who pay $5 and $10 apiece for every Doukhobor entering this country as an immigrant from Russia. I have strongly protested against that class of immigration coming into Canada and against the bonusing of any immigrants. With our great natural resources,

developed and undeveloped, there is ample inducement to attract immigrants to Canada if those advantages are properly set forth by the high salaried officials whom this government employ. The bonus system is entirely wrong and no good reasons can be advanced in support of it. Under it the slick-tongued gentlemen who receive the bonuses from the government do not care what class of people they induce to come, so long as they get their $5 or $10 bonus. If we had efficient salaried officials throughout foreign lands to induce proper immigration to come into Canada, who would devote their entire time solely to that service, we would get better immigrants than are now coming to our shore. I strongly censure the government for their policy in this respect. The local agents throughout the province of Ontario have made many misrepresentations, and immigrants have been induced to come into this country to their own detriment and to that of the Dominion at large. In my district we require a certain number of the proper class of farm labour. Owing to the attractions of the Northwest, many of our young men have gone there, leaving only the older men on the farms, possibly the fathers, and therefore we are compelled to employ a certain amount of farm labour.

I have every sympathy for any immigrant who comes to this country to seek a home; but the government are deserving of censure for having dumped into the city of Chatham an unnecessary lot of immigrants. They were told before they left the old country that they could get plenty of work in that district at good wages, and could practically pick up money on the streets. The city of Chatham and the surrounding district have taken care of those people during the whole winter, and we hope to treat them with every courtesy and consideration. But what were the conditions? So far as I have been able to discover, there were five English families, making thirty-five in all, for whom this country had paid $5 a head, deported from the city of Chatham back to the old country, without any reason being given. In one case the head of the family was a bricklayer, who was taken from his work by an officer of the government and bundled off with his family in half a day. I have a question on the Order Paper asking the Minister of the Interior for the name or names of the person or persons who gave the information on which these families were deported. That number of immigrants should never have been induced to come to the city of Chatham, because there was not room there for so many of that class; but after they were brought there they should not have been deported without some reason being given to the citizens of Chatham and the people of the district why they were deported. One evening in this House, I think while the estimates of the Minister of the Interior were under consideration, I made some remarks in regard to the character of the local agents representing the government throughout the province of Ontario, especially in the riding which I have the honour to represent, and I asked the minister if he knew the reputation of these people. I meant no offence, but I felt there was something wrong in that district, I intended to probe it to the bottom, and I asked for a return. I am going to take the time to place that return on 'Hansard.' I refer to one Mr. Waugh, a local agent of this government. I do not blame him so much for his little conniving at getting $500 or $600 which did not belong to him, because, as has been proved in the Public Accounts Committee, grafting has been going on in various departments of this government, and it was only natural for these local agents to try to get a little of it for themselves. I want to show where this local agent did get some graft for himself. I am going to read a letter which this gentleman wrote to the Minister of the Interior regarding myself. It is as follows:—

Immigration Branch, Department of the Interior, Canada.

Chatham, December 20, 1907.

Hon. F. Oliver, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Pardon me for writing this letter to you, as I know you are a busy man, but my attention has been drawn to a statement said to have been made in the House by Mr. Clements when speaking on the immigration question that 50 per cent of those that I had placed upon farms had left; 25 per cent has not remained in the riding and for a grand wind-up that you could not have known me or you would not have made the appointment.

As to his first statement it is as false as he has proven himself to be, and as to the latter I have written him to know if it is correct, and if so to be kind enough to make it again elsewhere than on the floor of the House.

As to the immigrants whom I have distributed during the year, I may say that I have kept in close touch with them and they seem to be very grateful for any small favour they may receive, and as a whole are getting along wonderfully well, just one instance being a man and family who came out here last June who, when a farmer asked him if he could milk said no, that he had never seen a cow, but to-day is engaged with the best farmer in the county for another year as a first-class man.

The farmers are all well pleased with the help they are getting, and resent so much petty political interference with the work, and may just here say that of the number who applied for men during the season I have not been able to supply scarcely one-half the demand, and the outlook this coming year will be greater still.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) JAS. S. WAUGH.

That was the position I was placed in, after having made the statement that there was a great deal more money paid out to

that local agent than there were immigrants received in that riding. My only course was to ask for another return ; and this is the return that I asked for and that was granted by this House :

Return to an order of the House of Commons dated the 20th January, 1908, for copy of certificates by farmers resident in the riding of West Kent, and returned to the Department of Immigration agents for the said riding, and on certificates such agents were paid for placing immigrants with each farmer, giving the names of each immigrant and of each farmer such were placed with, giving the total amount received by each agent up to the present time.

I do not wish to censure the Minister of the Interior, who has been protecting his department to the best of his ability ; but after having asked for this return once or twice a week for the last two months, I succeeded in having it brought down, with the following statement :—

James S. Waugh, of Chatham, has received to date $1,256, has an unpaid account of $26, and has been asked for a refund of $558 paid to him as commission on immigrants claimed by him to have been placed at farm work or domestic service, but whom the department has reason to believe did not engage at those occupations with the parties whose names were given as their employers.

That is a sample of what is going on throughout this country. I want to be fair enough to say this, that while I have a return giving the total number of immigrant agents appointed in Ontario, a great many have been honest enough in their dealings with the government and the public where they live. I purpose to place this return upon 'Hansard.' I may say that when I asked for this return, the Immigration Department sent a circular letter to every farmer with which this agent claimed he had placed immigrants, asking if these immigrants gave satisfaction. Here is the circular letter which was sent out :

It has been reported to me that an immigrant who arrived in Canada some time ago, engaged with you as a farm labourer. I would be pleased if you would let me know if such is the case, stating if he is still with you, what kind of satisfaction he is giving, and what wages he is receiving. I desire this information in order to form a fair opinion as to the satisfaction immigrants are giving to Ontario farmers. Please reply on space underneath and use inclosed envelope, upon whch no postage is required, in mailing your answer to me.

Your obedient servant,
W. D. SCOTT,
Superintendent of Immigration.

While a great many replies came back to the department, there are many farmers who did not reply. Possibly I should have known better myself but I never supposed, nor did any of the farmers and residents of the county of Kent, that the bonus of $2 was allowed not only on heads of families, but on every man, woman and child that came into that riding during the last season. Here is the return : Here is the list :

Family Name.	Family.	Placed with	Address.	Commission.
				$ cts.
Joseph Ivison		R. Emmett	Chatham	2 00
Geo. Dugard	Wife and child	Daniel Jordan	"	6 00
Sydney Marbrhem	"	Walter Sethbridge	"	6 00
Joseph J. Pope	Wife	D. Jordan	"	4 00
A. J. Fuller		J. Jordan	"	2 00
Edwin Hammond		Geo. Wilson	"	2 00
Frank England		Robt. Young	"	2 00
E. Drake	Wife and child	M. M. Drachs	"	6 00
Arthur Dungate		R. Gray	"	2 00
J. Heard	Wife and child	James Carnhill	"	6 00
E. R. Seach	Wife and 3 children	R. Gray	"	10 00
Arthur Hawkins	Wife and 2 children	F. English	"	8 00
William Sault	" "	R. Gray	"	8 00
Joséph Gumbrell	Wife and child	Robt. Millinn	"	6 00
Thomas Hills	Wife	The Defiance Iron Works	"	4 00
Frank Walwark	"	Perry Elypps	Colchester	4 00
James Barnett		A. V. Webb	Dungale	2 00
H. Rupel		Andrew Crow	Chatham	2 00
A. Sherwood,		Walter Strow	Ouvray	2 00
H. Tultree		Andrew Ross	Chatham	2 00
G. E. Hamtin		J. Terry	"	2 00
Frcd. Green		D. McPherson	"	2 00
Edward Merry	Wife	S. Newcombe	Harwich	4 00
Lewis Bastin		J. Cornell	Chatham	2 00
Austin Edwards		James Gray	"	2 00
Richard Paget		Thos. Anderson	Chatham,	2 00
W. J. Jackson	Wife and child	J. W. Banfall	Allanville	6 00
F. W. Norwood	"	F. Bradey	Chatham	6 00

Name.	Family.	Placed with	Address.	Commission.
				$ cts.
W. Kemp	Wife	W. Brookbank	Eberts	4 00
Geo. Pigden		A. F. Handy	Chatham	2 00
H. F. Chambers		T. W. Pardryn	Dungal	2 00
Frank Sampson		W. Cotton	Darrell	2 00
F. M. Barringer		Thos. Waddie	Doyles	2 00
J. H. Barringer		J. Ferry	Chatham	2 00
William Brown		John Cotton	"	2 00
Joseph Cook		W. Jordan	"	2 00
S. Coldrich		H. Stephens	"	2 00
Thos. Clark	Wife and child	Hugh Shanks	Port Alma	6 00
John Moody		William Dillon	Doyle	2 00
Alfred Mumford		Daniel Jordan	Chatham	2 00
William Mayhew	Wife and child	R. Werrett	"	6 00
Alex. Garrett	"	C. Storm	Ouvry	6 00
Laurence Brown		Neal Cumming	Darrell	2 00
H. T. Salter	Wife and child	J. Jenks	"	6 00
Wm. Harlock		Geo. Jackson	Dover Centre	2 00
P. N. Bone		Wm. Millar	Cedar Springs	2 00
James Butler		C. Terry	Chatham	2 00
W. G. Cain	Wife and child	Wm. Sham	Cedar Springs	6 00
Wm. Coleman		M. Waddie	Doyle	2 00
Jas. T. Gates	Wife and 3 children	Thos. Brady	Buxton	10 00
David Johnstone		Thos. Waddie	Doyle	2 00
Wm. Barber	Child	Charles Barber	Stratford	4 00
Wm. Mason		David Martin	Thamesville	2 00
A. H. Dunkin	Wife and 2 children	John Longman	Chatham	8 00
Geo. Holledge		R. T. Budd	"	2 00
H. Calver		Geo. Lewis	Merlin	2 00
Alfred LeMaitre		Neil Cumming	Darrell	2 00
John LeMaitre		M. McGregor	Chatham	2 00
Wm. Teale		John Stratrel	Selton	2 00
Claude Rundle		D. Martin	Thamesville	2 00
Jonathan Ward		D. Gardiner	Chatham	2 00
J. F. Perrin	Wife and 2 children	Jas. Smyth	Kent Centre	8 00
F. H. Cooper	Wife and child	Johnson Orr	Chatham	6 00
Thomas Hards	Wife and 2 children	J. Fisher	"	8 00
F. Downing		James Doolittle	"	2 00
A. J. Dye	Wife and child	Milton Bartrus	"	6 00
S. Ashdown		Albert Lamb	Pinehurst	2 00
George Francis		N. Bartrus	Chatham	
J. F. Gidney	Wife	James McCoy	Wallaceburg	4 00
W. F. Stubbesfield	Wife and child	Jas. Shaw	"	6 00
W. G. Wilson	" "	Kenneth Urquhart	Omgah	6 00
J. W. Deadman	" "	D. Orr	Kingold	6 00
J. Pendleton	" "	R. Millin	Chatham	6 00
Charles Lee	" "	D. Jordan	"	6 00
Albert Shoard		Wm. Millan	Cedar Springs	2 00
James Grierson		G. McFarlane	Chatham	2 00
J. J. Early	Wife	J. Tipping	"	4 00
H. W. Hibbard	"	Albert Smith	Kent Centre	4 00
Fred. Steers	Wife and child	W. McGeachy	Chatham	6 00
Thos. Osborne	Wife and 2 daughters	Wm. Shaw	Charing Cross	8 00
B. H. Last	Wife and child	J. Gray	Chatham	6 00
E. Lusk		S. Hitchcock	"	2 00
H. J. Maxted		J. Shepperd	Bothwell	2 00
A. F. Wilks		J. Carmode	Chatham	2 00
M. W. Herson	Wife	W. McCreany	Wallaceburg	4 00
Sydney Langbelt	Wife and 2 children	D. McPherson	Chatham	8 00
Sidney Russell	Wife and child	A. Williams	Williams	6 00
Geo. Higginson	Wife and 2 children	R. Everatt	Chatham	8 00
Wm. H. Hanley	Wife and child	R. Kings	"	6 00
Victor Story		D. Jordan	"	2 00
Henry T. Smith		"	"	2 00
Henry Augier		A. B. Lancaster	Port Alma	2 00
Alex. Law		H. Gillette	Chatham	2 00
Henry Lowe		J. Morrison	"	2 00
D. McDonald		Charles Mickle	Wallaceburg	2 00
A. McDonald		J. McCarroll	"	2 00
Jno. Taylor		L. Rhodes	Chatham	2 00
Arthur Howard	Wife	R. Huff	"	4 00
James Card Wallader		Neil McGinsbey	"	2 00
F. Rayner		Peter McGeachey	"	2 00

Mr. CLEMENTS.

Family Name.	Family.	Placed with	Address.	Commission.
				$ cts.
E. Blaize	Wife	T. Brady	Buxton	4 00
G. H. Warner	Wife and 2 children	J. C. Pullen	Chatham	8 00
Geo. Dudney	Wife and 4 children	Newton Driver	"	12 00
N. Bullingham		C. Campbell	Fletcher	2 00
John James		J. Derrow	Bare Line	2 00
Wm. Ward	Wife and 2 children	J. C. Pullen	Chatham	8 00
Wm. T. Day	" "	A. Bond	"	8 00
Harry Bodly		J. Payne	Bare Line	2 00
Henry L. Morris		R. Huxley	"	2 00
Thos. A. Morklin	Wife and 6 children	Newton Driver	Chatham	16 00
F. W. Maddock	Wife and 4 children	Geo. Stephens	"	12 00
Percy Dickinson		M. McGregor	"	2 00
Wm. Spearing		Alex. Dolsen	"	2 00
J. H. C. Cook		G. W. Athrop	Charing Cross	2 00
James Gray		F. Dolsen	Chatham	2 00
James Allen		Geo. Stephens	"	2 00
Robert Greig		R. Steen	"	2 00
John Wilson	Wife and child	A. Fisher	"	6 00
G. W. Bland	Wife and 2 children	W. Devlin	"	8 00
Fredk. McGee		John Fallahe	"	
Abbott Floak	Wife and 5 children	Milton Barkens	"	14 00
W. J. Green		Wm. Stover	Omry	2 00
Alfred Harding		J. Foxton	"	2 00
T. F. Harding	Wife	J. Blondin	Chatham	2 00
A. E. Mayberry	"	W. McCorkel	"	4 00
Geo. Pearce	Wife and 6 children	J. Fallken	"	16 00
N. Demasseachille		M. McGugan	"	2 00
H. W. Warring		W. Stover	Omry	2 00
J. Housden	Wife and 3 children	J. McKorkel	Chatham	10 00
W. G. Barnes	Wife and 4 children	P. W. McGarvin	"	12 00
Fredk. Cheese	Wife and 5 children	R. Grey	"	14 00
Edward Daugherty	Wife and 4 children	Mrs. English	"	12 00
Geo. Heane	Wife and 2 children	J. McKenzie	"	8 00
Samuel Heather	Wife and 6 children	J. Jordan	"	16 00
James Joiner	Wife and 5 children	J. Grey	"	14 00
D. Knight	Wife and 4 children	J. Hedley	Fletcher	12 00
W. Buxton	" "	D. Martin	Thamesville	2 00
J. Montague	Wife and 5 children	J. Story	Dawn	14 00
Wm. Ethridge	Wife and 4 children	T. Budd	Chatham	12 00
F. C. Grocott	Wife and 6 children	J. Nelson	"	16 00
Charles Newton	Wife and 3 children	J. Cornhill	Chatham	10 00
Frank Roberts		E. H. Toll		2 00
A. S. Anderson	Wife	Frank Dolson	Chatham	4 00
J. Fitzgerald	Son	George Jordan	"	4 00
A. N. Steel	Wife	J. Orr	"	4 00
H. J. Trevillyan	Wife and 1 child	James Coy	"	6 00
F. Norton	" "	J. Martin	"	6 00
Wm. Connoly	Wife and 5 children	J. Mason	Nelson	14 00
W. H. Dawson		R. S. Marshall	Chatham	2 00
James Prior	Wife and 4 children	S. English	"	12 00
James Daisly	" "	W. F. Tropp	Oil City	12 00
Richard R. Spendiff		D. McPherson	Chatham	2 00
Charles H. Baker	Wife and 1 child	W. F. Tropp	Oil City	6 00
Charles Crawford		A. Wolf	Fargo	2 00
E. W. Colt	Wife and 2 children	W. T. Tropp	Oil City	8 00
George Merrifield	Wife and 3 children	B. Blondin	Chatham	10 00
Charles W. Ward	Wife and 5 children	J. McKenzie	"	14 00
J. Evans	Wife	James Macdonell	Wallaceburg	4 00
Wm. Blackwell	Wife and 1 child	W. T. Tropp	Oil City	6 00
James A. Phayford	Wife	J. Brady	Burford	4 00
Albert E. Lee	Wife	W. A. Bodman	Fargo	4 00
Hugh Cannington		A. Wolf	"	2 00
Charles R. Ellicott		J. Early	Charing Cross	2 00
D. C. Fleming		J. L. Johnston	Lewisville	2 00
Thomas W. Huston		H. Edwards	Fargo	2 00
W. E. Merry		J. McPherson	Chatham	2 00
F. Goodall	Wife and child	Langstaff Brothers	Wallaceburg	6 00
Joseph Plante		S. White	Charing Cross	2 00
Alfred Powell	Wife and 3 children	George Popey	Kent Centre	10 00
Arthur Heers	Wife and 6 children	B. Blonnak	Chatham	16 00
Fred Watson	Wife and 3 children	J. Stevens	"	10 00
Wm. Chandler	"	W. Morrison	Blenheim	10 00
Richard Dennis	Wife and 5 children	G. Fulder	Chatham	14 00

Family Name.	Family.	Placed with	Address.	Commission.
				$ cts.
Thos. Eldridge	Wife and 4 children	W. T. Prangly	Dresden	12 00
Wm. Dawson	Wife and 2 children	Wm. McKenzie	Chatham	8 00
John Mortimer	Wife and 5 children	Wm. McKenzie	"	14 00
Alfred Perkins	"	F. Blondin	"	14 00
Geo. Wilder	Wife and 4 children	John Youmaus	"	12 00
Saml. Ward	Wife and 3 children	G. Fulder	"	10 00
John Young	"	G. Fulder	"	10 00
Geo. Timmins	"	J. Stevens	"	10 00
Thos. Clark	Wife and 4 children	N. J. McGeachey	"	12 00
Thos. H. Wilson	"	K. Urquhart	Oungah	13 00
Sidney Bennett		James Bellaney	Chatham	2 00
W. A. Williams		Geo. Wilson	Charing Cross	2 00
Sidney J. Scammett	Wife	Thos. Brady	Buxton	4 00
Arthur Le Patuvell,		H. A. Clark	Chatham	2 00
M. S. Hughes		J. R. Longmore	"	2 00
J. H. Edwards	Son	D. A. Wilson	"	4 00
Edward Hendra		Geo. Ball	Harwick	2 00
Wm. J. Smith	Wife and child	J. Purvis	Puce P.O	6 00
Herbert J. Fade		Andrew Grew	Chatham	2 00
Jas. White	Wife	J. Rhode	"	4 00
Chas. G. Harbutt		C. McKnight	Baldoon	2 00
Sylvester Horan	Wife and child	Geo. Brown	Chatham	6 00
Geo. Kent	"	J. C. Steen	Baldoon	6 00
Jno. Brown	"	J. Runyan	Chatham	6 00
W. W. Augel	"	A. Smyth	Kut Centre	6 00
Jos. H. Andrews	Wife and 2 children	J. McKenzie	Chatham	8 00
A. E. Panhurst	" "	J. McKenzie	"	8 00
J. B. Seeney	Wife and 4 children	Jas. Campbell	"	12 00
Saml. Edwards	Wife and 6 children	F. Shaw	Warrenby	4 00
Wm. Lamble	" "	D. Jordan	Chatham	16 00
Thos. Murray		J. D. McKay	"	2 00
Wm. McKenzie		W. J. Holmes	"	2 00
Fred. Sims		J. McCarkel	"	2 00
Robert Smith		M. Campbell	Northwood	2 00
Frank Holland		Geo. Frielell	Charing Cross	2 00
David Potts		Wm. Blight	Chatham	2 00
Jas. Baylis		Henry Gillette	Armagah	2 00
Wm. Ward		J. McCarkel	Chatham	2 00
A. H. Booth		J. Loaw	"	2 00
Alfred Done		J. Jewell	Northwood	2 00
George E. Guard		Wm. West	Tilbury	2 00
Henry Lewis		N. A. McGleachey	Chatham	2 00
T. H. Whalen		Arthur Johnston	Darrell	2 00
Jas. L. Smith		Geo. Falden	Chatham	2 00
W. J. Carter		J. McKay	Darrel	2 00
Thomas Godville	Wife and 1 child	D. Mason	Croton	6 00
Charles Day	Wife and 4 children	J. English	Chatham,	12 00
F. C. Towel		Neil McGerchy	"	2 00
W. H. Bone	Wife and 1 child	J. Tipping	"	6 00
Geo. Chamberlain		W. R. Mitchell	Merlin	2 00
Wm. G. Elder		J. Fallon	Chatham	2 00
Edward Elder		G. Fielder	"	2 00
Samuel A, Kerr		Geo. Ball	Kent Centre	2 00
Arthur H. Moore		S. Huxley	Dover Centre	2 00
Edward Mundew		W. Blight	Chatham	2 00
Albert Thomas		J. McPherson	"	2 00
J. Thompson		J. Irwin	Northwood	2 00
Arthur Spear		F. L. Horton	Kent Centre	2 00
John E. Charles		W. Blight	Chatham	2 00
Charles Warwick		Wm. West	Oungah	2 00
Wm. C. Head		N. Horton	Kent Centre	2 00
Wm. A. Brin	Wife	J. Fallon	Chatham	4 00
Wm. Cain		G. Fielder	"	2 00
T. Saward		D. Jordan	"	2 00
H. M. Aglett		S. West	"	2 00
Jas. H. Saunders		Thos. Asher	Baldoon	2 00
P. J. Hunt		J. McCorkel	Chatham	2 00
Frederick Martin		C. L. Johnson	Louisille	2 00
W. Blackman		Hugh Montgomery	Oungah	2 00
Geo. Bedwell		D. Jordan	Chatham	2 00
Richard Spendill		J, Asher	Dover Centre	2 00
J. W. Callery		D. Mason	Baldoon	4 00
Wm. Penn	Wife and 1 child	Jas. McCorkel	Charing Cross	6 00

Mr. CLEMENTS

Family Name.	Family.	Placed with	Address.	Commission.
				$ cts.
Mrs. Sarah Cooke	2 boys	Mrs. J. Chambers	Chatham	6 00
Mrs. Mary Ivison	Child	Mrs. W. Wattes	Dresden	4 00
John Eaton		D. Pender	Chatham	2 00
Chas. Fisher		M. French or Freeman	"	2 00
Wm. Dyson		R. Coatsworth	"	2 00
Thos. Martin		F. Shaw	Pepperville	2 00
H. F. Rayner		J. Asher	Dover S	2 00
J. Ford	Wife	J. N. McCoy	Wallaceburg	4 00
E. A. Wilson		Geo. Ramsdall	Cedar Springs	2 00
H. S. Sprigett		J. R. Shanks	Port Alma	2 00
H. S. B. Critchley		Lay Ritchie	Charing Cross	2 00
Henry Abbott		Geo. Bailey	Wallaceburg	2 00
Sydney Little		H. McGregor	Chatham	2 00
Annie Osborne		M. McGregor	"	2 00
Jas. Cairns		H. Beattie	"	2 00
F. W Hill		W. Lancaster	Port Alma	2 00
Ed. Mabin		Jas. Peel	Chatham	2 00
E. W. Daniels		H. Parrott	Dresden	2 00
Walter Henderson	Wife and 3 children	J. Waugh	Chatham	10 00
Sidney Thorne		H. Hildreth	Essex	4 00

I want to apologize for taking up so much of the time of the House, but as certain insinuations have been made in this House and as this agent and the department are shown up in connection with this matter, I propose reading some of the letters which were received by the Superintendent of Immigration from farmers in the neighbourhood of Chatham. In the first place, I have a letter written by Robert Gray with reference of Arthur Dungate, an immigrant who was placed with Mr. Gray. Mr. Gray says :

Fairly good man, still with us.

Underneath there is stamped upon the letter 'claim deducted.' My reason for reading this return is that this agent placed farm labourers with manufacturers and other concerns and was therefore not entitled to the bonuses that he received. There is another letter from Mr. James Cornhill as follows :

We have seven Englishmen working for us in our brickyards here, but no one by the name of G. Head. You inquire about some of the men coming out recently. I find them to be good workers and very sober and industrious fellows.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) JAMES CORNHILL,
Brick manufacturer.

Claim deducted.

The next has reference to E. R. Leach, wife and three children.

Fairly good man while with us; not here now.

(Sgd.) ROBERT GRAY.

Claim deducted.

Mr. Gray is a carriage manufacturer in the city of Chatham. There is a leter from L. English, Chatham, as follows :

Dear Sir,—We have received several notices from you in reference to immigrants engaged with us. We only had one man, a Mr. Docherty, wife and four children. We engaged him at 75 cents per day, free house, wood and milk. They just stayed four days, as he said he did not care to be so far from the city, which was only two miles. I don't know why our names was sent to you. We certainly was disgusted with the one we did have. Beer seems to be the greatest trouble with these people. Pardon for not answering your other correspondence.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) LESLIE ENGLISH,

Claim deducted.

The next has reference to William Sault, wife and two children :

No good; worked a week.

(Sgd.) ROBERT GRAY.

Claim deducted.

The next is from Robert Millinn another carriage manufacturer in the city of Chatham. It has reference to Joseph Gumbrell, wife and one child. This claim was also deducted.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why were the claims deducted?

Mr. CLEMENTS. When I asked for this return the department undertook to trace up the operations of this agent and when they found that, instead of placing these people with farmers, he had placed them with manufacturers the claim for compensation was deducted.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The money has never been returned?

Mr. CLEMENTS. No, the money has never been returned.

Mr. FOWLER. What do you mean by 'claim deducted'?

Mr. CLEMENTS. The department have deducted these claims, but they have not received the money back from the agent. He still holds the money. He was paid for them all.

Mr. FOWLER. And paid for them as farm labourers ?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Yes, paid for them as farm labourers. The next letter is from Eliakim Newcombe and has reference to Edward Merry and wife. The letter is as follows :

Dear Sir,—I have never heard tell of such a man as you speak of. I had one of my neighbour's boys working for me last year.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) ELIAKIM NEWCOMBE.

Claim deducted.

There is another from Thomas Anderton referring to Richard J. Paget :

Sir,—I did engage Richard J. Paget who worked for me at $12 per month for the first month and $20 for the following month if he gave me satisfaction. This man had his supper with me on Saturday night and three meals on Sunday and one more meal on Monday morning and I have never seen or heard of Mr. Paget since then, but I think he went back to Chatham. I told him as he was going if every one used him as well in Canada as I did he would be lucky. He never did anything for me not even feed a chicken.

Yours truly,
THOMAS ANDERTON.

Claim deducted.

He is a farmer. Here is a letter from B. Jordan regarding Joseph Cook. He says:

Jos. Cook was a good fair man, worked five months, $10 a week. He left to work in beet fields.

Geo. Degard was a very good man, worked about three months.

Jos. J. Pope worked about four months. He left to work for Blight & Fielder.

F. Mumford was a very good man, worked five months, $10 a week. He left to go to work in Wallaceburg Sugar Factory.

These are all very good men.

Victor Story I did not know. He didn't work for me.

Victor Storey is reported by the agent to be with this man Jordan.

There is a letter from J. Storm regarding Alexander Martin, wife and child, on whom there would be a bonus of $6. It reads :

I wrote for a man and I didn't get one. If you sent a man and his wife, he didn't come to me. He has dropped off at some other place.

J. Jinks supposed to be a farmer, writes regarding T. Salter wife and child, on whom there would be bonuses of $6 :

Please excuse me for not answering your first notice on the grounds that I never had an immigrant and took no notice of your notice. I sent in an application last spring, also to the local agent in Chatham, J. S. Waugh. Both were for single men. So information is a little short here.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) JOHN JINKS.

There is one here from C. Terry as follows :

Mr. CLEMENTS.

W. D. Scott, Esq.

Received this letter. As I am not a farmer, nor do I know of a C. Terry, either a farmer, or any other occupation, nor of a Mr. Butler.

Yours,
(Sgd.) CHARLES TERRY,
Cab driver.

Mr. Terry is a cab driver in Chatham, and the only Terry of that name living there. He was reported to have an immigrant and the agent received two dollars on his name.

There is a letter here from David Martin, brick manufacturer, in Thamesville, who said :

This man only worked about four weeks. He would rather drink than work.

There is a letter with regard to A. H. Dunkin, which reads :

I never knew of a man of above name. You must have been mistaken with regard to him.

J. LONGMORE.

He is the only farmer of the name in that district.

There is a letter from R. B. Gardiner, Chatham, with reference to Jonathan Ward, which reads :

In reply to yours of the 9th instant, I did not engage the man Jonathan Ward, nor have not seen him.

James Smythe, of Kent Centre, writes :

You have been misinformed about my having an immigrant employed. I have none. Geo. Smyth and Joseph Smyth, Kent Centre, have married men employed. They can no doubt give you the information you desire.

R. Tipping writes with reference to J. J. Early and wife as follows :

In answer to the above, he engaged with me as a plasterer, but left this town for Windsor, August 12, where he is still following that occupation, the wages being 40 cents per hour. Trusting this will be a satisfactory answer.

W. A. McGeachy writes with regard to Fred Steers, wife and child :

I am sorry to say that the above never made their appearance, consequently cannot report.

George Hitchcock writes with regard to E. Lusk as follows :

I received your letter in regard to E. Lusk. I did not receive him. I got one from the agent, Hon. Mr. Waugh. The man I got is giving good satisfaction, earning $12 per month.

John P. Cormode writes respecting F. Wilks, as follows :

I have not employed any immigrants this season and don't know anything of the one you inquire about.

Ray H. King writes with reference to William H. Hanley, wife and one child as follows :

Yours of the 28th instant at hand and note what you say about Mr. Hanley and family. I do not know anything about same as I never had an immigrant engaged in any way. I am told that your Mr. Waugh, I think that is his name, your immigrant agent in Chatham, sent in a good many names of men who have not even asked for a man. I am told that he got $2 per head for every immigrant he got work for and therefore sent for them when there was not even work for the Canadians who were here at that time. Therefore these immigrants came to our city and found no work, no home, and not likely to be any for some time. If it was not for the churches and the city council many of these poor people would have starved or frozen to death. I think this man should be put behind the bars if this is so.

D. Jordin writes regarding Henry T. Smith, as follows :

We had J. Cook and one named Mumford. They were both very good men to work. We paid them $10 per week. They are not with us now, nor do we know where they are employed.

These are all we had; we do not know anything about the following names, they were never in our employ: Henry T. Smith, Chas. Lee, Victor Story, Samuel Heather.

W. B. Lancaster, of Port Alma, writes with respect to Harry Angier :

Mr. Harry Angier has not engaged with me, neither do I know of such a man being in the neighbourhood. I have not had an immigrant engaged this summer.

N. A. McGeachy writes in reference to James Cardwallardes as follows :

In reply would say, he engaged the above person to work on our farm, but he failed to fulfil engagement, as he did not come for one week. In the meantime we engaged another man and did not need his services. We have not heard or seen anything of him since.

J. C. Pullen writes regarding G. H. Warner, wife and family :

There is no Mr. Warner working for me.

N. Driver writes regarding George Dudney, wife and four children as follows :

You have been wrongly informed. I have not any immigrant in my employment and don't want any. I never saw or heard of the family named above.

Arthur Johnston writes in regard to W. T. Day, wife and two children, as follows :

As Mr. Bond has never had Mr. Day as a labourer, but a Mr. Driver, he worked a month for him, then came to me, but has had very bad luck as he took sick with typhoid fever and I am just bringing him home from the hospital to-day after four and a half weeks' illness, so it will be a time before he can resume work, and then I do not expect he will be with me, as houses are scarce and it is too far to come to his work. He is a good man to work as far as I have seen yet, that is only about five weeks. He has been receiving $18 per month from me. His wife and family have had to have help from the township during his illness.

Mr. R. Huxley writes :

About the beginning of last July I brought four young men to Chatham. My neighbours took them, as Dr. Macfarland took Percy Westbrook; James Payne took young Shipley; Wm. Chapple took Geo. Swingler, and I kept Harry Gosling. The wages were $10 first month with a raise after. My men stopped with me six weeks. The others are all at the same places and all gave good satisfaction.

This is marked : 'claim deducted.'

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to explain how the claim was deducted ? If they were paid, how could they be deducted?

Mr. CLEMENTS. It is the claim they had against the agent. It is doubtful if they have ever received it.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this agent still in Canada?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Yes, I presume he is in Chatham. F. Dalsen, of Chatham, writes :

I don't know Jas. Gray; he never worked for me.

FRED. A. DALSEN.

This is marked : 'claim deducted.' Richard Steen, whom I know very well, writes :

There has been no immigrant placed with me for the past ten years.

R. STEEN.

Marked : 'claim deducted.' J. Blondie who owns a planing mills in the city of Chatham, writes in regard to T. J. Harding and wife :

You must be mistaken in the name, as there is no immigrant by such name working for me or any other Blondie I know of. There are, however, some unmarried immigrants in the neighbourhood who are giving good satisfaction, while others again are worthless. Hoping this will be of some use to you,

I am, yours truly,
J. H. BLONDIE.

Also marked : 'claim deducted.' Robert Gray, of Chatham, writes :

Fred Cheese is not engaged here as a farm labourer, but is working in our paint department. His foreman stated that he is giving good satisfaction, and his rate of wages will be from $1.75 to $2 per day, working on a piece-work basis.

THE WM. GRAY & SONS, COMPANY, Limited.

This is also marked : 'claim deducted.' David Martin, brick manufacturer, writes :

Mr. Buxton has worked for me since July the 18th, and is still working for three or four weeks yet in my brick and tile yard. He is a good steady man, just the kind of men we want in this country. I am paying him $1.60 per day of ten hours.

Another from David Martin about the same man. Both of these marked : 'claim deducted.' J. Carnhill, another brick manufacturer, of the city of Chatham, writes :

Chas. Newton has worked for us in our brick works, and he has proven very satisfactory, is sober and industrious. Up to now he has been drawing $1.50 per day.

Geo. Jordan another brick manufacturer, writes regarding J. Fitzgerald and son :

We did not engage any immigrant whatever. Would like to know who gave you such information. I think they are a nuisance in the country. A great many are working for their board.

Here is one from Jas. Brady, of Buxton, regarding John A. Playford and wife :

Having received your letter I write to tell you that I never had any immigrants, so I cannot inform you as to the wages or anything about them.

JAS. BRADY.

There is a case where $10 was paid as commission, and it is marked, 'claim deducted.' Here is one from Langstaff Bros., Wallaceburg :

Mr. Goodall is not with us; in fact, I never heard tell of the man; he never applied to us for a situation.

S. S. White, Charing Cross, writes :

I must say I never engaged this man Jos. Plant, nor do I know any man around Charing Cross that did; it must be the wrong place. I do not know the man.

I know S. S. White, the only man of that name living in Charing Cross. Here is a letter from E. Blondie :

Re Arthur Steers. I might say he has been working for us for the last two months, employed as a bricklayer, and has given very fair satisfaction.

This is marked, 'claim deducted.' F. Blondie, of Chatham, writes regarding Alfred Perkins, wife and five children :

You have been misinformed in the name. F. Blondie is not farming; he is a mason by trade. There is no Blondie engaging any farm hands around this part of the country, as I am personally acquainted with all the Blondies.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I have given evidence enough from this return amply to show to this House what has been going on in the Immigration Department regarding immigration agents who do not act honestly in that capacity. I do not blame the agents so very much ; I blame the system under which the government have allowed these agents to act. I say they should not have been given a free hand, as this agent was, to pay out money which belonged to the people of this country. I want to censure the Immigration Department for having paid out money in the reckless manner shown by this return, and then been compelled to ask the agent to return $600 which does not belong to him. If he were a brother of mine, I would say that this agent ought to be prosecuted.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Hasn't he been arrested yet ?

Mr. CLEMENTS.

Mr. CLEMENTS. He is running at large so far as I know, and I suppose this will only be a step to his getting promotion, as a great many others of the same class have been promoted by this government in other departments. I am looking forward to this gentleman getting promotion rather than prosecution. I hope that the government will see that that money is returned, because it belongs to the people of this country, and does not belong to the government or to any agent of the government. But the government evidently do not prosecute for fraud. I suppose we might give hundreds of cases of agents who acted in the same manner as this agent has done, and who have been promoted. I do not expect that in this case the government will attempt to collect a dollar. I want to say that there are many worthy immigrants in that district. Many of those English immigrants are willing to work and to accept what they can get, and will, I believe, make good Canadian citizens so long as they get a fair show.

They were all dumped into that riding, they came there in such numbers that there was not enough work for them, and they had to be placed on the hands of the public. That is one of the greatest detriments to this Dominion, because it is only natural that such people would write home to their friends, and possibly many who would make excellent immigrants and citizens would be discouraged in coming out. That is why I say the whole system carried on by this government is wrong, and I hope the government will see fit to cancel this bonus for the bringing of immigrants into this country. I think there is encouragement enough in the country itself to cause immigrants to flow in without this additional incentive, and I believe immigration will continue to come in without our paying out a million dollars a year in bonuses to agents for bringing it. I believe that we could even take the step which the American union has taken and get a revenue for our immigration instead of paying out a million dollars in bonuses. I have spoken in what I consider the interests of the agriculturists. I want now to look at the question from the manufacturing standpoint. It was a great mistake when this government by their revision of the tariff, practically wiped out the woollen industry. They thus practically destroyed many millions of dollars which were invested in woollen mills. Look around this Dominion and you will only find a few woollen mills running to-day. That certainly is no credit to this government. In a few remarks I delivered in this House a year and a half ago. I pointed out that a vast amount of shoddy goods were allowed into our market under the low tariff and that these goods were a detriment to every mechanic and labourer who purchased them. Besides that importation was the cause of depriving of work thousands of mechanics

who were formerly employed in our woollen mills. That policy was thus detrimental, from every point of view, to our mechanics and labourers. In 1890, when we had a tariff sufficient to protect the industries of this country, we imported $11,000,000 worth of woollen goods on which we collected $3,157,000 in duties. But in 1904, under the low tariff, we imported $15,159,000 worth and only collected $3,953,000 revenue. In other words, inside of five years there was $5,000,000 of low class goods imported which took the place of goods manufactured by Canadian labour and we only got the same amount of revenue. And I will say this, that I believe no woollen goods were made anywhere equal in quality to the woollens manufactured in this country. It is not to the credit of this government that they undertook to wipe out that great industry which had done so much for the people, both from the manufacturing standpoint and from the standpoint of furnishing our consumers with a better quality of goods. I sincerely trust that the government will reconsider their policy in the interests of both our agriculturists and manufacturers and give us a home market for our agricultural products and at the same time a superior home made article for our consumers.

Mr. W. S. LOGGIE (Northumberland, N.B.) I have listened with considerable pleasure to the hon. gentleman's remarks and congratulate him on the lengthy statement he has given the House. The burden of his complaint was that the farmers are not receiving enough protection for their pork products and that the woollen industry does not enjoy a sufficiently high tariff to be placed on a stable foundation. Then he went on to cite instances in which he claimed the government have not managed the immigration carefully and prudently and have paid out money which they should not have paid. But to my mind the very fact that the government have discovered that money has been paid out wrongfully and have endeavoured to get it refunded is evidence of the care the department is taking in the management of its immigration business, and I think it has been very well established that the immigration or the bonusing policy of the government is : Pay your money for value received ; when the goods are delivered, the money is paid ; until they are delivered no money is paid.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The government would never have discovered that money was wrongfully paid if I had not made a protest. It was only when I protested that this government found that out.

Mr. LOGGIE. I am glad the hon. gentleman has been such a useful member and that those in charge of the department were wide enough awake to take advantage of the information as soon as it was brought to their notice. That is all any business man can do. The hon. gentleman tells us that a considerable quantity of pork is imported, and he has the audacity to claim that our farmers are suffering because a class of pork is imported which Canadians do not raise.

As a matter of fact, I know from personal experience, a large proportion of the pork that is imported into Canada from the United States is a class that is not produced in this country to any great extent. It is known in the trade as 'fat back' or clear fat pork. As a matter of fact, the farmers and packers of Canada do not produce in any large quantity this class of pork and cannot supply the demand for it. Now, if this statement of mine regarding this class of pork is true, and if this pork is used largely in fishing camps and lumber camps, is it fair or reasonable that you should heavily tax the people who consume it with the expectation that some one is benefited by it who produces a lighter class of pork in Canada? We have an example of the same kind of policy in the United States. In portions of Maine there are blueberry barrens, and the people there are so given up to the idea of protection that, for the sake of these few blueberry barrens in the state of Maine, they put a duty of 70 per cent on the canned article. But does that stop the canned article, packed in Canada, from finding its way into the United States? It does not, it simply enhances the price to the consumer. If any hon. gentleman wants this verified, let him go to Messrs. H. N. Bate & Sons in this city, and ask the price of canned blueberries for the wholesale trade. He will find that they are sold at 75 cents a dozen. Then let him write to Messrs. Francis H. Leggatt & Company, of New York, and he will find that they sell the same goods at $1.15 or $1.20 a dozen. So, to protect these blueberry barrens in the state of Maine, the whole consuming public of the United States is paying this extra duty. Is it wise to increase the duty on barrelled pork as suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Clements) especially the class of pork referred to by me as being used by our fishermen and lumbermen.

Mr. CLEMENTS. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Loggie) will permit me, I would like to ask a question. So far as the statement he makes regarding American pork is concerned, which pork he claims, the fishermen require, no doubt he refers to the heavy, fat salt pork.

Mr. LOGGIE. Yes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I can tell the hon. gentleman that in the section of the province of Ontario from which I come we produce any amount of that class of pork and we cannot get sale for it. The Minister of Agriculture accused the farmers in my district of raising too much of that class of pork, and we are compelled——

Mr. LOGGIE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clements) does not know it all. I am interested in a corporation that uses a large quantity of that class of pork, and I know that when we apply to the Park-Blackwell people or the William Davis people and houses of that class, they are not able to supply that class of pork. I note what the hon. gentleman says about the Minister of Agriculture, and the Minister of Agriculture is right. That is not the class of pork that we are adapted to raise in this country. This class of hogs is raised mainly in Iowa and is fed largely on corn. The people there raise a heavier class of hogs than we do. It is unreasonable for the hon. gentleman to ask an increase of duty. The duty is already 2 cents per pound, and I suppose that if he had his way it would be 3½ cents. Well, it would only mean that the fishermen and farmers who use that class of pork would have to pay that much more.

Mr. BLAIN. What about the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Loggie) own friends, who made up a deputation that went to ask for an increase in the duty?

Mr. LOGGIE. I am glad the hon. gentleman mentioned that. I congratulate the government that they did not entertain any such proposition.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clements) has referred to the woollen industry. To my mind, if an industry cannot survive at a reasonable protection in a country like this, it would be better for our people to bend their energies in some other direction. With a protection—or revenue, if you like to put it that way, because all revenue tariffs afford incidental protection and industry suited to our conditions should prosper. My hon. friend from West Kent (Mr. Clements) has the audacity to tell the people of this country forsooth, that because we are not paying a higher rate of duty than 30 per cent on woollens the woollen industry cannot survive. Well, I know something of the woollen industry, and I can tell the hon. gentleman that that is not at all my opinion of that industry. But I shall have something to say about that later on and do not wish to discuss it at this moment. I think that the hon. gentleman, in stating his case, has made out a very bad case—certainly, I would expect better from him.

Now, as the motion before us is one on which we can chose our subjects of discussion, I would like to say a word with regard to the fiscal and financial policy of the government. I congratulate the country and the Finance Minister upon the wonderfully prosperous condition of our finances at the present time. We find that for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1907, we expended on capital account $11,327,791. And, while we were able to do all that, we reduced the net public debt by $3,375,117. Then, again, the fiscal year that ended on March 31 last shows the very satisfactory surplus of something like $19,000,000—not counting, of course, the special expenditure for the Transcontinental Railway, on which, during that year, we spent no less than $17,750,000. But, though we put this large sum into the Transcontinental Railway we increased the public debt by only $12,000,000. So, were it not for the extraordinary expenditure on the transcontinental, we should have had a surplus over all expenditures of nearly $6,000,000. It seems to me that wiser or more statesmanlike words could not have been spoken than those of the Minister of Finance when he said that the present is a time for caution, but—a rider to that, for I think the wise man, under the circumstances would not close his 'caution'—it was a time for courage. The showing that the hon. gentleman has made has done much, perhaps more than any one thing to maintain the high financial standing that Canada enjoys to-day and has enjoyed for a number of years past.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to deal with a few of the allegations made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). First of all, he alleged that the Liberal party were not true to the pledges they made in 1893 at the Ottawa convention. I want to say that it was my privilege and pleasure to be present at that convention, and I know somewhat whereof I speak; and if there was one thing at that convention that impressed me more than another it was this, that in future the tariff was to be based on the revenue principle rather than the protective principle that is in most cases, perhaps not every case. I must admit that I am a little bit tinged with the idea that our friends the farmers do have a little protection to the extent of 2 cents a pound on pork; but practically speaking, we removed from the tariff the principle of protection.

Mr. HENDERSON. How far?

Mr. LOGGIE. I would invite the hon. gentleman to turn to the Trade and Commerce report, page 14, and I think he will be able to follow the figures I am going to quote. He will find that the average customs duty on all imports for the decade from 1887 to 1896, the last ten years of the Conservative regime, was 19·64 per cent. Then he will find that for the following decade, from 1897 to 1906, the average rate of duty on all customs imports was 16·88. The decrease in the ten years was 2·76. During the last ten years I refer to we find that total customs imports was $1,932,262,271, which sum applied to the 2·76 shows a reduction in taxation of $53,330,438. It would be fair perhaps to deduct from this saving in taxation the amount of bounty paid during the ten years, which, according to the blue-books, amounted to $9,501,385. That sum deducted from the sum I have already mentioned, $53,330,438, makes the reduction, or the saving that my hon. friend wanted to know about, of the appreciable amount of

$43,829,053. And yet the hon. gentleman from North Toronto in addressing the House used these words:

So I say in actuality the duty for protection has not been diminished to any appreciable extent.

As a matter of fact, it is beyond dispute that we had an actual saving to the country in the ten years, in the way of duty, of money that remained in the pockets of the people, after deducting the amounts paid for bounties, a sum no less than $43,000,000. These figures are beyond dispute. The books are there, and I challenge any hon. gentleman to prove me in error. Now, Mr. Speaker, we would not have so nice a story to tell if the prediction of hon. gentlemen of the opposition came to pass, when they said that if the Liberals got into power and reduced the rate of duty, our industries would be closed up, we would not have any home industries to speak of, because the reduction in duty would take place at the sacrifice of the industries. Sir, we have proved many times that that has not been the case. We can prove as a matter of fact that although we have increased our imports we have at the same time increased our manufactures, perhaps in quite as great a ratio as our imports have increased.

Mr. PATERSON. While the hon. gentleman is referring to the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto, has he thought of adding the bonuses to the taxation? The bonuses that we paid on iron were paid out of revenue derived at the rate of 19·93. On the same principle you might say that all the moneys expended on public works and everything else were all paid out of revenue.

Mr. LOGGIE. Of course that makes my argument all the stronger. I gave the hon. member for North Toronto credit for that, because he thought it was fair to deduct that. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out that this government have materially reduced the rate of customs duties on goods imported into Canada, and have thus enabled our people to live on less money than they would otherwise require; if by so doing they have sacrificed Canadian manufacturing industries then their policy would be a fair subject for criticism; if we reduced our rate of duty and saved the money for our people, on our imported goods, thus our people can live on less than they could otherwise, if we had thereby made the sacrifice of our home industries, that might be a question of policy. But let us see if the prediction of the opposition has been realized. Have our mills closed? have our industries deprecated? have our employees been dismissed?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I pointed to the woollen industry.

Mr. LOGGIE. Let us see. I think there is no better test or index of the progress of the manufacturing industry of this country than the manufactures of cotton. Now I have taken the liberty to take from the blue-books a table to prove what I say with regard especially to our textile industries. I do not take wool, I take cotton, because cotton enters into a greater number of textiles than wool. The imports of raw cotton for the last five years of the Conservative government were as follows:

1892	$3,389,232
1893	3,201,452
1894	2,610,538
1895	2,853,987
1896	2,845,371
Total	$14,900,580

or in round numbers there was an importation of $15,000,000 worth of raw cotton in five years.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you the price per pound?

Mr. LOGGIE. No, that is the total value.

Mr. FOWLER. You should have the price per pound.

Mr. LOGGIE. We will get that after if you will have a little patience. This makes a yearly average of $2,980,116, or during the last five years of the Conservative regime, there was raw cotton imported amounting, on the average, to a little less than $3,000,000 a year. Let us compare the imports of raw cotton during the last two years with the imports during the period that I have mentioned. We find by turning up the blue-books, and these figures are beyond dispute, that in 1896 we imported no less than $7,626,625 worth of raw cotton, that for the nine months of 1907 for which we have returns we imported $6,631,489, and if the imports during the remaining three months, for which we have no statistics, were in the same ratio, we would have imported raw cotton to the amount of $8,842,995, which, I would ask the House and the country to note, is a threefold advance over the average importation of raw cotton during the last five years of the Conservative regime. I know of no better index than statistics of this kind of the progress and onward march of our home industries. I would like to congratulate the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) for a thought that he suggested in his speech the other day which I think is well worthy of the consideration of the government. He said that we lacked Canadian statistics showing the progress of our home industries, that we had no reliable information to refer to or to get at. For that reason I have taken this information about raw cotton from the blue-books, and I believe that it is the best index that we can have of the marked expansion of the textile industry of Canada.

Mr. FOWLER. You have not compared the prices per pound yet?

Mr. LOGGIE. No, I think we shall leave that until some other time.

Mr. FOWLER. I think you should.

Mr. LOGGIE. My hon. friend is very anxious to compare prices. I know that the price of raw cotton has somewhat advanced, but perhaps my hon. friend was thinking too much about the price to notice that there was an importation of raw cotton threefold greater than it was before. I have some other statistics that go to prove that the home industries of this country are in a very prosperous condition. Let me give you a few items. I find that in 1905 the capital invested in our home industries, cotton mills, woollen mills, knitting mills had greatly increased. Let me point out that I believe that the knitting and woollen mills are in a prosperous condition. Of course, I cannot prove what I am saying, but I understand that the Penmans, the largest knitting people in Canada, are in a very satisfactory condition.

Mr. FOWLER. You had better ask my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) ?

Mr. LOGGIE. If I were to refer to my hon. friend (Mr. Stanfield) I think he would say that the knitting industry is in a fairly prosperous condition even in the maritime provinces. I have no desire to pry into his private business, but I am sure he would tell me that.

Mr. STANFIELD. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Loggie) how many woollen mills closed down in the province of New Brunswick during the last ten years ?

Mr. LOGGIE. I do not know. I have not the details of that. I will give you what I have. I have a few figures here showing the wonderful expansion which has taken place in the industrial life of Canada during the five year period ended 1905 :

—	1905,	1900.	Increase.
	$	$	$
Capital.....	833,916,155	446,916,487	386,999,668
Employees..	383,920	339,173	44,747
Salaries and wages....	162,175,578	113,249,350	48,926,228
Value of products.....	706,446,578	481,053,375	225,393,203

It seems that this is another evidence of the wonderful prosperity of the country during the past decade. It is an answer to the prediction of hon. gentlemen on the Conservative side of the House that the manufacturing interests of Canada, when a Liberal administration had an opportunity of framing the tariff, would go to the wall. I think it is an answer that cannot be disputed. This table shows, to my mind, and I am sure it shows to the House and the country, a remarkable expansion, there being in the aggregate, an increase of $45,000,000 in salaries and wages and $225,000,000 in production within the short term of five years. We find also that the output of our Canadian industries increased approximately 50 per cent from 1901 to 1906 which is a somewhat greater ratio of increase than occurred in the foreign trade of Canada. In 1906 home consumption had approximately increased to $972,930,286, of which Canadian manufacturers supplied $595,830,253. This figure may not be accurate because there may be some articles which are entered twice in the trade tables. For instance, leather is put in and when it is made into boots and shoes it is included in the statement again and in that sense perhaps it may not be accurate.

In order to show this more fully I have prepared the following table showing the increases by groups of industries.

PRODUCTION BY GROUPS OF INDUSTRIES.

Groups of Industries.	1905.	1900.	Increase.
	$	$	$
Food products	172,017,002	125,202,620	46,814,382
Textiles	84,370,099	67,724,839	16,645,260
Iron and steel products	52,587,051	34,878,402	17,708,649
Timber and lumber and their remanufactures	109,500,970	80,341,204	29,159,766
Leather and its products	41,201,872	34,720,513	6,481,359
Papers and printing	32,773,880	20,653,028	12,120,852
Liquors and beverages	13,928,701	9,191,700	4,737,001
Chemicals and allied products	15,290,822	11,437,300	3,853,522
Clay, glass and stone products	13,558,921	7,318,582	6,240,339
Metals and products other than steel	50,068,669	19,561,261	30,507,408
Tobacco and its manufactures	15,189,720	11,802,112	3,387,608
Cars, carriages, wagons, &c	36,911,124	19,971,605	16,939,517
Vessels for water transportation	1,892,253	2,043,668	151,415
Hand trades	1,433,753	599,329	834,424
Miscellaneous industries	65,721,741	35,607,212	30,114,529
	706,446,578	481,053,375	225,393,203

Under 'Miscellaneous industries' I have included the value of our fisheries which in 1905 was approximately $30,000,000.

These figures show that our industrial production has kept pace with the increase in our population.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC BRANCH LINES.

Mr. CRAWFORD moved second reading of Bill (No. 151) respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to tell us the nature of this Bill? We have no copy of it yet before us.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is simply to grant an extension of time for the construction of the branch lines.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

Mr. LOGGIE. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock I had practically finished what I had to say in regard to the taxation of the country during the past decade as well as during the preceding one, and had also made a few remarks regarding the industrial condition of Canada as we find it to-day, and I think I substantiated by figures that the home industries of this country are in a very satisfactory condition—that they are keeping pace with the increased population of Canada, as well as the export trade of Canada. Now I wish to make a few remarks regarding the expenditures of the country during the past decade as well as during the few years preceding the same. It is well known to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House that the expenditures of this country are divided into two classes—namely, certain recurring expenditures which are charged to consolidated account, and expenditures which are not recurrent but are rather of a permanent character which are charged to capital account. In this connection I wish to refer to some remarks of the hon. ex-Minister of Finance, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). On page 5349 of 'Hansard,' referring to the expenditures made by the present administration, he said:

> Some unthinking person says they have given it all back to the people. Not at all, every dollar of that money that is put in fixed works, such as buildings and works of that kind, which return nothing to the people except use, and the money invested in hundreds of thousands of different constructions into which the people's money is put, is effectually barred out from the currency and from the money power of the country. It is as if it were hoarded. Much employment has been given for the time being but so far as returning any value is concerned, its usefulness has absolutely ceased. It is fixed in these constructions which are of use but return nothing in a financial way to the people of the country.

I wonder at the hon. member for North Toronto making these disparaging remarks in regard to the expenditures of the country during the last ten years; but I wonder more when I read his further remarks, as follows:

> The Conservatives in their last years of office preferred to incur a debt of $31,000,000 and leave that extra taxation which they would have had to take from the people of the country with the people who needed it, and to do with that $31,000,000 of debt, what was necessary in the way of capital expenditure to be used and to be enjoyed not only by the people of those years but by the future generations. That is the proper way of financing.

The hon. gentleman has the audacity to tell us that for ordinary small public works the proper way to finance is to go into debt. Now, let us see what the hon. gentleman did during the last five years that he was Finance Minister of this country. The figures I give you can find in the blue-books. In 1892 we find charged to capital account $2,164,456, but in the same year he went into debt to the amount of $3,322,403; that is to say, he had not sufficient money from current account to pay the ordinary expenditure chargeable to consolidated account, but actually had to borrow money for that purpose. In 1893 he charged to capital account $3,088,317 and borrowed $549,605. In 1894 he charged to capital account $3,862,969 and borrowed $4,501,989. In 1895 he charged to capital account $3,030,490 and in that same year he added to the net debt of the country no less a sum than $6,891,897. In 1896 he charged to capital account $3,781,311 and borrowed no less a sum than $5,422,508. These figures, when added together, prove to us that the Conservative party, during the last five years of their regime, expended on capital account $15,927,743 and borrowed no less a sum than $20,688,402. That is to say they borrowed $4,761,659 more than they paid out during the entire five years on capital account. In other words they borrowed $5,000,000 to pay for ordinary expenditure, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite have the audacity to tell us that as they expended $31,000,000 and that they thought it was a wise thing to borrow this $31,000,000. What other way had they of paying for it? They did not have the money in the treasury, they did not have it in the revenue, and they used their only recourse which was to borrow the money. And the expenditures were

small. They were not sepcial expenditures to meet which would be the proper thing to borrow.

During the last five years of the Conservative regime, we find that they expended in round numbers $16,000,000 on capital account. Now let us see what was done by the present administration in the following ten years. I find that they expended on capital account no less a sum than $89,000,000, viz., on canals, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, on debts allowed to provinces, on Dominion land, on new public works, and during the same period although they expended $89,000,000, they added only $5,000,000 to the net public debt. Compare that with the last five years of the Conservative administration when we find that they expended only $16,000,000 and borrowed $21,000,000 and added to the net debt $21,000,000. Then spent $16,000,000 on capital account and $5,000,000 on ordinary consolidated account.

Carrying the comparison still further, we find that the parties in power from 1868 to 1896, twenty-nine years — twenty-five of which were under Conservative regime—expended on capital account $204,000,000 and increased the net debt of the country $182,000,000. Compare that with the capital expenditure, during the decade I have already referred to, of $89,000,000 and yet with only $5,000,000 added to the debt, whereas the other expenditure on capital account was $204,000,000 and $182,000,000 added to the net debt. It seems to me that this comparison speaks golden words for the present administration.

Mr. BENNETT. How does it compare with the Robinson administration?

Mr. LOGGIE. I have no doubt it can stand the comparison.

Mr. MORIN. Is not my hon. friend giving the House wrong figures? The debt of the country in 1896 was $258,000,000. At the time of confederation it was $75,500,000. When Mr. Mackenzie was in power he added $19,600,000 to the debt. Make a calculation on those figures, and you will not get $189,000,000.

Mr. LOGGIE. That would make it practically correct. It included Mr. Mackenzie's administration. I said twenty-nine years, twenty-five of which were under Conservative regime, and I gave the figures for the whole twenty-nine years, so that they are quite correct.

Mr. MORIN. $75,500,000 and $19,000,000 would make at once $96,000,000. Deduct $96,000,000 from $258,000,000 and that will not work out your result.

Mr. LOGGIE. That works it out exactly correct. I told you that I included the $19,000,000 in the $182,000,000 which makes it exactly correct. We expended on capital account from 1897 to 1907, $84,000,000 and did not add practically one cent to the net debt. Here is the point I want hon. gentlemen particularly to note. During this period, we reduced the rate of customs duty 13·86 per cent and the per capita debt 15·7 per cent. I think that the country deserves to be congratulated on this very favourable showing to a decade to which I have referred. It shows that the words of my honoured leader, which were quoted by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), have been fulfilled. These words were :

> We shall be in power before long, and when in power I promise you such an era of prosperity that it will not require statisticians to prove it. You will have it in your pocket.

It seems to me that the fact that this large amount of money could have been expended on necessary public works without our adding to the debt of the country to any appreciable amount, is an evidence of this great prosperity which the right hon. the First Minister promised.

I have pointed out to you that the Conservative party, during the last five years they were in power, went in debt to the extent of 33⅓ per cent or thereabouts more than they paid out on capital account altogether. If the expenditures which the present administration have overtaken had been overtaken by the Conservative government in the same ratio, they would have added to the debt no less a sum than $112,000,000. That is, we have expended $84,000,000 on capital account without borrowing money, and, if you add one-third to that, you get $112,000,000. So, had they made the same expenditures with the same proportion of revenue, they would have had to spend all their revenues and borrow $112,000,000 besides. If it were necessary, as I say it was—and there has not been any question about the necessity of expenditures on capital account—to spend this large sum of money and run the country into debt to the amount of $112,000,000 besides, should we feel like going into debt for another $100,000,000 to build the Transcontinental Railway ? I think the credit of the country would not have stood as high as it does if such had been the case. But we echo the words of the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) when he said that we glory in the fact that we had this money to make these expenditures without adding to the debt. Thus we are in a position to go on with this great and laudable undertaking, the building of the Transcontinental Railway. I believe that when we are spending so large a sum of money on an undertaking like the Transcontinental, the proper businesslike way is to borrow money on the credit of the country instead of endeavouring to meet so large and such an expenditure out of ordinary revenue.

Now, let me deal for a moment with the net debt. My hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Morin) tells us that in 1896 the debt

was $258,000,000, which is right enough, In 1906 the net debt was $267,000,000. In 1907 it was reduced to $263,000,000. So, we find that the net debt has been increased by nearly $5,000,000 over 1896. But we must not forget that a considerable sum of money has been expended on the Transcontinental Railway. As a result of the operations of the year just ended, we shall probably have increased our net debt by $17,000,000 as compared with 1896. But, as an offset to that, we find that we have expended no less than $26,000,000 on the Transcontinental. And this is an undertaking that we think is a valuable asset to the country. We know as a matter of fact that, after a certain number of years, we are to receive a rental equal to 3 per cent of the cost of the railway.

Mr. MORIN. After seven years.

Mr. LOGGIE. Yes, after seven years. And we shall have expended probably $100,000,000 on this great undertaking. And certainly the country is to be congratulated that its credit is in so favourable a condition that we are able to go on with such an undertaking. Not only shall we receive benefit in the way of transportation by the construction of this road, but we believe there will be opened up large areas of land fit for settlement and agriculture, settlement which will add to our strength and help to increase our home industries. My hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Stanfield), for instance, will find that his goods will find their way into the northern part of Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. STANFIELD. They do now.

Mr. LOGGIE. I congratulate my hon. friend on having goods that commend themselves over such a large territory. Now, I have referred to a few items that are charged to capital account comparing the last five years of the Conservative regime with ten years of Liberal rule. I would like to refer also to certain items charged to consolidated account. In 1896, the expenditure on consolidated fund account was $36,0000,000 but, under the Liberal administration, in 1906, the expenditure was $67,000,000—an increase of nearly 100 per cent. All this has been paid out of the ordinary revenue of the country. Had these revenues not been available, either the necessary public works could not have been overtaken, or we should have had to borrow money to provide them. The following figures will give a comparison of the expenditure under Conservative and Liberal rule :—

	1896.	1906.
Fisheries	$427,250	$968,702
Agriculture	210,877	603,812
Immigration	120,199	842,668
Quarantine	95,247	624,758
Lighthouse and coast service	466,057	2,530,307
Ship subsidies	534,916	1,227,560
Ocean and river service	181,451	1,013,682
Mounted Police	533,014	1,004,079
Militia	1,136,713	4,294,124
Post Office	3,665,011	4,921,577
Railways	3,826,225	8,779,677
Public Works	1,229,768	7,484,715
Provinces	4,235,664	6,726,372
Inspection of staples	2,921	109,939
Trade and Commerce	9,462	63,625

I have not given all the figures for the $67,000,000 of expenditure, but this group represents a total of about $41,000,000 as spent by the Liberal administration as against about $16,000,000 spent by the Conservative administration. This table I think indicates growth and prosperity during the past decade, each department of the public service requiring—now note the word 'requiring' because of the prosperity of the country—requiring an expenditure on consolidated account, no borrowing. I have indicated to you that $5,000,000 had to be borrowed to pay on consolidated account during the last five years of the Conservative administration. Here in the group I have named, there was $41,000,000 spent, and not a dollar borrowed. Surely the government and the country are to be congratulated. We find, in referring to this matter again, that on the fisheries service we have expended $550,000 more in 1906 than the Conservatives did. You will understand that that means the fostering and care of our fisheries, and I think the country is to be congratulated in that we had the money and were able to take care of those services that devolved upon us. Then again in agriculture, we have expended $400,000 more than they did ten years ago, and we know as a matter of fact that agricultural interests have prospered wonderfully. Then again on immigration, we find that $750,000 more has been expended in 1906 than in 1896. We all know the wonderful development that has taken place in that regard, 300,000 immigrants or thereabouts coming into Canada during the past year. Then we find that on lighthouses and coast service we expended in 1906, $2,000,000 more than they did ten years previously. What benefit have we received from that? We know, as a matter of fact, that our coast line has improved lighthouses, that our buoy service is improved. In place of the old fashioned service we have gas lighted buoys, as a rule, and the fog alarm service has been very much improved.

Then ship subsidies is another matter worth noting. We are now spending $700,000 a year more than the Conservatives spent ten years ago. This is a very important service. We know that our transportation service and mail service are indispensible and have been greatly improved. We have now a direct service to South Africa, to Mexico and other ports, and these aids to our industries will enable them to reach new markets. And last, but not least, we

have a direct through service to France, which we think will largely aid in the development of Canadian industries. Then we have another item ; we find that for ocean and river service $800,000 more is expended in 1906 than in 1896, and what does that mean ? You know, Mr. Speaker, that we have a long coast line, and we find that railways and aids to steamboat companies afford transportation facilities to localities that would have no other means of bringing their products to market. Then we have the mounted police. We have expended $500,000 more on that service, and I am sure we can only speak in terms of laudation of the work performed by our mounted police. Then we have $3,100,000 extra expended on the militia. We know that this is a very important service. Of course, it is much more expensive because we have taken over the permanent force, and we have had to add to the expenditure some $5,000,000. We must expect to spend more money on our militia if we are to become a great country. We are only in our youth yet, and if we are to broaden out and take our place amongst the nations of the world we must spend more money on that department.

Then we have the Post Office Department, and I am sure we can only speak in words of praise of the hon. gentleman who presides over that department and of his predecessors as well. In 1906 we expended $1,300,000 more than the Conservatives did in 1896, and with what result? We find that during the interim we have reduced the postal rate about 50 per cent. We have done more than that ; we have turned deficits into surpluses, and surely we can congratulate the country over the management of the Post Office Department. Then as to the Railway Department. We find that in 1906 we expended $5,000,000 more than the Conservatives did in 1896. We find that during this time the railway earnings have more than doubled. Railway earnings have increased in a greater ratio than has capital account. Not only have earnings increased more than capital account, but the mileage has increased more than capital account as well. So we find this department in a very satisfactory condition. We find that we have spent $6,000,000 on Public Works. I mean the ordinary small recurring public works ; this is $3,000,000 more than in 1906 than in 1896. And who will say that a town here and a town there with 2,000, 3,000 and 4,000 inhabitants, does not need a new post office? Would the hon. gentleman tell me that this money is not wisely spent? A man that is in business must erect his store. The money is locked up in it, it is true, but it is decidedly in the interest of the business, and it is just as much in the interest of this great country that its population should have proper public buildings in every town where there is sufficient population.

Mr. LOGGIE.

Then we have another large expenditure which, to my mind, marks an epoch in the history of Canada. I refer to the $2,500,000 additional subsidies to the provinces. It was deemed by the present administration to be equitable that from our customs duties we should increase the provincial subsidies. Now, to summarize, in 1906 we spent $41,000,000 on the group of services I have indicated. Not only does this expenditure show advancement, but I think it has been a great incidental advantage to the country. The material interests of Canada have developed in a much greater ratio than has the expenditure, because I have shown that while we have reduced the rate of customs taxation nearly 14 per cent, we have reduced the per capita expenditure 15·7 per cent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the facts I have given show that the Minister of Customs was quite right when he said that we had the money to execute these great works in the interest of this young and rising nation. And the glory of it, to my mind, is that all this has been overtaken without increasing, but rather decreasing, the per capita debt of the country, while at the same time reducing by about 14 per cent the customs taxation.

Now, having spoken thus on the expenditure I wish to say a word on the progress of the country. I indicated before dinner that the progress of the country in its industrial interests was going on at a very marked and rapid rate. But, there are other departments as well that are making progress at as marked a rate and to my mind this fact indicates the prosperity of the country at large. We find that the deposits in the savings banks increased as follows :

1886..	$ 46,350,946
1896..	61,259,152
1906..	90,264,229

Paid up capital of the chartered banks.

1886..	$ 61,841,395
1896..	62,198,413
1907..	96,362,130

An increase of 54 per cent. Could you have any better evidence of the fulfilment of the policy of the Prime Minister as enunciated in the words that I referred to a few moments ago than to find that the capital of the chartered banks had increased 54 per cent in the last ten years, whereas, in the ten previous years, it had increased but one per cent ? We find that the bank reserves in 1906 was $71,500,000.

Note circulation.

1886..	$ 45,497,080
1896..	50,709,059
1907..	133,826,934

An increase of 180 per cent during the past ten years as compared with an increase of 11 per cent during the preceding ten years.

Deposits in chartered banks.

1886..	$147,532,690
1896..	245,029,144
1907..	679,724,118

or an increase of 177 per cent during the last decade as compared with an increase of 69 per cent from 1886 to 1896. Bank assets, during the last ten years of the Conservative regime increased 39 per cent while in the last ten years, under Liberal administration, they increased 202 per cent. These figures are certainly most gratifying, indicating the great natural wealth of the Dominion and the activity and enterprise of the whole Canadian people. Then, let us look at our foreign trade:

	Imports.	Exports.
1896..	$118,000,000	$121,000,000
1901..	190,000,000	195,000,000
1905..	261,000,,000	203,000,000
1906..	294,000,000	256,000,000

These figures indicate, I think, that the import trade is growing in proportion to the population and in proportion to the expansion of our home industries as well. It is apparent that commercial enterprises generally have proved profitable and that all classes have shared in the prevailing prosperity which is indicated by the enormously increased deposits in the banks.

Another item indicating the progress of the country is the gross earnings of the railways.

Railway earnings.

1896..	$ 50,000,000
1906..	125,000,000

Increase, 150 per cent.

I think we may fairly say that these figures indicate the prosperity of the country, but the prosperity of a country is very well judged of, I would say, by the contentment of the people and by their earning power. Another indication of the earning power of the people is the growth of their savings. I have indicated that by the figures which I have just read. The growth of a country's savings is assisted by the prosperity of the country and the expansion of its industries. Before dinner I pointed out that the industries of this country have expanded in a marked degree during the past decade and this is an index of the prosperity of the country. Then, another important item is the development of transportation and we know how it has developed during the past decade. These conditions mark this decade as an epoch of progress the greatest in the history of Canada and unprecedented perhaps in the history of any country. As I have already indicated I think that the statement of the Minister of Finance has done perhaps as much as anything else to enable us to retain our high standing in the financial centres of the world. Now, I have spoken of the taxation, the industries, the expenditure and the progress of the country.

I want to say a few words on a matter that perhaps comes a little nearer home. I wish to say a word as to how things are going on in the maritime provinces, the home of a number of us in this side of the House as well as on the other.

Mr. BOYCE. What about New Brunswick?

Mr. LOGGIE. Well, we will talk about New Brunswick too. In the province of Nova Scotia, as compared with five years ago, there is an increase of $5,500,000 in the produce of the smelting works. Then, I think we can very well refer to the increase in the value of the fisheries as well as to the increase in the value of our timber exportation. It would be fair and reasonable to refer to the growth and prosperity of the export trade through the maritime ports. I refer particularly to the port of St. John, and as far as that shipping port is concerned we know that during the last decade it has bounded from nothing until to-day it is a very important shipping centre outwards for the trade of the prairie fields of Canada. While I am on my feet I want to say a word in reference to my own province. Not only are we going ahead in the lumbering and fishing industries, but we have recently discovered that we have a country rich in minerals. In the county represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Turgeon) there has recently been discovered one of the most valuable iron deposits perhaps in Canada. This has been purchased by the Drummonds, these mines will be developed and will, I think, add much to the material wealth of our province.

I wish to refer briefly to the transportation question as it affects the maritime provinces, particularly the Intercolonial. This question of transportation is a burning one all over the country. Hon. gentlemen will remember that a few years ago complaints were made that the Canadian Pacific Railway were not building branches fast enough in the west and that the farmers were obliged to haul grain twenty or thirty miles. It was considered a great hardship that it should cost 10 or 15 cents a bushel to haul grain to a station to ship it. I sympathize with these farmers; I realize that it is a hardship to be so situated. But we ought not to forget that the older provinces are enduring the very same hardship to-day. We must realize that if the Intercolonial Railway is to be a common carrier for the people of the maritime provinces, that railway owes a duty to the territory adjacent to that trunk line. It must not be forgotten that practically every branch line which serves as a feeder to the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway has been taken over by these great corporations and

made a part of the system, thus feeding the trunk line and aiding the industries situated along the branch lines. It is not possible to manage these branch lines as profitably independent of the trunk line. The Intercolonial Railway with its trunk line between Rivière du Loup and Moncton has practically a monopoly of that whole country and it is not fair to leave the adjacent territory without proper facilities nor is it fair to expect private corporations to build branch lines, because the branch lines could not live, the population is not sufficiently large to make them paying ventures, they would not receive a sufficient return on their short haul on freight which they would have to hand over to the Intercolonial Railway which would have the long haul. It is the duty of the government and of the people of Canada, the owners of the Intercolonial Railway, to see that the territory adjacent to the Intercolonial Railway has proper railway facilities and that the industries of that locality are not retarded because of want of transportation. Simply as an illustration, I would point out that even in my own county there is a section of country between Indian town, where the railway terminates, and Red Bank, a large and thriving village, without any railway facilities, practically without any transportation facilities whatever. We are trying to have a steamboat service inaugurated there but in order to do that we shall require some assistance. That section between these two places should have a railway in the interest of the country and I would ask that this matter should receive the favourable attention of the Minister of Railways and of the government. We have also a large and rich section along the Miramichi between Newcastle and Tabusintac that deserves the consideration of the people of Canada, the owners of the trunk line of the Intercolonial Railway because they have a monopoly of transportation there and it is their duty to see that the people there do not suffer. They are suffering to-day because of lack of transportation facilities to enable them to send their commodities to the markets of the world on as advantageous terms as other sections of Canada. The maritime provinces are an old section and deserve the attention of the government even as much as the western provinces, and I ask on behalf of the maritime provinces, and particularly the sections I have indicated where the Intercolonial Railway is the only means of transportation, that branch lines should be constructed as a part of the Intercolonial Railway system. Where there is another railway, the situation is not so bad, as one railway will compete with another; but where there is only the one line and that owned by the government, it is the duty of the government to provide efficient transportation facilities. We in the maritime provinces never say a word about the cost of the canal system in Ontario and Quebec; that is provided in the interest of the country at large. The Intercolonial Railway is a part of the great scheme of confederation, it is a link in the chain that binds us together, and as such, if it is to perform its mission, it ought to provide for the maintenance of branch lines. As a matter of fact a portion of one branch line has been lying all winter unoperated and to-day, although there is hardly any snow on the ground, carload after carload of freight has to be teamed. Yet there is a railway there and the blockade exists simply because the railway has not the necessary equipment. All that is required is equipment, with proper equipment there would be no trouble in keeping the rail open all winter. It is not fair and I bespeak in the interests of the maritime provinces the favourable consideration of this matter by the government.

I was deeply interested in an important subject which was referred to in the House the other day, the All-Red line, an imperial means of transportation. When the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) was speaking, I was impressed with the difficulty of dealing with the present investments, in transportation, that is to say what is to be done with the transportation interests now operating. It occurred to me that if the great ocean lines or the corporations owning the ocean lines, could combine and form one great corporation to perform this all-red service, all infringement on existing vested interests would be obviated. The question of hauling the traffic on Canadian soil would also require consideration. Possibly some arrangement might be made between the transcontinental railways so that the traffic would be handled by the Intercolonial Railway between Halifax and the nearest point on a transcontinental railway. The Intercolonial Railway, I presume, would be double-tracked between Moncton and Halifax. For instance, at Moncton they would hand over to the Grand Trunk Pacific its share of the traffic; at St. John they would hand over to the Canadian Pacific Railway its share, and they would hand over to the Canadian Northern its share wherever its nearest point would be; and if one road got more than its share according to its mileage, there might be a division made. In that way, if we could get our capitalists of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Allan line and the Dominion line to form one great corporation, we might have its financial interests largely in Canada, and thus make Canada the centre of this great project. These are matters which ran through my mind while the hon. member for Brandon was presenting his case.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to close with a word or two of congratulation to the country, particularly on the fact that we have at the head of affairs a gentleman of the statesmanlike qualities of the Prime Minister. It was his duty, as well as his pleasure, I am sure, to represent this country on a recent occasion at a conference in London. We all followed with interest his re-

marks on that occasion. Bearing them in mind, we can see him as it were with the main sheet of the ship in his hand rounding a big boulder at the entrance to the conference, while inside we see dropped in the placid waters of the conference the anchor bearing the title "Imperial Conference." We certainly should feel proud that we have at the head of this young and rising nation a gentleman of the capacity of the Prime Minister. Then we gave him a royal welcome back to his own country. He is not long back, however, when we hear a flurry out on the western coast—the Japanese are overflowing our country! Listen to the prudent words of the leader of this young nation when he says : 'Patience; we must respect treaty rights ; the rights of the western provinces will be conserved, but we must not jeopardize the interests of our country as a whole.' I do not quote the exact words, but they were words to that effect ; and we know what a happy issue they had. To-day we have practically what the Prime Minister said would come—the rights of the Pacific province have been conserved and yet the integrity of the treaty has been maintained. Then we find him at the neighbouring industrial center of Canada, Toronto, and what does he say there of the proposed All-Red line? He said he would not dictate to the mother of parliaments, perhaps that would not be becoming but he would remind the Imperial authorities that they had subsidized a service, very much like the proposed fast Atlantic service, from the motherland to a foreign port, and perhaps it would not be too much to ask them to do the same for their own kith and kin. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that these were the words of a statesman, and we all congratulate ourselves and the country at large that at the head of the affairs of this young and thriving country we have an hon. gentleman who can thus wisely guide the ship of state, so that we realize in our own pockets the fulfilment of what he said down in Halifax, as quoted by the hon. member for North Toronto. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. gentlemen, for the attention given to me in my first attempt to say a word on the financial conditions of the country.

Mr. P. H. McKENZIE (South Bruce). Mr. Speaker, in rising on this occasion I must express my reluctance, at this late hour of the night, and at this late stage of this very important debate, at trespassing on the time of the House. I would not have done so had it not been that I do not speak very often in the House; and that on this occasion it behooves those who take an interest in the welfare of their country, and I think we all on both sides of the House do that, to have something to say at this, as we may call it, stock-taking time for the Dominion of Canada. I would preface my remarks by complimenting, as others have done, the Finance Minister on the splendid statement he has been able to present to this House and this country in his annual budget. When we consider that this country has been eleven years under the present tariff with very little change, and when we consider the success that has been achieved by this country under it, we are led to inquire what are the special features of that tariff, as inaugurated by the present government, and specially by the present Finance Minister. The Fielding tariff, as it is commonly called, has been a very great success. It appears to be a distinctive tariff, a tariff different from almost every other tariff in existence at the present time in constitutionally governed countries. There has been a good deal of discussion as to whether it is a protective tariff or a revenue tariff. If I were to express my honest conviction, I would say that it is part of both. Its basic principle is that of a tariff for revenue ; but incidentally it affords protection for the industries of the country consistent with the requirements of the whole country. That was a plank in the platform adopted previous to the introduction of this tariff, and I think that has been lived up to. While this tariff affords a certain amount of protection, it does not decrease trade, but increases trade, and at the same time produces an abounding revenue. This seems to be a remarkable feature of this tariff. I would also refer to the preferential feature of the tariff. A preference to Great Britain had been discussed for some years previous to the introduction of this feature in the tariff, but the idea had always been that if Canada should give the mother country a preference, it would expect something in return. So when the government gave the preference to Great Britain, our friends on the opposition side found fault with them for not getting an equivalent from the British government. I might read you statements here but it would take too much time to show how public opinion stood on that matter in Great Britain at that period and also, that it has not changed since. Had the government stood on their dignity, as members of the opposition advise, and said to Great Britain: We will give you a preference in our market when you give us one in yours, Great Britain would not have had that preference to-day. But this government conceded the preference without asking any thing in return. I claim however that the preference has been just as great to Canada from Great Britain—that is, the indirect preference, not so much the preference described in figures. There has been from the British people an indirect preference which has been of very great benefit to Canada.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. In what way has it been a benefit to Canada?

Mr. McKENZIE. In this way. It drew attention to Canada and Canada's products were asked for. Previous to 1896 many Canadian products entered the British market as American products and were sold as such in that market. Canada was to a large extent unknown in the British market on that account. But the day this preference was given, we touched the great heart of the British people, they began to inquire among themselves, what can we do for Canada which has done so much for us? In that way we gained the good will of the English people and that amounts to a great deal in the matter of trade.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will my hon. friend be good enough to tell us whether Canadian goods are sold in the British market out of sympathy for Canada or whether it is not because of the quality of the goods?

Mr. McKENZIE. I would answer that question in this way. At the beginning of the increase of our trade with Great Britain, it was largely due to a sentiment, but now it is due both to sentiment and quality. Through the efforts of the Minister of Agriculture very largely, the status of our products that enter into immediate consumption in Great Britain has become so improved that they are now asked for on their merits, but the sentiment in our favour still exists and our market is extending, in consequence of that sentiment to a great extent, in other products. That is undeniable, and I am astonished that members on the other side, such as the hon. member for Lambton, should endeavour to combat that idea. The figures are there and they show that since we gave that preference, our exports began to increase and our trade to expand.

Let me now say a word on the intermediate feature introduced into our tariff. That is practically a new idea, and I notice that the Americans are studying our tariff with the idea of incorporating this very feature into it. It stands to the credit of this government that they introduced this feature, it is a tribute to their inventive genius, and by means of it they have been able to negotiate the French treaty. My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) is very anxious to have the markets of the German empire opened to Canadian products. Well, if we are to obtain any advantage in that market, we will get it under the intermediate tariff.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Then why do you not get it?

Mr. McKENZIE. I think that events are moving in that direction. The Germans are gradually coming to their knees and you will soon find them ready to negotiate with this government. When we look at the revenue and find what surpluses we have to our credit, when we find that we have a surplus of $19,000,000 this year over actual outlay, that is something we ought to congratulate ourselves upon. Our post office surplus is considerably over $1,000,000, which is very gratifying. I have a quotation here from an English authority, which I shall read to the House. Commenting on our preferential tariff, Mr. Asquith said:

> The United Kingdom could not adopt any form of preference involving the taxation of corn, meat or raw materials. The colonists on their part could give no form of preference which would admit the British manufacturer on level terms into competition with their own protected industries. That was the principle upon which the Canadian, the best of all colonial tariffs, was based. It was a principle still more conspicuous in the new Australian tariff. If the government left office to-morrow he would wish them to be judged as to whether they had not justified the confidence of the nation in their colonial administration.

That is the testimony of an eminent authority in Great Britain regarding our tariff. Let us take ten years as a comparison in the matter of imports and exports between Conservative and Liberal regime. Take the total imports of 1896, they amounted to $118,011,508. In 1897 they had risen to $359,793,278. Our total exports from Canada in 1896 were $121,013,852. In 1907 they had risen to $258,171,674. Or the total trade in 1896 was $239,025,360, and in 1907 $617,964,952. I wish to give the figures here to show the increase of our trade with Great Britain. Our trade with Great Britain in 1896 amounted to $99,513,758, including coin and bullion. In 1906 it amounted to $202,276,456, so that we have the gratifying fact that our trade with Great Britain increased $102,762,729 from 1896 to 1906.

Look at the tariff from another standpoint. The debt of Canada was $50.09 per head in 1896. In 1906 it was reduced to $42.84 per head. Under Conservative rule our population in eighteen years increased 4 per cent whereas during the last eleven years of Liberal rule it increased 25 per cent. Our foreign trade in the eighteen years of Conservative rule increased about 16 per cent, whereas in the last eleven years of Liberal rule it increased 158 per cent. The trade in 1896 was $42 per head and in 1907 $93 per head. If we turn to the rates of duty, we find that in 1889 the rate was 31·86 per $100 worth of dutiable goods imported into Canada; in 1891 it was 31·38, and in 1896 29·97, showing that under the present tariff, while the duty has been decreasing the revenue has been increasing. From 1896 there has been a gradual reduction until the rate reached the lowest point, 26·33, or a difference of 3·63 per $100 in favour of Liberal administration.

Now we come to the expenditure. And a great deal has been said by the opposi-

tion members concerning the increase of expenditure. The amount expended on capital account during eleven years of Conservative rule amounted, in round figures, to $80,000,000. Of this, as has been stated by previous speakers, the Conservative government borrowed $62,000,000—they added that much of their expenditure to the public debt. During eleven years of Liberal rule, $127,000,000 has been spent on capital account of which only $5,000,000 was borrowed. And I may say in passing that of the $127,000,000 spent on capital account by the Liberals during the last eleven years, $90,000,000 has been spent in improving the transportation facilities of the country.

Now, I am free to say that I am not in favour of extravagant expenditure either in public or in private affairs. But I realize that no private individual and no government can afford, in a young country like this, to hoard money for the sake of what it will bring by hoarding. Canada is much in the position of a farmer or business man. If a man has a farm that requires improving—as many of our Canadian farms do, and progress in this line in Canada is steady—if he has the money to improve his farm, he is foolish if he does not spend the money in the necessary improvements. A man must pay attention to his business and improve his facilities—to stand still is to go back. And the same is true of a business man engaged in a store, factory or office. A man cannot afford to stand still. He must progress, his business must grow, or others will go ahead and he will fall behind. The same is true of the country. We want economical and wise expenditure, but we do not want the affairs of the country to stand still—'progress' must be the word. Members of the opposition have been pretty constantly talking about expenditure, and, I have no doubt, will continue to talk about it when, in the country, they speak of the actions of this government. But when they do so, I would like them to notice what members their own side propose that the government should embark in. They all have their proposals involving expenditure of money. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) would consider the advisability of government ownership of public utilities, an idea that would involve millions upon millions for this country. My hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) has an idea in the shape of free rural mail delivery, on which he has given us a great deal of information.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. May I ask the hon. gentleman, is he opposed to adopting it in his riding?

Mr. McKENZIE. At the present time, yes. I hope that the time may come when I can say: 'No.' But that time has not come yet. I wish to be perfectly candid in the matter. I do not think the people of my riding would thank me for advising this government to embark upon such an extravagant expenditure as that at the present stage of our history. However desirable it might be, it would add some millions to our expenditure. Then the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) has been complaining a great deal about the Department of Agriculture. He wants more fruit inspectors, he wants better cold storage facilities. And hon. members on both sides of the House, including a large number on the opposition side, are in favour of the construction of the Georgian bay canal, which would probably cost $130,000,000. And our friends from Prince Edward Island want a tunnel. When men so strongly advocate economy of expenditure, it is rather surprising that they should even allude to such enormous expenditures as they propose to be added to what the country must spend in other directions.

Mr. LEFURGEY. We believe that these would be economies in some cases.

Mr. McKENZIE. I am not disputing it, but it would involve a large expenditure. I hope the time will come when the Dominion can give to Prince Edward Island better means of communication than are now provided. But Prince Edward Island is not disposed to wait, they want the tunnel now. According to their view, no matter what stands, this cannot stand. I would say to hon. members of the opposition that the problem we are up against in Canada is not so much to cut down the expenditure as to make the expenditure in the right direction. There is no doubt that in Canada the transportation problem is a very expensive one and one that must be met by the government. There was a time in Canada when we were pretty well content with the Welland canal, the Canadian Pacific Railway, and other existing railway connections. But the time has come when we need improved facilities. The Welland canal is too shallow, too narrow, too roundabout. The cry is for a direct route and the proposal is made to build the Georgian bay canal. The cry is for a better railway across the continent with better grades and easier curves. This demand the government is trying to meet with the Transcontinental Railway. The time may come when we shall decide that it is necessary to build the Georgian bay canal. Canada is progressing. Canada has begun the development of her great west; the great north is being discovered. Canada cannot afford to stand still, and I do not believe that the people, when the matter is properly laid before them, will wish to stand still. I would advise the government to go on courageously with any wise expenditures. But let the money be spent

on a system. If the Georgian bay canal is to be built, for instance, do not touch it until we can build it with a depth of 25 feet. If we must build this canal, let us build it so as to meet the requirements of the future. Vessels are constantly getting larger and of deeper draft, and canals allowing only a shallow draft will soon be out of date. But no mistake should be made by the government in taking up new schemes. They should wait until they are ready to build the thing right, keeping in mind the future of Canada.

A good deal of criticism has been levelled at the Department of Agriculture. Being speaking of agriculture, I cannot resist the temptation to look back to the period before 1896 in the history of our farmers. I can well remember those dark days; I can well remember that times were hard for the farmers previous to 1896. The population of Canada was leaving us by hundreds of thousands, Canada was not growing and even our natural increase was not remaining with us. No change could have been more marked than that which has taken place. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Clements) this afternoon whining about the poor farmer of his county. I felt that he was not doing justice to his county. I cannot see for my part why such a whine should go up from that splendid county of Kent, and by their own member in this House. I do not think there is another member in this House who would rise up in his place and say the same regarding his county. I am sure my hon. friend from South Ontario (Mr. P. Christie) would not do it, and I am sure my hon. friend from East Huron (Mr. Chisholm) would not do it. I do not think it was fair to the county of Kent that such a statement should be made regarding it. I know they have had their troubles in Kent. I know they have had hog disease that has injured the farming industry, and perhaps they have had some other drawbacks. But I do not think the government should be blamed for that. The Department of Agriculture has done their best for the people of Kent to help them over these difficulties, both in past years and in the present year. I do not see why so much fault should be found with the government for the condition of the farmers in Kent, if they are in that condition, but I very much doubt it.

Now I wish to refer to a remark made by one of the previous speakers, I think the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). He spoke of the fact that Canada was going back in her exports as shown by the balance of trade, and instanced butter as one of the articles which showed a falling off. Now let us look at that matter for a moment. In the ten years between 1877 and 1886, the total exports of butter were $22,706,360; in the next ten years, from 1887 to 1896, the total exports had fallen to $8,252,088, showing a decrease of $14,456,272 during Conservative rule. Now in sharp contrast to that we find that in ten years under the Liberal government from 1897 to 1906, butter exports amounted to $46,599,782. The items of bacon and hams show a like result. The total exports of bacon and hams for the ten years ending June 30, 1896, were $17,671,000, as against $115,000,000 during the ten years ending June 30, 1906. The hon. member for Brantford blamed the governmen in regard to the item of butter. We all know that Ontario had a dry season last year, that the quantity of milk fell off and consequently the production of butter. We exported largely in the early part of the year and that left us short in the latter part of the year, with the result that we had to import butter again from the British markets for our own consumption. But this was only an isolated case, and may not occur in Canada again for many a day to come. I regard the agricultural interests of Canada as so important that they should receive careful consideration from any government that may be in power. We find that at the present time there is invested in agriculture in Canada $2,200,000,000. The value of farm products exported and consumed at home was last year $450,000,000. Compare agriculture with manufactures. In 1896, the money invested in manufacture was $200,000,000, and in 1906, it was $600,000,000 a sum still far below the investment in agriculture. Therefore I think that agriculture may safely be called the basic industry of Canada at the present time, and will remain so for many years to come.

Some members of the opposition have recently criticised the Minister of Agriculture severely. I think that one hon. gentleman in particular has criticised him and given him little or no credit for having done anything in the interest of agriculture. Let me refer to one of his late acts to show what he has done for this industry. It was called to my attention recently at a meeting I attended, by the Minister of Agriculture for the province of Saskatchewan. We are all sorry to know that last year the west was struck by a bad frost, with the result that the grain was damaged. No sooner had the Department of Agriculture here in Ottawa learned of the damage, or supposed damage, by frost, than orders were sent at once to the Ministers of Agriculture in the west, and through them to other correspondents throughout the western provinces, to send as soon as possible samples of their grain down to the department at Ottawa that it might be tested to see to what extent damage had been done. That was done as soon as the grain was threshed and got dry enough. Mr. A. H. Clark, the chief commissioner at the head of that department at once set to work experimenting with this grain, and he found the most astonishing result that but a very small portion of the oats was fit for seed, that the vitality of that grain for seed purposes had been practically destroyed.

This information was communicated to the western provinces in a bulletin; and Mr. Motherwell told me that on his way down to Ottawa, when he came to Winnipeg, the great cry was: Have you seen A. H. Clark's bulletin? This was in everybody's mouth, the information seemed to be so incredible that people were looking at one another in blank amazement. Is it possible that the immense crop of oats in those western provinces is going to be of no use for seed? Mr. Motherwell stated at a meeting in the Normal School Hall here in Ottawa, that the work done by the department in reference to that seed grain had saved the west from a total failure in respect to oats and barley, and partly in respect to wheat. He said that the prompt action of the government in testing the seeds had saved the western provinces from a great loss. Let me tell the House that Mr. Motherwell stated that his own crop of oats looked so well and weighed so heavy that he would have sold them without any compunction for seed oats, had he not known that from the experiments made in Ottawa their vitality was destroyed. The result, he said, was a saving of millions of dollars to the west. Now that is one thing that the Minister of Agriculture has done for this country, he did it last year. Now I would like to show what Mr. Clark says about this matter.

Prior to governmental operations in the matter of guaranteeing seed supply in unfortunate districts in western Canada, wholesale business interests were sceptical as to the ability of farmers within those districts to meet present and future payments on goods—farm implements, &c., &c. In consequence the farmers and all retail business interests within those districts found it difficult to obtain credit on reasonable basis from wholesale merchants, from banks or loan companies.

The very action of the government in procuring seed grain, served as a guarantee of a crop so far as seed supply is concerned and at once restored confidence on the part of business men and financial institutions that the prospective crop output for 1908 would be equal to present and future liabilities. Then and not till then were farmers in general able to procure reasonable credit to enable them to purchase supplies of seed grain on their own account. Many farmers needed more seed grain than the governments undertook to supply—namely, 200 bushels wheat, 200 bushels oats and 100 bushels barley. Many thought perhaps they could get it cheaper and were encouraged in that thought by numerous unfavourable newspaper comments Such newspaper comments also may have induced many to take the risk of sowing their frozen grain, but the fact remains that not until action was taken by the government were they able to get the financial accommodation they needed to help themselves.

This action of the government has had a very beneficial effect and Mr. Clarke has told me, immediately on his return to Ottawa, that the information that a certain district was to be supplied with seed had a most astonishing effect. Business men and others who had refused to give credit at once loosened up, the banks and financial institutions began to lend money, and every one took a more hopeful view of the situation.

Another matter that was criticised very severely by the hon. member for Wentworth was the action of the Department of Agriculture with reference to cold storage facilities on sea-going vessels. It was stated that a very small quantity of goods were being shipped in cold storage as compared with the quantity that was expected to be shipped. I have a return showing the number of packages that were shipped in cold storage this year and this applies to early apples and perishable fruits such as peaches and pears. There were in all thirty-one shippers who shipped by cold storage 3,847 barrels of apples as well as 94 packages of smaller fruits. The fact has been alluded to that a quantity of fruit was sent across the equator to South Africa in cold storage and landed in good condition. That fact is likewise stated here. But we have also the fact that 12,017 packages of California fruit came through Canada, sent through the Canadian cold storage in preference to their own, and this, I think we will all admit, is a tribute to the character of the accommodation which is being furnished by the ships on the Canadian route.

Again, in regard to the Fruit Marks Act, it has been very severely criticised. I should say that this year the conditions surrounding the trade in fruit have been exceptional. Fruit in the country was not up to the average, and at the commencement of the barrelling season it was thought that apples were going to advance in price. A great many people went into the business and prices went high in the orchard. After it was known that the supply was abundant, the price was decreased and a number of dealers packed a good deal of inferior fruit with the object of trying to come out even. I have here an American opinion of the Fruit Marks Act of Canada which I will read :

Comparison of American and Canadian apples by United States Vice-Consul Albert S. Phillips. Writing with reference to American and Canadian apples in Great Britain, he says:

The Canadian government has regulated these grades as to quality and size of fruit, and if packers deviate therefrom they are liable to a fine. This government control inspires dealers with confidence, and the fact of there being only three grades simplifies the trade, making it possible for dealers to have a perfect knowledge of what they are purchasing. These conditions do not obtain, however, in the United States; on the contrary, marks run from 1x to 25x, and the sizes of the boxes and barrels differ in every state, thus, according to the dealers here, rendering the trade most complicated. I have been shown large numbers of barrels (Ameri-

can apples) where the packing was very uneven, consisting of small green apples on the top and bottom, with decayed fruit in the middle. It has also been pointed out to me—and judging from the fruit I have seen on the Cardiff market I am forced to admit it—that Canadian apples receive more care in gathering and packing than the American fruit.

Quoted from 'California Fruit Grower,' December 28, 1907.

That is American testimony to our Canadian Fruit Marks Act and its results. I do not say that the hon. member for Wentworth decried the Fruit Marks Act; he criticised it, but he did not decry it. He said it was a good Act, but that it did not go far enough, and that the government should appoint more inspectors and institute a separate branch for fruit. That is a matter of expense. I think myself from my knowledge of matters in connection with the Department of Agriculture that it would be to our advantage to have a separate branch in the Department of Agriculture devoted to the fruit interests, but it means a considerable addition to the expense of the department. I think also with the hon. member for Wentworth that it would be well to appoint more inspectors, that seems to be a necessity, and that fruit should be inspected at the point of shipment as much as possible. I think these are changes that could be beneficially made, but I would say on behalf of the department that they did make an honest endeavour to carry out the Fruit Marks Act this year. We have a return showing that last year there were 30 prosecutions under the Act whereas this year they have run to 100 already and they may run to 150.

I would like to say a word before I leave this subject in regard to the recent investigation into the tobacco industry in Canada. As chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization I take an interest in this matter, and the facts justify me in saying that the Minister of Agriculture has been beforehand in this matter of the growth of tobacco in Canada. Some years ago he appointed an expert to give directions as to the cultivation of tobacco. The investigation we have just gone through before the Committee on Agriculture has shown us that there is no necessity for Canada importing tobacco. It has shown us that we can grow leaf equal to the American leaf or to the leaf imported from other foreign countries, and it has also shown us that with the changes that the Department of Inland Revenue has just made in the Act it is reasonable to believe, in fact, it is almost a certainty, that when the rehandling business is in the hands of men who have capital to provide rehandling buildings in which to properly cure the tobacco we can export tobacco very profitably to England and Belgium. If this is true, and I believe it is—I am quite satisfied that from hearing the experts who have been examined—we will add another industry to the agricultural industries of Canada. I am not a tobacco user and some one might say that I have no right to speak in this way, but I feel that tobacco has come into general use to stay; we are sending out a large amount of money for imported leaf and if we can produce it in Canada we are no worse off in the matter of the consumption of tobacco than we would be if continued to import it, but on the other hand, we will have another industry added to the industries that our farmers can engage in. These are matters that we would like to talk on, but there are other matters. Before going into them I might say a word on immigration. I had almost forgotten to say anything upon that subject. The immigration branch has been severely criticised for the conditions prevailing at the present time in the matter of immigration.

Speaking of present conditions in Canada, members of the opposition have taken advantage of the exceptional conditions to criticise the general immigration policy of the government. We hear a great deal about the adverse balance of trade in Canada. As we might expect, different views have been advanced during this discussion as to whether a country can be prosperous under an adverse balance of trade. For my part I think that it is not at all surprising that we should have an adverse balance of trade in Canada to-day. A close examination of the returns will disclose that the excess of imports is largely due to the importation of raw materials on account of the great progress Canada is making in manufacturing and the building of great railway works, particularly the National Transcontinental Railway. We heard to-day from the hon. member for New Brunswick (Mr. Loggie) of the enormous amount spent for the importation of raw cotton, while we as farmers import a large quantity of corn, our raw material. A great quantity of settlers' effects are also imported and these things together would make up the difference between the exports and imports. My solution for the difficulty would be to pump in the immigrants. That was Kipling's solution of the Japanese problem; I do not know whether it was as true in his case as it is in mine, but I am satisfied that mine is correct, we should have no diminution of the stream of immigration to Canada if it is of the right class. I wish to be distinct on that point, we want the class that will go on our lands, or will go on public works presently and afterwards on the land. We cannot get too many people of this class. It is true that during the last months of last year we had an excess of immigrants, many of whom have stayed around the towns and have been a burden in a sense on some towns in Ontario. A great deal has been said about the conditions in shack-

town in Toronto. When that is mentioned it recalls to our minds the conditions previous to 1896 when all over Canada soup kitchens had to be opened to feed not immigrants but Canadian born citizens, and men and women who have been in Canada for many years. We do not find that to-day and the conditions in those cities are entirely due to this excess of immigration, in the latter months of last year, of people without means who could not get work, and this, of course, was partly due to the stringency of money which restricted the labour market. That condition could not be foreseen or avoided and naturally there was some little congestion in centres like Toronto where these people congregated. So I do not think we need be alarmed about conditions in Canada. These people are moving out of Toronto as quickly as may be to public works in progress throughout the country and will very soon be earning their own livings and will no longer be a charge on the charity of the city or province.

I have here an interesting statement showing the immigration into Canada from different countries for the nine months of the fiscal year up to December 31, 1907. It is as follows :—

Source.	Number of immigrants.
British Isles..	111,238
Continental Europe	77,165
United States..	46,925

From 1903 down to the present time British immigration has taken the lead and every year has shown an increase while the immigration from continental Europe has shown a decrease in comparison. That fact I wish to note particularly. It is a condition which we are all very glad to see. It is true that there are many countries in northern Europe from which we welcome immigration. There are countries in the south from which we do not want it. Our Immigration Department cannot be too particular to discourage immigration from these southern countries of Europe altogether. It must be remembered that unless we prohibit these people from entering the country, a certain number of them will come. While we can keep out a certain number it is very difficult to shut the doors against immigrants coming from Europe, and the government cannot be blamed if a certain number from southern Europe do come in ; but we would blame them if they encourage that class of immigration. Immigration from northern Europe is very desirable. If we go to the western provinces, into the settlements of immigrants from northern Europe, while individual members may decry that immigration and discount it as compared with the British immigration, I say that these people are filling a need that we cannot fill from British sources ; we cannot get the number of people from the British Isles, from the older provinces of Canada or from the United States we require. We have an immense country to fill. It is true that we should fill it if possible with the very best class possible, and the government must exert themselves to secure immigrants from the countries I have indicated. I would favour particularly German immigration. I have noticed that German immigrants, no matter from what country they come, whether Germany, Russia, or any other country, if they are of German extraction and belong to the German race, are desirable settlers. They came into Ontario from the United States and from the old country as well. I have them in my county and there is no better class of farmers, no better class of citizens in the country and no class that is doing its duty to the country in the way of increasing population and wealth in a greater degree than the Germans.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Why not get into their market ?

Mr. McKENZIE. We will get there, I will help you, friend Armstrong, if I can. It is significant that we are confronted. with no great question of policy in Canada to-day. It is remarkable, that we have got away from matters of policy altogether. The policy of this government seems to have been such a success, so much above successful criticism, that the opposition, in order to get something wherewith to influence the electors, have left the weightier matters, the matters of greatest importance, and have resorted to cries discreditable to Canada, cries of graft, graft, graft, scandal, nothing but scandal, the government of this country not worthy of the least consideration. It is true that the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) received from the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) a little consideration. That hon. gentleman said that Providence might be seen walking with him, but certainly not with any other member of the government. That is strange language for a leading politician in Canada to utter. It is almost a slur on Providence. I wonder who gave us the success we had as disclosed at our stock-taking time in this particular budget. It was not the other fellow I am sure, we do not look for blessings from him, so I think the hon. member from North Toronto must have been very hard up for an argument when he made the statement that Providence would not be seen walking with the Minister of Finance. He was with him all the time.

Now we are forced to speak of the matter of scandal. We have heard a great deal of it for several sessions. This session we are getting a surfeit of it ; but I notice that the scandals of past sessions have been getting stale, and are not now so often alluded to. There was one scandal which I had

something to do with personally, having been chairman of the committee that investigated it; that is the scandal in regard to the North Atlantic Trading Company. I am going to state as briefly as I can to the House how that appeared to me, as I sat listening to the evidence day after day. The Conservative government had been in the habit of getting immigrants from Europe by means of correspondence with booking agents, corresponding with over a hundred of them. When Mr. Sifton came into power, he saw that if he could get these people united into some sort of a company and conduct the correspondence with their representatives, it would be a great improvement. Such a company was formed, and a contract was made with it, along with an agreement that the names of the members of the company would be kept secret, otherwise they could not live in the country; they would be ostracised and perhaps imprisoned for inducing emigration from the country. The government pledged their faith that the names would be kept secret, and in pledging their faith, they pledged the faith of the people of Canada whose representatives they were. Time went on and this investigation took place, the names of the company were called for day after day. Frequently the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) who was leading the attack, would appeal to the committee to have the matter referred to the House. I often remonstrated with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, saying, 'Why not wait until we report the whole matter to the House, and then we will discuss it fully.' But, no, he wanted to get the matter referred to the House before the investigation was ended. I thought the object was to stampede the country before the truth came out. Finally the Prime Minister sent for the names, brought them to this House in a sealed envelope, rose in his place in the House, and offered the leader of the opposition to go with him into a room and open the envelope and satisfy him who the members of that company were—that there were in it no members of the government or friends of the government, or if there were he would know it. Before the leader of the opposition could say any thing in reply, his supporters shouted 'No, no'. The leader of the government turned and said: 'If you have not enough confidence in your leader to allow him to go into a room with me and open this envelope, I would suggest that you appoint three or four of his friends to go with him, and we will appoint three or four of our friends, and we will all go together into a room and open the envelope.' That likewise was refused. What reasonable man could come to any other conclusion than that it was not the names the opposition wanted, but an attempt to stampede the country with a cry that there was nothing in. I had recently occasion to address a public meeting. Before the meeting a leading Conservative came to me and said: 'Do you know anything about the North Atlantic Trading Company?' I said, 'I know a little.' He said: 'Is it true that Sir Wilfrid offered to go into a room with three or four members from each side and give the names of the members of the company?' I said: 'Yes, that is true.' He said, 'Will you speak of that to-night?' I said: 'I will if you like, but this matter is getting old; now it is teaspoons and teacups and pemmican and other little matters that are engaging the attention of the opposition, while the North Atlantic Trading Company is relegated to the past.' 'Well,' he said, 'that is a matter I want you to bring up, because if what you say is true, it means a good many votes for your candidate.' I spoke of it and tried to show that the government was justified in keeping faith with those men, and that everything was done to enable the opposition to see the names consistent with the honour of the country.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman think that it would be satisfactory to the representatives of the people for a few of them to get the names without being able to go into an inquiry as to who those men were, whether they were fulfilling their agreement or were capable of doing so, or using their names in many other ways, as they would be obliged to do in following out the inquiry?

Mr. McKENZIE. I know perfectly well that that is the position the hon. member for East Grey takes; I have heard him ask the same question of other speakers. If the hon. member or any other member of the opposition had been desirous of getting at the facts of the case, they would have gone that far at least. It could have done no harm, and the fact that the Premier's offer was not acceded to showed me most clearly that it was not the names they wanted. I think the opposition in this House have some interest in the honour of this country when the word of its representatives is pledged as well as members on the other side, and they should have shown that on that occasion. I think the people of the country will take my version of the case, as they did on the occasion I have alluded to.

Mr. SPROULE. When a member of this House stood up and held up what was declared to be an Act of incorporation of a company incorporated in Amsterdam, and the opposition accepted that declaration as correct, and when they found out in the inquiry that that was an absolute perjury, what would they have done in this case if they had not been able to follow up the inquiry?

Mr. FIELDING. What difference was it where the company was incorporated ?

Mr. SPROULE. Did it not make a great difference in the statement of a public man on his honour that the company was incorporated, and professing to produce the Act of incorporation, when in reality there was no such incorporation ?

Mr. FIELDING. What difference would it be whether the company was incorporated or not, for all substantial purposes ?

Mr. SPROULE. It made this difference, that they deluded the public with the idea it was a respectable company when there was no such company.

Mr. FIELDING. Incorporation does not create respectability.

Mr. SPROULE. Forgery does not create respectability. People guilty of it generally get behind the bars.

Mr. McKENZIE. The important point in the whole matter was whether any member of the government derived any pecuniary benefit from that contract. Another important point was, were we getting value for our money ? I say we were. I was astonished to hear the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) state that we had paid $400,000 of the money of Canada under this contract, and had not derived one cent of benefit from it. I say that we derived benefit from every dollar that we spent, and it was the cheapest immigration propaganda that we were carrying on. Our immigration propaganda in the British Islands cost a great deal more ; it was perhaps worth more, but about two-thirds of the immigration coming in cost us nothing. We could put a great deal more to our credit than the $400,000 that we spent on that company, as we only paid the bonus for agricultural immigrants and domestic servants. So that I think all the talk of scandal in this matter falls to the ground. The transaction was quite legitimate, and I am prepared to justify it anywhere before the farmers of this country.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If it was such a good contract, why did the minister cancel it ?

Mr. McKENZIE. For the simple reason that the company was not living up to the contract in regard to immigration from the northern countries of Europe. They were going to countries further south where they could get immigrants at less expense and with less effort instead of going to Scandinavia where they would have to spend more and take more trouble. Previous to that being done, I had a talk over the matter with the Minister of the Interior. He gave me this idea of it and I commend him for the course he has taken. I did so as chairman of the Colonization Committee.

There is another matter in which the public have taken a good deal of interest and that is what is called the Saskatchewan valley land deal. That transaction, which is well known to hon. members, has been characterized by the opposition as a gigantic swindle. But a short history of this transaction will show that it was nothing of the kind. We all know that Osler, Hammond & Nanton built two lines of railway, one from Calgary to Edmonton and the other from Regina to Prince Albert. The company got a grant of 1,000,000 acres of land and were given a large area from which to make their selection. They found that the land was not good enough. They selected a small portion and then wanted to throw the land back on the hands of the government. I need not go at length into the transaction but I would point this out. The company were willing to take as low as $1 an acre for the land if the government would take it off their hands and give them a money grant instead. They even went so far as to institute a suit to compel the government to take back the land and give them money in its place. While this dispute was going on, a certain American firm, Davidson & McCrea, who had just closed out a land transaction in Minnesota, heard about this block of land and came up to look over it. They heard the company's proposition, and they bought from the company 1,000,000 acres at $1.75. They brought up with them to look at this land men engaged in farming in the dry states, and who were engaged in farming on a pretty large scale. They brought up three or four of these men, and three of these are still farming in that country. These men, after looking over the land, after testing the soil and comparing it with their own dry states, made this offer to Davidson & McCrea : If you can get us the even numbered sections in a certain area in this territory from the government so that we can start farms on a large scale, we will make the experiment. Davidson & McCrea were not willing to go into the matter by bringing in individual settlers because they were afraid that individual settlers might not adapt themselves to the style of farming required in that country and the experiment might prove unprofitable, so they accepted the proposition of these men. And they proposed to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) that they would like to get a certain quantity of even-numbered sections so that they might establish large farms and experiment with this land in that way. The transaction was closed for 250,000 acres of land at $1 an acre, subject to settlement conditions. These conditions were that the company would put twenty settlers on twenty even-numbered sections and twelve settlers on other sections or 32 in all on each township. Just look at the transaction from a financial standpoint.

The government would have given away the land for nothing in any event, but instead they got in cash $250,000 and had 32 settlers in each township as well. Look at it from the standpoint of settlement, and you have an influx of immigration of the most desirable character. You have 32 settlers established in each township and a system of farming introduced specially adapted to that Saskatchewan valley. I have been there and in almost every part of the west and I know something of the various systems of farming adapted to the different portions of the west. With regard to the soil in the Saskatchewan valley, I can say that it requires a system of farming entirely different from that required by the sections around Portage la Prairie or the Red River valley. The soil of the Saskatchewan valley is hard and solid and requires deeper ploughing and more thorough pulverization. Unless that is done, you cannot have a crop grown successfully on it. I have seen crops on the soil there, which was deeply ploughed and thoroughly pulverized, and crops growing on the soil lightly ploughed as in the country further south, and while the first was a great success the latter was a complete failure. Those three men whom the company sent out there to examine the land have their farms there still. They have most beautiful farms and are growing wheat successfully. The settlers around them are following the same system of farming, a system adapted to that section, and farming there could not be made a success following any other system. This is one of the greatest advantages derived from that transaction, namely, the fact that this particular system of farming was introduced and developed there and demonstrated to be the proper system for that country. What has been the result? There has been a flow of immigration into that Saskatchewan valley since and we have several large towns, including Saskatoon, there to-day, whereas before that transaction took place the railway was running 60 miles without a settler and 100 miles with only three settlers. And the Americans are still flowing in there. The year before last and last year a Minnesota company ran their own trains right up into that country and delivered immigrants at points right along the line every two weeks. These immigrants they had collected at Minneapolis and St. Paul and ran them right through. That is the system which the Americans have adopted and that has been applied to that country in consequence of the Saskatchewan valley land deal. And that flow of immigration is going to be large again this year, and that valley, which at one time was considered a semi-arid region, not fit for the growing of wheat, is going to yield millions of bushels. I cannot see why any one should condemn the Saskatchewan valley land transaction from any standpoint. If the men who took up that contract did make some money from the rise in values, they were entitled to it, and the country has gained a great deal more than they did, and they got considerably less prices than the property has since been sold for, because these lands are appreciating in value all the time.

I would like to say something about the 'Arctic' and the 'Montcalm' scandals, but these have been dealt with already very fully. I might just mention one matter with regard to the 'Arctic' which has been made a great deal of. I see the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) looking at me very hard.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am wondering what you can have to say in defence of the 'Arctic' scandal.

Mr. McKENZIE. I shall just make reference to one item and that is the item of pemmican. The firm of Davis & Company offered to supply pemmican at 35 cents a pound. I have taken the trouble to find out what kind of pemmican that would be.

Mr. BLAIN. How much did the government pay ?

Mr. McKENZIE. $1.25 per pound, but the pemmican that could be bought at 35 cents a pound would not last on ship board on such an expedition three months. It would not keep, whereas the pemmican taken aboard the 'Artic' when she went on her first expedition, and for which $1.25 per pound was paid, is fit for use to-day and as good as ever. So, we see there is pemmican and pemmican. I do not deny that you can buy pemmican at 35 cents per pound. But there is a special method adopted in making pemmican that will keep long enough for the use of these expeditions to northern latitudes and that is what was bought for the 'Arctic.' I do not see why the two sides of the case should not be given. I am surprised at the use that has been made of the affidavit in the matter of this pemmican. Had the other and cheaper pemmican been taken, the chances are that the stuff would have become so rank long before the three years' cruise was over that the men could not use it, or, if they did use it, the result would be sickness and death.

Mr. BLAIN. What did the affidavit say?

Mr. McKENZIE. It was read in the House.

Mr. BLAIN. It stated—if the hon. gentleman will permit me—that the manager of Wm. Davis Company had examined the pemmican and would agree to supply them in quantities at 35 cents per pound, what the government were paying $1.25 per pound for.

Mr. McKENZIE. If that is the wording of the affidavit, I will accept the hon. gentleman's word for it. At the same time, I

do not believe it could be done, for I have gone into this matter to some extent. The process is so elaborate and so difficult, and the quantity is so reduced, that, taking meat at the ordinary prices and prepare it for long keeping as I have stated, the price is increased.

Mr. BLAIN. If the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) will permit me—I do not wish to interrupt him—I will read a portion of the affidavit:

I have examined a sample of the pemmican so-called, furnished for the 'Arctic' expedition, and the firm with which I am connected would be pleased to furnish to the government or any institution or individual an article similar and equal in quality, in lots of 1,000 pounds or over, packed in 10-pound tins, boxed, strapped and shipped to any point in Canada, for 35 cents a pound.

This was signed by the manager of the Wm. Davies Company.

Mr. McKENZIE. Where doctor's differ, it is hard for us to decide. The affidavit seems straight enough, but I have satisfied myself that they cannot do it at the figure. He could produce pemmican, but it would not keep for the length of time required for such an expedition. Now, I wish to say a word about transportation. A good deal has been said about the Hudson Bay Railway. Looking to the future of Canada, I must say I am very much in favour of something being done to provide a road to Hudson bay. I think the country will require an outlet for the northern part of the west, not immediately perhaps, but within five or six years. I have heard a good deal and read a good deal about the northern part of Canada, and am very much of opinion that a great part of our country there is adapted for agriculture, that it has greater resources in the way of valuable minerals and otherwise than we are now aware of. I am likewise of opinion that our northern country is improving in climate. From what I can read, the low temperature is passing away from northern Canada and is travelling eastward over Greenland and towards Siberia, and that, as years roll on, our west and northwest will grow milder in climate and we shall have a great asset for the production of agricultural products in that north country. The Hudson bay road is not a very long stretch, only 500 miles. And, seeing that lands in that part of the country have never been alienated from the government, I think it would be wise for the government to look towards building that road with the proceeds of sales of lands in that northern country. I would not say that the general revenue of the country should not be finally taxed for this purpose. The country might have to advance some money in the initial stages of the enterprise, but I think it should be so financed that, eventually, the land would pay for the road. I think this is a proposition for the near future. With regard to the Georgian bay canal, I do not look forward to the building of it in the near future or until the Transcontinental Railway is completed, and until we see what it is going to do for us with its improved grades, its straight lines, its capacity for carrying heavy loads and its cheap rates. Until this is known, I think we should not rush on with large expenditures for other transportation lines. I think that, possibly, the Intercolonial should be extended to the centres of Ontario, and, perhaps, to the Georgian bay. I believe also that branch lines in the eastern provinces should be considered by the government with a view to strengthening the system. These things, I think, are in the interests of Canada and the government should look in this direction.

I have read the statement by a learned English professor that, within a generation, Canada would be the centre of the empire. I confess that I cannot take so sanguine a view as that. What may come to pass in three generations or more we cannot say. But, of one thing I have no doubt, and that is that a great future is before Canada. I believe Canada has the most valuable part of the North American continent. I believe that we shall have on this northern part of the continent, a population strong and progressive—this must be the result of our climatic conditions. I see no reason why any Canadian should be pessimistic as to the future of his country or why Canadians, when a slight stringency occurs—a stringency that is far greater in other countries—should howl poverty and disaster for Canada. Our credit has stood the strain well. We find that there is a great inpouring of capital from Great Britain into Canada to-day, and here I would like to read to the House a statement of the bond issue of Canada for 1907.

The total Canadian bonds issued in 1907 was approximately $82,635,740. This compares with:

1906	$ 53,987,008
1905	134,874,531
1904	34,529,247

1907

Corporation	$58,931,200
Municipal	14,430,540
Provincial	9,274,000
Total	$ 82,635,000

Corporation issues then nearly doubled and municipal issues increased nearly fifty per cent. Throughout 1906, financing was withheld in the expectation of lower interest rates. Bonds were issued in 1907 partly through immediate necessity and partly because the expectation was given up of a quick return to lower interest rates. It is an indication of the excellent standing of Canadian securities that during the time of such stress the market took Canadian bonds in such large quantities.

The distribution of Canadian bonds issued in 1907 was as follows:

Canada has taken..	$14,761,683
Great Britain has taken.. ..	63,095,057
United States has taken.. ..	4,779,000
Total..	$82,635,740

The most interesting thing about this comparison is that Great Britain took during 1907 nearly two and one half times as many Canadian bonds as in 1906, and came well up towards the $85,621,395 taken in 1905, the year of the Grand Trunk Pacific and other large issues. This is especially gratifying as an indication of the continued increasing interest of British investors in Canadian securities.

We welcome this capital, we get it cheap, use is here and make a good deal more than the interest we have to pay upon it. The future of Canada depends largely upon getting population of the right class. I would say to the government: Do not relax the efforts to secure immigration, but bring in the people and settle them in the west. The prosperity of the west will build up the prosperity of the east. We have only to look at the result to-day of a partial failure in the west to see how one part of the country depends upon the other. Western Canada, for years to come, with ordinary success and fairly good crops, will tax the manufacturing industries of the east to their utmost capacity. How ? By the increase of its population. Not only do these people, going on the land, increase their own products, but the supplying of their needs in many lines of manufacture means prosperity for the whole country. I thank the House for the consideration shown me, in this almost my maiden speech.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). There is one thing the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. McKenzie) said that I can agree with, and that is that the outlook of Canada may well be optimistic. There is no substantial ground for pessimism if, as he says, the flow of immigration continues, and we get the right sort. Every one will agree with that. But the question naturally suggests itself: We have the flow of immigration, is it of the right sort? Who is responsible if it is not the right sort ? Why, it is the government. Every one admits that a large percentage of what we are getting is not of the right sort, and yet the government are spending the money of Canada to bring in the wrong sort and fill up the country with what is entirely unsuitable. The hon. gentleman dealt with several subjects, but I have not time to do more than touch upon them. He told us one thing we did not know before with regard to the North Atlantic Trading Company. He told us that Mr. Sifton asked them to form such a company. That is new information. So I presume after this, if the hon. member from South Bruce is reliable, we may fairly hold the member for Brandon responsible for the formation of that company, and whatever odium may attach to that company he is largely entitled to, because he, it seems, was one of the originators of the company, and his man Preston carried it out. The hon. member for South Bruce justifies the action of that company, he justifies the expenditure, he justifies the secrecy surrounding the expenditure, and surrounding the so-called company, and he justifies the denial of the right to the representatives of the people in parliament to ascertain who got the $300,000 or $400,000 of Canada's money for immigrants that was paid out to this company, a large percentage of whom were entirely unsuitable for Canada. The hon. member for South Bruce holds that the secrecy was justifiable, that it was ample for parliament to be told : If you send one or two men into a room with me I will show you the names of the individuals who form that North Atlantic Trading Company, provided you never mention them outside. I would like to ask him if he thinks his constituents would be satisfied with that. I would like to ask him if the farmers of South Bruce would be satisfied if he told them : I went into a room, I saw three or four German names and one or two English names, I do not know whether they were paupers or millionaires, whether they were in the immigration business or not, how much of Canada's money they got, whether Canada got any return for it or not; we were not allowed to go on with the inquiry because we were told that those names were to be kept absolutely secret. I ask the hon. member if he thinks his constituents would be satisfied with an explanation such as that. We were assured in this House that the expenditure of this money was all right, that it was expended by a very wealthy corporation of responsible and respectable men, a body corporate and politic, and the letters of incorporation were shown in this House as representing that respectable corporation that was incorporated in Amsterdam, with the seal on it, showing it to be a wealthy corporation, to be an honest corporation. These letters of incorporation were held up before the eyes of the people's representatives as evidence that the money had been spent by these respectable men, and we had to accept the assurance. But afterwards, when we were endeavouring to ascertain who composed that corporation, we found there was no such company in existence, that an absolute deception had been practised upon the people's representatives—I say, to the eternal shame of the man who stood up and defended it. And the hon. member for South Bruce was satisfied with all that, and would have been satisfied to this day, and would have gone out no doubt and told the electors of South

Bruce that this money was spent with a wealthy incorporated company of respectable men, had the opposition in parliament not gone on and made inquiry and ascertained that no such company existed, that no such corporation had ever been formed, or were in existence at that time. The whole thing was an absolute forgery and deception. How discreditable, how disgraceful it was, and I ask the hon. member for South Bruce : Are his constituents satisfied with that ? Will they justify the government and their supporters in endeavouring to burke an inquiry with regard to that large expenditure of money on the North Atlantic Trading Company ?

Mr. BENNETT. Why did the government cancel the contract ?

Mr. SPROULE. That question has been asked. If we were getting such satisfactory results, why did the government cancel the contract ? Can the hon. member for South Bruce answer that ? Does he forget that Lord Strathcona said that we would get as many good immigrants if we never spent a dollar on that North Atlantic Trading Company ? Is he aware of the fact that since the contract was cancelled we are getting immigrants equally as good, in as large numbers, increasing numbers every year ? Yet that contract was cancelled, all expenditures were stopped, as regards that North Atlantic Trading Company, it is not operating any longer. So far as we know, Canada has not suffered in any respect by the cancellation of that contract and we are saving hundreds of thousands of dollars that we were paying out before.

Mr. McKENZIE. The hon. gentleman has quoted Lord Strathcona. Did not Lord Strathcona justify keeping the names secret ?

Mr. SPROULE. I don't remember that he did, but I think he said he saw no reason why the names should not be given.

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not think so.

Mr. SPROULE. But he did not agree that we should ever enter into such a contract as that. He says in his letter that it was against his views, but because he believed it was the policy of the party in Ottawa, and because the deputy minister came from Ottawa and associated himself with Mr. Preston and went into the organization of that company, he did not feel like going against their views, knowing also that it was the view of the Minister of the Interior, whose representatives were over there. But his judgment was that it was wrong and improper, and we would get no substantial return for it.

Mr. PATERSON. Did you not say we were paying nothing now ?

Mr. SPROULE. I said to the North Atlantic Trading Company.

Mr. PATERSON. No, you said we had been spending this money.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Customs is too respectable a man to try to make me say something I did not say. I said we were not spending a dollar with that North Atlantic Trading Company for that purpose.

Mr. PATERSON. You said we were saving the money, I think.

Mr. SPROULE. The money that we paid to the North Atlantic Trading Company.

Mr. PATERSON. But you are paying it to some one else.

Mr. SPROULE. We are paying it to people that we know, we are paying nothing to that company. Now with regard to the class of immigrants. The hon. member said : If we were getting the right class. Are we getting the right class ? Have we got the right class, and how are they placed ? Then we are paying $5 a head to bring men here who are presumably farmers.

Mr. PATERSON. How are you saving it then ?

Mr. SPROULE. We have paid $5 to bring them out and $2 to locate them and this agent mentioned by the hon. member for Kent was paid $1,200 altogether when it was shown that there was not $600 earned.

Mr. PATERSON. That is poor saving.

Mr. SPROULE. It is poor saving. How has the other $600 been taken out of the country ? Unfortunately, improperly, stolen! Who has prosecuted the man who did it? What has been done by the Minister of the Interior or the Minister of Agriculture ? Nothing has been done. This was going on all year until finally it was brought to the attention of the House. These men who were brought out to this country and were declared by the Department of Agriculture to be farmers and agricultural labourers were planted out among the farmers when they had never spent a day on the farm but had come from the cities and towns of England and other European countries. As farmers and agricultural labourers $5 a head was paid for them, $2 a head was paid to the agent to locate them and in many cases no immigrant was ever located. Letters from farmers were read by my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Clements) in the House today showing that this agent never earned the money which was paid to him, in one case $10, in another $12, in another $8, in many cases $5, $4 or $2 and in many of these cases no immigrant had been placed at all. And no prosecution ! This is the country's money, is it not ? Who is responsible for the stealing of this money out of the public treasury ? The government.

Who was this agent? The government's agent. The government, although they have a guilty knowledge, although they are responsible, in so far as we know, have not raised hand or foot to punish the individual who did this. Is that what the country expects from a moral government, from an honest government, a good meaning government, a government of business men? I say it is a disgrace to any civilized country in the world. What does their own agent say in regard to many of these people coming out to Canada? What does Mr. Bruce Walker say? In a pamphlet which he has issued he tells us that the East End Emigration Fund has sent out 6,096 immigrants and the Central Emigration body 2,842. What do the members of the government say about that? We have been told that they are bringing out nothing but the very best, that the government are exercising supervision over those that come; that they are examined there and they are examined when they land here, both at the point of embarkation and the point of debarkation, that those who are unsuitable for Canada are sent back. But, what does Mr. Walker say?

The Central Emigration Board, an executive body, not at all of a philanthropic or charitable character, was brought into existence for the purpose of providing a machine for booking and emigrating the products of the provincial distress committees. The latter have not taken kindly to the organization, inasmuch as provincial distress committees object to overlooking the claims of local booking agents, probably ratepayers in their community——

To whom we pay $5 as well.

—in order to deal with the Central Emigration Board in London, from whom they receive no return, and no special consideration. Consequently, therefore, notwithstanding the inauguration of this body, with considerable press display, and not a little prestige from important and influential persons on the directorate, it has not done a great deal of business. During the year it sent to Canada 228 persons.

Then he says:

In inclosing you in tabulated form the totals of persons emigrated by such philanthropic societies as I have dealt with in this report, I beg to offer, in the most respectful way, the suggestion for submission to the minister, that if this emigration is not to be discouraged in toto, some means must be devised at once for its proper supervision and control.

Thereby admitting that there is no proper supervision and control over the immigrants that come here.

Mr. PATTERSON. You are in favour of that, are you not?

Mr. SPROULE. In favour of what?

Mr. PATERSON. What he suggests?

Mr. SPROULE. The government have been telling the country for five years that they are doing all they can and their immigration agents says they are not. That is what I want to bring to the attention of the government and of the country. What they have been declaring they were doing they are not doing at all, and it must be done if the country is not to suffer.

In my opinion, it will be an unfortunate condition of affairs if such organizations are permitted, unrestricted and unrestrained, to pour upon the shores of Canada large numbers of persons, few of whom are morally and physically quite fitted.

That is the class that are coming in.

Mr. PATERSON. No, we will not allow them to come.

Mr. SPROULE. Will not allow them to come? They are coming in thousands, they are filling our charitable institutions in Toronto and Montreal and, what is worse, they are filling our hospitals.

It might be well to institute a regulation that the same permission should be obtained for the emigration of such persons as is obtained for the emigration of persons from workhouses, and it might also be permissible to insist that such organizations in England must have a complement organization in Canada.

To distribute them.

Here is what one of the judges of the country said in regard to this matter in addressing the grand jury of the county of Carleton:

In addressing the grand jury at the opening of the high court assizes yesterday Judge MacMahon referred to the injurious results of immigrants coming into Canada who were not mentally sound. He read statements of Dr. C. K. Clarke, superintendent of the Toronto asylum, to the effect that of the 362 admissions to that institution last year 136 were foreign born. The majority were recent arrivals. Of these most were deported but there were about 40 that the province would never get rid of, and each patient that is retained would cost the province $6,000.

That is only speaking of one of the cities of Canada.

The Provincial Secretary's Department has deported thirty since January last. Of these weak-minded foreigners, sixty-five per cent were afflicted with dimentia præcox, the same form of insanity accredited to Harry K. Thaw.

And this is a class for which we are paying $5 a head when we should be filling up the country with desirable citizens. These were the most undesirable classes of lunatics and were likely to live a great many years. In other words they were the failures sent from the old country by immigration companies to try and make good in Canada if possible. The judge explained that this disease was usually contracted in early life,

and in 60 per cent of the cases becomes evident before the age of twenty-five years.

And that is the class we are bringing in in such large numbers. Mr. Bruce Walker also speaks of this class and condemns the policy that had been carried out for the last five years during which time the Minister of the Interior, the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Agriculture have been telling Canada that the government were exercising the greatest care in the selection of immigrants.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend said that we paid $5 a head for these.

Mr. SPROULE. I said for some of these.

Mr. FIELDING. The mere fact that these people came in does not prove that we paid $5 a head.

Mr. SPROULE. I reached that conclusion because they are taken right to the farms in the country and come out as farm labourers. I know that they are brought out as farm labourers and were booked as such, because they said they were advised to put themselves down as farm labourers, although they had never worked a day on the farm. I have had four or five in my own employ and I do not think that they had worked on a farm before.

Mr. PATERSON. Were they crazy?

Mr. SPROULE. Some of them were, not the ones I had, however, and we raised money and sent them to Toronto. They were imbeciles.

Mr. PATERSON. Did the Ontario government bring them out; did not they place the men on the farms?

Mr. SPROULE. I made application at Toronto and I think the application was forwarded here and they were sent on to me as soon as they landed by the immigration agent for the Dominion. Three of them were sent on. As far as I know, they were sent from the immigrants brought in by the Dominion. They told me that they were instructed to book themselves as going on farms, although they had never worked on farms.

Mr. PATERSON. You had better mention that to Mr. Whitney.

Mr. SPROULE. I mention it to the people responsible, to the people who did it, who spent the people's money ; I mention it to the guilty parties.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Was their information reliable if they were crazy?

Mr. SPROULE. I did not say that the men I had were crazy ; I said the men who were brought into our locality and put among the farmers were in some cases crazy and some were sent to Toronto.

Mr. PATERSON. Were they the ones you were talking to.

Mr. SPROULE. No. I think the hon. member for Ottawa will have to put an insurance policy on this man or he will explode again. At the meeting of the Associated Charities in Toronto it was said that the medical inspection was 'farcical.' This was stated by Dr. Hodgetts, I believe. Mr. Samuel Arnold, secretary of the Associated Charities, at the same meeting gave a statement of the position of the allied societies. This was in September last, really before the season of the year when distress is felt in the cities. The statement was as follows:

St. Andrew's Society, he said, had not one family to provide for. The Society of St. Vincent de Paul suggested that men with families should have enough funds to support them for six months. St. George's Society assisted persons 681 times——

Mr. LEMIEUX. What city is that?

Mr. SPROULE. Toronto, last September.

—sent nine to the hospital, and had seven funerals in the past year. On the register of the British Welcome League there were 5,293 names. Of these, 606 were without money, 347 with less than $2, 310 with over $2 but less than $5, 185 married couples with 352 children, wthout cash, 348 couples with 865 children with less than $5 a family.

They had been landed down in Canada and at once became practically paupers on the country. These were the desirable immigrants that the government were bringing out to the country.

During the past year 300 persons applied for work at the office of the Associated Charities, and of these over 200 were recent arrivals. At the city hall 216 persons asked for relief and 44 for hospital treatment. All had lived less than three months in the country.

And that is the class we are paying so much money to bring into Canada.

Mr. PATERSON. Does it say the Ontario government brought them out?

Mr. SPROULE. What is the million dollars being spent for by this government? To bring them out and to pay bonuses.

Mr. PATERSON. I am asking you——

Mr. SPROULE. —to pay bonuses to the booking companies and many of these were brought out as desirable settlers.

Out of 200 families aided by the House of Industry, 150 were immigrants.

Rev. Canon Welsh appealed for quality, not quantity, in immigration, and said immigrants should have definite employment guaranteed them before they left home.

Mr. Rufus S. Hudson showed that on paper the rules of the Dominion government for the medical inspection of immigrants were excellent, but in practice they were execrable.

The discussion was continued by Dr. Pepler, Mr. W. F. Sexton, Mr. J. C. Bayliss, Mr. C. W. Mogridge, Mr. H. M. Mowat, K.C., and Mr. G. F. Harman.

Dr. Hodgetts said that the medical examination of the immigrants was farcical, as a

physician was not allowed time sufficient to properly examine all who passed through his hands. Cases of heart and lung diseases and even of imbecility frequently escaped their notice.

That is the class of men who are being brought to the country and we are expected to applaud the government because they are bringing them to Canada. What is the result to-day ? It is that there are over 2,000 people in Toronto out of employment. I saw in a paper no longer ago than yesterday that two or three of these men had been offered $25 a month and their board to work on farms near Toronto, and refused because they could not get $26 a month. These men are lying about the towns and cities of Canada and are absolutely useless to go on farms. They have no sense of honour and no regard for a bargain, whether it is written or oral. Large numbers of them come from London, and they tell us they never worked on a farm; yet they are sent out as farmers. I employed one on a farm, and I saw him walk around a field three times to learn how to put in a plough, and he could not manage it properly if he got a million dollars. I was to pay him $20 a month, with board and washing.

Mr. PATERSON. The Ontario government brought him out. You should mention the matter to Whitney.

Mr. SPROULE. He told me he was booked at the Dominion government agency in London. I have had three more of them since. I had one who left only last week, who had been paid $20 a month, with board and washing, all winter, although I do not think he was worth half that. He went away on Saturday night, and never came back, and he is now looking for work. Another remained three days ; another remained nine days. This is the kind of immigration the hon. member eulogized. Some years ago in the Committee on Agriculture the hon. member moved a resolution recommending the government to try to get the embargo taken off cattle, and he stood up with the greatest simplicity and innocence and assurances to tell the Committee that the government of England was going to change shortly, he believed, and a reform government was going to come in and would take the embargo off cattle. That reform government came in. Has it taken off the embargo yet ? How many times has the Minister of Agriculture applied to it, but he has not succeeded. Have we heard anything about it since? Not a word lately. If the hon gentleman is a prophet, I am afraid he is one of the false prophets. He talked a great deal about the cold storage provided by the Minister of Agriculture and told us what beneficial results we had from it. He said that practically all our products, including cheese and butter and eggs, were sent in cold storage and were therefore sold at a higher price in the British market than before. Am I correct in that my understanding of his contention ?

Mr. McKENZIE. I spoke more particularly of early apples and small fruits during the months of August and September.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought he mentioned cheese, butter and egggs.

Mr. McKENZIE. In reply to Mr. E. D. Smith. Of course, I accept the statement of the hon. gentleman as the truth.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman accepts my statement as correct. Then what did the Minister of Agriculture say in this House in answer to a question by Mr. Armstrong ? This is the question :

What was the total number of boxes of cheese, butter, eggs, bacon, apples, in boxes and barrels respectively, shipped in cold storage, the number in cooled air chambers, and the number shipped in ordinary storage in twelve months previous to March 1, 1908?

What was the answer to that ? Here is what the Minister of Agriculture said :

Of the cheese sent over in cold storage, there was not a single box in the twelve months; in cooled air chambers, 290,076 boxes; but in ordinary storage, 1,721,000 boxes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to ask the hon. member if he expects cheese to be shipped in cold storage. You can ship butter in cold storage, but you destroy cheese if you ship it too cold.

Mr. SPROULE. Did not the hon. member state the benefit that the farmers were receiving from it, and did he not admit that what I stated practically represented his sentiment ? How much butter went over in cold storage ? 66,896 boxes. I take meats; how many boxes went in cold storage ? 2,858. How many in cooled air chambers ? 29,000. How many in ordinary storage ? 25,900. Take lard—how much went in cold storage ? Not a single pound. How much in ordinary storage ? 1,000 packages. Then I take apples, which the hon. member says cold storage is for ; how many went over in cold storage ? 6,131 barrels. How many in cooled air chambers, 1,720 barrels. How many in ordinary storage ? 634,000 barrels. There is what the farmers got from this splendid system of cold storage.

Mr. McKENZIE. Surely the hon. gentleman does not expect the whole trade of Canada to go in cold storage. Surely he must know as well as I that during the latter part of the summer, when our winter apples are going forward, there is no necessity for cold storage. That is required for the earlier apples and perishable fruit.

Mr. SPROULE. Then why did the hon. gentleman misrepresent the facts by saying that practically it all went by cold storage? He said that nearly all the apples went in

cold storage, but I have shown him that by far the greater proportion went without cold storage. When the farmers of South Bruce read what he said and then compare his statement with the facts, what credit will he receive from them? Of the tender fruit, how much went in cold storage? None at all. How many eggs went in cool air chambers? 934 boxes. How many in the ordinary way, without cold storage at all? 24,249 boxes. And the farmers are expected to bow down and be grateful to the Minister of Agriculture. I see that the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) is here. What did he say on that question? He also eulogized the Minister of Agriculture for the wonderful things he had accomplished by his cold storage, and he went on to say that practically all that the farmers sent now was sent in cold storage, and their products were consequently laid down in splendid condition in the markets of the world. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) put to him this question: Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that all these articles he has mentioned were exported in cold storage? And the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) replied: That is my understanding and my opinion. But I have given the facts to show how utterly absurd his opinion was. Then the hon. member for South Grey went on to give a list of figures, showing the quantity of eggs and butter and cheese and bacon and hams exported, and he left the inference to be drawn that all these went in cold storage. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) again asked him if these were all exported in cold storage, and the hon. gentleman replied: That is my understanding. But we find that exactly the contrary is the case. What has the hon. member for South Grey to say, in the face of the figures given by the Minister of Agriculture to-day? If the farmers of South Grey only heard the one side, they might believe the hon. gentleman, but if the facts are put before them what will they think of him? They will conclude that either he is absolutely ignorant or dishonest—that he either does not know the facts or is dishonest enough to give figures which the facts do not bear out for the purpose of making some political advantage for himself and party and his wonderful Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. PATERSON. Cold storage is a good thing, is it not? Whether they ship by cold storage or not, is it not a good thing? Or are you opposed to it?

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister from Brant (Mr. Paterson) is very fond of putting —I was going to say silly—but I will say irrelevant questions. I do not like to be offensive but I cannot see the sense of his putting the questions he does. We have had held up to us the action of the government in furnishing seed as a great boon to the farmers of the west. Well, a great many of the farmers do not approve of the system the government have adopted. It would have been far better if the government had made some arrangement by which the farmers, whose crops were a failure, could have been furnished with the money with which to buy seed from their neighbours, whose crops were not frost bitten and who consequently had seed for sale. Take one section where the grain was destroyed by the frost and adjoining that you will find another where the grain was first-class and where those farmers, whose crops had failed, could get all the seed they required if they had the money to pay for it. But instead of doing this the government are providing the seed themselves and taking security for payment from the farmers, and the government are giving a bonus of 3 cents a bushel in the way of a higher price for it to those who will turn in pure seed. Who is getting that bonus? A good many of the friends of the government are getting it and those who are not friends are not getting it. That discrimination is wrong. In any event the price of seed grain is raised 3 cents a bushel and the farmer who requires it has to pay that. His neighbour who has equally good grain cannot sell it to him because he has not the money to pay for it, and he is compelled to take the government grain and pay 3 cents a bushel more. I am not giving this as an argument of my own. I had it from a man in Saskatchewan who is farming there. He has in his granery as fine wheat as you could wish to see yet he cannot sell to the farmers, who are in want of seed, because they have not the money to pay for it. Those farmers are obliged to give the government security and have to pay from 3 cents to 5 cents more per bushel for grain which is no better or cleaner than they could get from adjoining farms. I am not blaming the government so much because I think that was not what they intended. I believe they were doing their best, but when we are doing our best, it does not always work out exactly right. This man said to me that if the government had provided some means whereby the farmers could get money enough to buy from their neighbours, they could buy equally as good grain and very much cheaper. But to-day they have either to do without the grain or give security and buy from the government at a much higher price.

Mr. PATERSON. Was it known that the grain you speak of was all right? Was it tested?

Mr. SPROULE. It was wheat which no man with an eye in his head and who was a farmer could doubt was first-class wheat.

Mr. PATERSON. They say the oats that were blighted looked just as well.

Mr. SPROULE. You could be deceived easily in oats but not in wheat.

Mr. N. F. WILSON. Is the hon. gentleman aware that the people appreciate the fact that they can get outside grain and prefer to pay 3 cents more per bushel for it.

Mr. SPROULE. The government can get as good grain in the country.

Mr. N. F. WILSON. They do not want to get it from their neighbours but want to change the seed.

Mr. SPROULE. That is largely moonshine. Besides most of the wheat is not imported at all but bought in the country there. I wish now to refer to the discussion which took place this afternoon. My hon. friend from West Kent (Mr. Clements) was dealing with a very important subject, and during most of the time he spoke there was but one minister present. I do not know whether the ministers have entirely abandoned their functions as such, but the House sat with only one minister present and he a subordinate one, although at the moment the government were being charged with dereliction of duty and improper conduct. The benches were empty nearly the whole afternoon and but one minister present.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? While he was speaking it struck me very forcibly—would it not be well to refer to the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) for his absence? This country is paying that hon. gentleman a good salary and he has been in his place very little within the last month.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not against the leader of the opposition that charges are made, but against the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Immigration, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) is not responsible for these.

Mr. FIELDING. Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clements) give notice to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) of any such charge to be made?

Mr. SPROULE. Some time ago.

Mr. FIELDING. That is not very definite.

Mr. SPROULE. I heard him in his place give notice to the House that it was his intention——

Mr. FIELDING. That is not the kind of notice that is due to a minister. He should get notice of the time when the matter is to be brought up.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the kind of notice that any member should give and it is all the government should ask or expect.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule).

Mr. SPROULE. I am speaking from a knowledge of some years which is worth as much to me as the experience of the minister (Mr. Fielding) is to him. Here are charges made against the Department of Immigration, not merely of mismanagement but of absolute fraud in the expenditure of public money. Yet we do not learn of any effort made to compel restitution, or to punish the parties. The hon. member (Mr. Clements) read case after case, seven hundred in all, of people for whom the agent had received a commission of $2 a head. And when letters were addressed to the individuals who were supposed to have taken these employees, half of them declared that they had never had these men. Yet this agent got $1,200 for locating these people, half of whom were never located at all;—pure dishonesty. And, that charge being brought to the attention of the government, they have not a word of reply, but sit as dumb as oysters. They do not try to punish the individual, or get back the money, or offer any excuse. But is it any wonder that this individual should act in this way? I do not think so. He knows what is going on in the departments of the government. Everybody who deals with the government expects to get a rake-off or to steal some of the public money. And the man who gets only a small portion feels that he is hardly doing himself justice because somebody else is more astute than he and gets a larger amount. Now, not only was $2 a head paid for locating these people in this country, but $5 a head was paid for bringing them here, and this was done on the plea that they were farm labourers. Yet what do these lettters show that were read by the hon. member (Mr. Clements)? One man had never worked as a farmer, but was a plasterer by trade; another had been a mechanic; another stayed a few days and then went and got work in Detroit. And these were the people that were sent out as farm hands, labourers, $5 per head being paid to bring them here and $2 a head to locate them, though many were not located at all. And yet the government has not a word to say. Was this not a fraud? It would appear that somebody buncoed the government, but no attempt seems to be made to punish the parties. What percentage of these people belong to the agricultural class? Not half of them. In fact, half of them were not located at all, so that probably not more than one-quarter of these people were agriculturists. This shows the slipshod methods employed by the department, which are also illustrated in the examining of immigrants at the port of debarkation.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) is said to be a practical farmer, a man whose ambition it is to do something for the farmers of this country. He often tells what a wonderful thing he did in getting the United States regulations changed so as to enable us to get our cattle sent into that country, and this is how it works out at the

present time. If the hon. gentleman disbelieve me, my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. N. F. Wilson), whom I saw at the gathering of livestock men the other day, will verify what I say. Here for instance is the regulation with regard to horses—it provides how these horses may be brought into Canada :

A proper pedigree referring to the English or American stud-book to be given by the breeder in his certificate, but in the case of such blood horses whose pedigree is not entered in the stud-book an authenticated certificate of purity of blood and identification will be sufficient, provided the animal is found on inspection to have the properties and qualifications essential to improvement of breed.

Then, as to short-horn cattle :

The breeders' certificate shall embody a correct pedigree, referring to a recognized short-horn herd book.

These regulations were made in November, 1887, before the present government came into power. And yet, they have been telling the farmers of the wonderful things the Minister of Agriculture accomplished by going to Washington and arranging with the Secretary of Agriculture for an exchange of pure-bred cattle between Canada and the United States. I find in the 'Farmers' Advocate' of Manitoba announcement of a sale of pure-bred cattle at Wetaskiwin, on March 31. And where are the cattle from? They are from the United States. They are consigned to a Canadian who sells them in his own name. These are advertised as pure-bred cattle, and the farmer who buys them thinks he is getting cattle that can be registered here in the herd-book of Canada. He goes on and buys them and what does he find? He buys them as pure-bred cattle, and he finds that they won't register here at all. They have four registration herd books over there, they belong to joint stock companies who make money out of the business. Therefore they are lax in it, and we would not admit their registration at all. But the cattle they are bringing in and pretending to be pure-bred cattle as we know and understand the term, are cattle that cannot be registered in Canada. Will the Americans allow us to do that with our cattle? We are sending cattle over there and what do they compel us to do? They compel us to register our cattle before they get in, and it costs $100 a head to register. But we allow them to bring theirs in here free, and they sell their cattle in Canada as pure-bred, and we find that they are only grades when wet get them. So the Canadian farmer is deceived and imposed upon, a fraud is perpetrated upon him, and our beautiful Minister of Agriculture is letting it go on.

Mr. BENNETT. Does he know about it ?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, he was at the meeting, and they brought it to his attention, and they asked for a remedy. I asked the question the other day : Are the government taking any steps to regulate this, and under what regulations are the cattle coming in now ? The Minister of Agriculture did not answer, but the Minister of Customs answered, and said they were coming in under the same regulations as in 1887. Yet the Minister of Agriculture told the farmers of this country in the meantime, I fancy a hundred times: What a blessing it is that you have me as Minister of Agriculture, because he went down to Washington and had one consultation with the Minister of Agriculture there, and arranged everything on a fair basis so that there was a free interchange between the two countries in thoroughbred stock, and grade stock as well, to the advantage of farmers in Canada. Now they bring in horses, what are they worth when they bring them in ? I am told they are no good, the horses cannot register here. I say that also is a fraud perpetrated upon the farmers of Canada, and it becomes a tax placed on our good cattle. Our farmers are paying three prices for them. One case is cited of a man who paid $2,100 for a horse that the party who referred to it declared on his judgment was not worth $500. Yet these horses come in under the regulations, the Minister of Agriculture knows it, and he is making no effort to change it, and the farmers are suffering in consequence. Yet we are told by the hon. member for South Bruce and others that we ought to be profoundly thankful because we have a practical farmer at the head of the department.

Mr. N. F. WILSON. Does the hon. member mean to state that all thoroughbred cattle going over to the States to be sold come under this hundred dollar regulation ?

Mr. SPROULE. The man that was trying to ship them was told that he could not take them in unless he paid $100, he had either to give it then, or to pay it beforehand.

Mr. N. F. WILSON. The cattle that pay this $100 registration fee in order to be sold in the States are cattle of recent importation. I know the cattle we have bred and sold in the States have been registered before this clause was adopted requiring a hundred dollars to be paid, and we don't pay anything extra in order to sell in the States.

Mr. SPROULE. When was that clause enacted ?

Mr. N. F. WILSON. Two years ago. Up to the time of our national registration we registered all our cattle in the American Shorthorn herd book.

Mr. SPROULE. If they are registered there, of course you could take them there. But now they have to be taken in by an American, and they have to be registered as well—so I am informed, and if am not correct I want to be set right. That is the regulation, and I complain because the Minister of Agriculture allows American cattle to come in under such a regulation on their side, while we are deprived of the benefit of their market, and the Minister of Agriculture sits by and allows Canadian farmers to suffer.

Now as we are practically discussing the budget, I wish to say a few words about the speech of the hon. member for Brandon. I was amused to see how highly the reform press eulogized that speech. You would think it was one of the most wonderful deliverances ever heard in the House of Commons. It was original, it was new, it was practical, it was valuable, and if it was carried out, what wonderful benefits would result to Canada. Well, if all this is true, is it not a condemnation of the government who waited all these years for the hon. member for Brandon to tell them what they should do? In proportion as his deliverances were wise and his recommendations valuable, in the same proportion did he condemn his late colleagues because they have not been doing what he says they should do. His whole speech is a rebuke to the government. He says that several reforms are urgently demanded, and not one of them was mentioned in the speech from the Throne or in the budget speech. Not a word in the speech from the Throne about building the Hudson Bay railway, not a word about his other propositions, except something about the all-red line in the budget speech. Now is there any justification for the fulsome eulogies of that speech by the Reform press? Were these suggestions new? Not one of them was new, they had been discussed in this House over and over again. What are they? Reforming the Department of Trade and Commerce by the appointment of commercial agents to increase our trade. What were we told by the Minister of Trade and Commerce? They were going to establish commercial agencies all over the world, who would collect statistical data that would be of great value, they were going to increase immensely our foreign trade; and that the Department of Trade and Commerce was going to do wonderful things that had never been done before. But the member for Brandon says it wants to be reorganized; it is out of date. We have paid sufficient money to enable the government to get it up to date. We have 32 or 33 agents appointed in England, South Africa, Japan, Australia, New Zealand and other countries and yet the hon. member from Brandon tells us they are no use. We want it reorganized and that is what the country needs to-day. If it has not got it who is to be condemned? The government told us when they organized the department and agreed to pay $7,000 a year to the head of it that they were going to have wonderful results from it, but the hon. member for Brandon tells us: We never had any wonderful results. Is that not a condemnation of the government? Certainly it is, and they must be responsible for it. The next question referred to by the hon. gentleman was that of civil service reform. We have had civil service reform discussed over and over again since I came into this House thirty years ago. Every year some one is going to reform the civil service. Before the Conservative government went out they appointed a commission and they were prepared to reform the service and woud have done so if they had not gone out of power.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is mistaken. They did not go out of power for nearly four years after that. The commission was appointed in 1891 and made its report in 1892. They made no reform at all.

Mr. SPROULE. On account of going out of power.

Mr. FIELDING. They had all the time they needed but they did not do it.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not going to debate that now. The present government have been in office for twelve years. They have had two civil service commissions and they have not reformed the civil service. Yet, the hon. member for Brandon says that it should be reformed. Is that not a condemnation of his own friends? On the contrary, they have deformed it. They have been in office for twelve years and there is no result as yet.

Mr. FIELDING. We have had the report of the commission for three weeks and the late government had the report of their commission for four years and did nothing.

Mr. SPROULE. But you had a commission before this.

Mr. FIELDING. Never.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, they reported long ago and you introduced two measures in consequence of it.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is mistaken; there was no commission.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What was it?

Mr. FIELDING. There was no commission. I do not know what my hon. friend is referring to.

Mr. SPROULE. There was the inquiry upon which you based your Superannuation and Pension Fund Bills.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend has made a statement and he is questioning about some other things. He has said that we have had two commissions. I say that he is mistaken. There has been no commission but the one that was recently appointed and which has reported.

Mr. SPROULE. I will give my hon. friend the facts later.

Mr. LEMIEUX. When Sir Wm. Mulock introduced the Superannuation Bill there was no commission.

Mr. FOWLER. There was an inquiry.

Mr. FIELDING. By whom ?

Mr. FOWLER. By the government, I suppose.

Mr. FIELDING. Every Bill is the subject of inquiry.

Mr. SPROULE. The next question that came up was the fast Atlantic service. When the present government came into power there was a provisional abstract made for a fast Atlantic service which called for an annual payment of $750,000, but the present government declared that they could provide a service for $500,000 a year, and that they would not pay $750,000. Man after man got up and said that we did not want a fast Atlantic service, that we required something to carry freight and it did not matter whether it was carried rapidly so long as it was carried cheaply. They took two grounds, first, that we did not need it, and, second, that we were paying too much for it. Now, we are told by this wonderful Daniel-come-to-judgment that it is the most pressing need of the times and that it would be cheap for Canada to give $1,226,000 for it, the only difference being that it will extend across the Pacific as well as the Atlantic. This wonderful thing is something new, something great. They are all talking about it now. The press have eulogized the deliverance of the hon. member for Brandon for advocating something that was practically ready to be realized some twelve years ago but which the government, with its want of foresight and good judgment, prevented from being accomplished. The government refused to ratify the contract which was made by their predecessors, they declared the service was not needed and now we are told that it is one of the most pressing needs of the country. The next was the building of the Hudson Bay Railway. I listened to members from the Northwest the other day saying how much they wanted it. I believe they do want it. When I was in Winnipeg five years ago I was asked by the 'Free Press' if I would give them an interview on what the country needed and I said that one of the most urgent needs of the time was the Hudson Bay Railway. I was taken to task very severely by a good many people on both sides of politics for saying so. That was my opinion then and it is my opinion still. Now the hon. member for Brandon comes forward as an advocate of this project forgetting that the only effort that was ever made to build that road was by the late government. If they had remained in power the whole of the road would undoubtedly have been built long ago but because they went out the present government have allowed the men who held the subsidy and charter to dilly-dally with it. They have renewed the subsidy and kept it alive but the railway is not built and it never will be built so long as the laxity of the present government continues.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Is the hon. gentleman not aware that the Hudson Bay Railway is being built and that it is already built for a considerable distance ?

Mr. SPROULE. I am aware that a portion of road which is used for other purposes is being built as part of a line going to the Pacific coast. Can the hon. gentleman tell me how much is built and how much they got to build it ? I do not think he knows anything about it. He has heard some one tell him. What a wonderful inspiration it was that came from the superlative cranium of the hon. member for Brandon when he said that the road might be built by setting aside a portion of the land ! Practically the late government were carrying out the same principle in giving alternate sections of land for the purpose of building it. What is the difference ? The member for Brandon says hold the land for, say ten years, until it becomes valuable. If you hold the land for ten years it may become valuable but there is the interest accruing on the money in the meantime. The only practical effort that was made to build the road was made by the Conservative party. These are the wonderful deliverances of the hon. member for Brandon. The last was that the government should buy back the lands from the railways and throw them open for settlement. We have discussed that in the House a dozen times and a dozen years ago. Every one of these old subjects has been revived and revamped, and the utterances of the hon. gentleman with regard to them are considered to be a wonderful deliverance as if he were an oracle from Heaven. Every Liberal paper praises the hon. gentleman and in proportion as it praises him it condemns its own friends.

Mr. FIELDING. But the Tory papers praised him.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, and I said they were slobbering over nothing. I have heard it discussed so often. There was not a suggestion made in the speech that was not debated over and over again in this House, and the fact that they are not ful-

filled to-day is in several instances due entirely to the present government who had it in their power to carry them out. The late government were prepared to carry out the suggestions had they remained in power, and would have carried them out long before this. If the people do not to-day enjoy these advantages it is because of the men—I was going to say the incompetents—who have occupied the treasury benches for the past eleven years. I would not have spoken upon this question had it not been that the government have not dared to utter one word in defence or justification of this, or to say what they are going to do with regard to the stealing of the money of the country, the dishonest conduct of their own employees.

Mr. JOHN H. SINCLAIR (Guysboro). This debate, Mr. Speaker, has taken a very wide range. Hon. gentlemen opposite have gone back into ancient history and have made many gloomy predictions as to the future; but not one of them, to my mind, has made any fair attempt to meet the splendid statement made in the budget speech of the hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding).

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is this the budget debate?

Mr. FIELDING. You might ask the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Clements) who said that he was cut out on the budget debate and was now cutting in.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The story which the hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) had to tell was heard with delight by every patriotic Canadian. It was a story of increasing trade, increasing prosperity, increasing deposits in the savings banks, improved transportation facilities, a surplus on the Intercolonial Railway, a surplus in the post office and a surplus in the general revenue of the country, the largest in the history of Canada. With all these evidences of prosperity before them my hon. friends have made more blue-ruin speeches than it has ever before been my misfortune to listen to. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) went pretty far; he saw all kinds of bogies across his path, but the past master as a blue-ruin prophet was the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). There was nothing too doleful for that hon. gentleman. The lamentations of Jeremiah were cheerful reading compared to that hon. gentleman's remarks in this debate. If there is one thing more than another characteristic of the Canadian people it is that they are hopeful, that they look forward with great courage and hope to the future, and that they have no use for the pessimist, for the man who sees nothing but blue ruin ahead of the country. My hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) to-night made a very eloquent reference to the ship of state. Let me tell these hon. gentlemen that the people of Canada will never commit the care of the ship of state to a lot of Jonahs, a number of whom mutinied the last time they had charge of her, who are always afraid to get outside the harbour and always see breakers ahead, whereas in fact the sky is clear, and the wind fair and the ship is sailing along on her triumphant course, steered by a pilot who has weathered many a storm, who still has a steady hand on the tiller and in whom the people of Canada, the owners of the ship, have implicit confidence. I sympathize with hon. gentlemen opposite in the fact that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has left them nothing to talk about, that he has exhausted the whole subject. He went over every thing that a man could possibly discuss in connection with the budget debate, leaving nothing at all for the men who sit to his right and left.

Mr. FOWLER. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is referring to a previous debate.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman who preceded him (Mr. Sproule) did nothing but refer to a previous debate and why should not my hon. friend enjoy the same privilege?

Mr. FOWLER. It was open to my hon. friend to take the point. I will answer the question of the Minister of Finance. It is now twelve o'clock at night and I do not think the members are desirous of listening to a written essay such as is being given by the hon. member for Guysboro, who is reading his speech. For that reason I rise to the point of order in order that we may not have such a speech.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. member for West Kent (Mr. Clements) was permitted to enter upon the budget debate; every one who has spoken to-night has done so and I submit that it is now too late to object.

Mr. FOWLER. I have the right to raise the point whenever I see fit.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I intend dealing with questions discussed by the last speaker (Mr. Sproule). That gentleman referred at great length to the question of immigration and endeavoured to condemn the policy of the government in regard to the paying of bonuses on immigrants. I understood from him—I do not know whether he intended to convey that idea to the House—that he was under the impression that the government were paying bonuses on all immigrants coming into Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. No.

Mr. SINCLAIR. He may not have thought so, but listening to him I received that impression because he spoke of all the insane

men among the immigrants or men who could not work and repeatedly asserted that these were the men on whom the government had paid bonuses.

Mr. SPROULE. Was I not speaking most of the time of farmers and farm labourers on whom they do pay bonuses ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. He said they represented themselves as farmers and farm labourers, and found their way into this country in that way. He said that the government had paid bonuses on these people. Would he be surprised to find that the government had paid bonuses on only a small proportion of the immigrants who have come into Canada in the last eleven years ? I find from the record that from 1897 to 31st December, 1907 we received in Canada from northern Europe 359,575 immigrants, and paid bonuses on only 27 per cent of that number.

Mr. SPROULE. Did that include the North Atlantic Trading Company ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. That included all the immigrants we received from Northern Europe, not including the British Islands, during that period. My hon. friend will also note that a great many people came into Canada from other parts of Europe on whom the government did not pay any bonus. Hon. gentlemen opposite appear to think the government have been paying bonuses on people coming from southern Europe, whereas they have never at any period paid bonuses on such immigrants.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the hon. member explain what he means by southern Europe ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I mean the countries of southern Europe, such as Italy and Greece.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What about Roumania, Bulgaria and Transylvania?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I stated that the government never paid bonuses on any immigrants coming from countries of southern Europe. For every man on whom the government paid a bonus they got a settler on the western lands. They have placed more homesteaders on the lands of the west than the number of men on whom they have paid bonuses. If hon. gentlemen will examine the records of the Interior Department, they will find that while bonuses were paid on 27 per cent of the immigrants from northern Europe, 28 per cent of these immigrants settled on the lands of the west. When hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, they paid out a great deal of money to bring people to this country, but got almost no settlers, so that after eighteen years the western prairies were still a wilderness, while we have this splendid record, that for every man from northern Europe on whom a bonus was paid we have settled a man on the western prairie. So we have not lost one dollar of the bonuses we have paid. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) wishes to know the countries from which the people come on whom bonuses are paid. Under the present arrangement the government pays bonuses on three classes of immigrants—farmers, railway navvies and female domestic servants coming from the following countries : Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, France, Belgium, Germany and Finland in northern Europe, and also from the British isles. My hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), in his speech the other day, informed the House that we ought to be paying bonuses on people coming from Germany. I was surprised to find the hon. gentleman, who is supposed to be an authority on German questions, making a statement like that. I do not know whether there are any Germans in his constituency but I suppose there are, and his speeches must be for them.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I might take the liberty of informing the hon. gentleman that the hon. member for East Lambton has no Germans in his riding. He talks on the basis of principle. I know it is a surprise to the hon. gentleman to find him doing so.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement, but I would like to have some explanation of the deep interest the hon. member for Lambton takes in the Germans. This is what he said in regard to immigration :

> Then, Sir, on account of the present regulations of this government, within the last eleven years the immigration into Canada from Germany has been little or nothing, and I am sure there is not a man in this House but who realizes the importance of a German community in any country such as Canada. Instead of us assisting immigrants to come from southern parts of Europe it would be better for us to get into better relations with Germany——

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise the point of order again. The hon. gentleman is referring to a previous debate. I would like to have your ruling on that.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, the rule is well understood, that there cannot be any reference to a past debate. But this afternoon and this evening it seems to have been accepted by the House, commencing with the hon. member for West Kent (Mr. Clements) that the budget debate should be practically continued, and I have been assuming up to this point that that was the disposition of the House. If the point of order is pressed, I shall of course have to rule that there cannot be any reference to a past debate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. If I may be permitted, the hon. Minister of Finance and I think the Speaker rather misquoted me in saying that I referred to the budget debate. I did not treat on it to any extent.

Mr. FIELDING. I was obliged to leave the House to receive an important deputation, and as I left I distinctly heard the hon. gentleman state that he had some observations to make in the budget debate, which he now wished to continue. I admit that the hon. gentleman cannot make the quotation. We have been on the budget debate the whole afternoon.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I was pointing out that the hon. member for East Lambton condemned the government for paying bonuses on immigrants from southern Europe.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman is doing the same thing again. If he proposes to do that, I propose each time to raise the question of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member refers to a past debate and the point of order is pressed, I shall have to rule that he cannot do so.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am simply discussing the question which the hon. member for East Grey discussed. If any hon. gentleman asserts that the government has been paying bonuses on immigrants coming from southern Europe, he is mistaken. There has never been such a policy. If any hon. gentleman is under the impression that the government is not now bonusing immigrants from Germany as well as from other countries of northern Europe, he ought to try and inform himself on that question, and when an hon. gentleman gets up in the House and tells us what we ought to do, when it happens to be the very thing we are now doing we are surprised.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has this government an agent in Germany?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I understand that the policy of the government is to pay bonuses to booking agents in Germany or anywhere else in northern Europe—that since the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company has been cancelled, any booking agent in northern Europe who sends an immigrant to Canada, and succeeds in settling that immigrant on the lands of Canada, is entitled, after the immigrant has become a citizen of Canada, but not before, to the $5 for securing the immigrant, provided the immigrant is a farmer, a railway navvy or a domestic servant.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is $5 the bonus today ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I understand that it is.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has it not been doubled ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I think the hon. gentleman will find that is the bonus.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says so.

Mr. SPROULE. I was informed it was that some time ago. It is a little more now.

Mr. CLEMENTS.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am afraid there is a good deal of misapprehension, not only among hon. gentlemen opposite but in the country with regard to this question of immigration. I was very much suprised the other day to see an article in the Toronto 'Globe,' on the front page of that paper, framed in a pretty way and headed with large letters 'The Goth is at our gates' and giving the name of some Italian who had murdered some other Italian somewhere in the province of Ontario and suggesting that the government should not pay bonuses on immigrants from southern Europe. I was surprised to find that such a well informed paper should haye been led astray, but the reason is hon. gentlemen opposite from day to day make these statements in this House and the Conservative press repeat them, and the result is that they deceive the very elect, and the people run away with the idea that our immigration policy is altogether different than what it really is. I have pointed out to the House that out of all the immigrants we have received from northern Europe, we have only paid bonuses on the 27 per cent who have settled on our lands. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) asked some questions a few days ago and got a reply, and since then the matter has not been referred to by my hon. friend, but the question he asked was such an interesting one and the answer was so interesting that I wish to place both on record :

Mr. BLAIN asked:

1. How many immigrants of every kind arrived in Canada each year since 1896?

2. On how many immigrants has a bonus of any kind been paid in each year since 1896?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

	Total No. arriving.	Total No. on which bonuses were paid.
1. 1896	16,835	4,484
1897	21,716	2,432
1898	31,900	8,664
1899	44,543	4,588
1900 to June 30	23,895	19,700
1900-1	49,149	16,309
1901-2	67,379	15,294
1902-3	128,364	27,945
1903-4	130,331	47,973
1904-5	146,266	32,604
1905-6	189,064	33,680
1906-7 (9 months)	124,667	14,070
1907-8 (9 months)	235,328	20,516
	1,209,437	248,249

So that it appears that out of 1,209,437 who reached our shores since 1896, we only paid on 248,249.

Mr. SPROULE. Are the immigrants from the United States included in that ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I think so.

Mr. SPROULE. What calculation was made with regard to the bonuses on these immigrants? The government pay $3 a

head on what they get from the States, but I suppose they are not included in that as bonus paid immigrants.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am endeavouring to expose the fallacy that we have paid bonuses on all the immigrants who have come in. I do not wish the hon. gentleman to run away with the idea that when he finds a crazy man in some part of Ontario who happens to be a newcomer, we have paid a bonus on that man. Some of the crazy men he discovers in parts of Ontario are most likely men on whom we did not pay a bonus at all.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there a calculation showing that we have paid a bonus on the Americans or not? My understanding is that we paid $3 a head to the agent who gets them. If that is not a bonus, I do not know what is.

Mr. SINCLAIR. True we are paying a bonus of so much a head but only on certain classes and we have only paid on a very small proportion of the whole. What does the hon. gentleman want? Does he want to build a stone wall around the country and keep out these immigrants. The Department of the Interior is taking great care in the selection of immigrants. I have watched them arrive at the port of Quebec. Every man was examined by a doctor. I heard the questions asked as they went through the turnstile, and none were allowed to pass unless fit to pass examination. A large number were sent back and the greatest care was exercised by the officers of the department. What is the policy of my hon. friends opposite regarding immigrants or have they any policy at all? Do they condemn the policy of paying a small bonus of $5 on a farmer who will settle on our western land and help to defray the burden of taxation ? Do they remember that the debt of this country per head has been reduced by the fact that the policy of the Interior Department has been so vigorous. When they were in power the debt per head was $50, but because so many immigrants have come into the country, the debt per head to-day is only $42. Do my hon. friends remember that ? What is their policy I would like to know ? They have condemned the government, but I do not think they are justified in condemning the government for paying a small bonus of $5 for farmers who settle on the western land. Farmers are necessary out west to till the soil and so are navvies to build our railways. Then there is a great demand for female domestic servants. Our fellow citizens in British Columbia paid $400,000 into the revenue of the country to introduce Chinamen to do the domestic work of that province during the past year. That is the condition throughout Canada.

I do not think that my hon. friends, if they face this question squarely, will condemn the government for their present policy. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said we did not get the right kind of immigrants. Well, we are paying $5 a head for every respectable farmer from Ireland who comes to this country. Are they the right class of immigrants ? I have heard it said that my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) claims to be of Irish descent. Does he object to immigrants coming from Ireland ? Are there no good men there ? Or what does he mean by condemning the payment of $5 a head for farmers from Ireland ?

Mr. SPROULE. I did not object to that. The hon. member (Mr. Sinclair) is merely setting up an argument of his own to answer it in his own way.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Is not the farmer from England all right ? The hon. gentleman dilated for a long time on the class of immigrants from London. Well, are we going to shut out a man from this country because he happened to be born in London ? The hon. gentleman says that we ought to be condemned for letting men come here from the cities. Well, if a man is so unfortunate as to be born in a city is he to be kept outside the borders of Canada ? Surely the hon. gentleman is not so narrow as that. But, what do these hon. gentlemen mean. I have listened to their speeches, but I fail to find out what their policy is. We are paying for immigrants from Germany. Does the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) condemn that ? I think that if the question is looked at fairly, hon. gentlemen will change their minds concerning it.

Some hon. gentlemen opposite have spoken of the rural delivery of mail. I do not think that we in Canada are ready to adopt that policy. I am inclined to think that it would be too expensive. We have too many other things to do. Our people are very anxious to have transportation facilities, they are in need of railways, public works, of canals—of many things that are more important to them than receiving their letters and newspapers at their own door. This appears to be the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, but it will be a very extravagant policy. They lecture us day after day on economy. But, if we introduce rural mail delivery, we must spend a great deal of money. It is estimated, I believe that it cost $30,000,000 in the United States. I do not think it could be done for anything less in a sparsely settled country like Canada. At any rate it will cost a great deal of money—perhaps $20,000,000. I do not think we can afford to spend $20,000,000 in the carrying of our mails. Of course, like everybody else, I am proud of the record our post office has made. When the Liberals came into power, as everybody will remember, the post office service was in a very backward condition. Like all the other departments, it had become a kind of political machine. Mail contracts were giv-

en to favourites of the late government. When Sir William Mulock took charge of the post office as a member of this government, hon. gentlemen will remember there was a deficit of $781,000. One of the first acts he performed was to cancel a large number of improvident mail contracts—perhaps I should use a stronger term than 'improvident.' However, he cancelled them and put the contracts up to tender, the result being that he saved on these contracts the sum of $103,000 a year. If you consider that these contracts run for four years you will see that he saved no less than $412,000. It will be remembered, as it was drawn to the attention of the House this winter, that a proposition was laid before the late government to reduce the postage from 3 cents to 2 cents. But Sir Adolphe Caron, then Postmaster General, said it would be impossible to do so. Here are his words :

> The government has no intention of reducing the rate of postage on letters. The loss of revenue would be $700,000.

It was only about three years after that that Sir Wm. Mulock took this step that was said to be impossible and made the reduction proposed. And we all know what the result was. He had deficits for the first two or three years and then he began to have surpluses. And if we look over the record for the last eleven years, every man must be proud of that record.

(1) Postal facilities have been provided for the Yukon and for a large number of new settlements in the west at very great cost.

(2) The number of letters increased from 116,028,000 in 1896 to 364,095,000 in 1907, an increase of 248,000,000. Of course there was also a large increase in the staff of the employees to handle all these letters.

(3) The annual mileage or travel of the mail has been increased by 12,254,211.

(4) New post offices to the number of 2,186 have been established.

(5) 7,941 money order and postal offices have been established.

(6) 298 new savings banks have been started.

(7) The increase in the amount of money transmitted by money orders and postal notes aggregated the enormous sum of $34,847,440.

(8) The number of savings bank depositors has doubled.

(9) The salaries of postmasters of smaller places have been increased from $12 to $35, and, of course, in the larger post offices large additions to the service have been made and paid for. Notwithstanding all this, last year, instead of a deficit of $781,000 as in 1896, we had a surplus of $1,011,965 for nine months. Estimating at the rate for the whole year, we should have a surplus of $1,349,020 But, to make a comparison, with 1896, we should add the old deficit, and this gives us a financial betterment of no less than $2,130,172. But even that is not all. By the reduction of the English postage from 5 cents to 2 cents, and the Canadian postage from 3 cents to 2 cents, we have saved another $1,000,000 which is in the pockets of the people of Canada. I say this is a record of which every Canadian ought to be proud, I do not care on which side of the house he is. There is one thing I want to suggest and I am glad that the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) is here, and that is that the surplus should be spent in improving the system. We cannot afford rural delivery of mails, but we can afford a great many more daily mails than we have at present.

Speaking for my own province, and in looking over the post office returns there are 96 post offices in the province of Nova Scotia that have only a weekly service. Now in this 20th century I think there should be no people in this country receiving a mail only once a week. There are a good many who receive only two mails a week, and a good many others who receive only three mails. As much as possible I think we ought to give to the people in the country districts a better mail service. My idea would be to spend the whole of the surplus in improving the service, in increasing the number of daily mails. That would be doing the greatest good to the greatest number. Our farmers and farmers' sons would be more content to live on the land if they were brought into closer touch with civilization by getting a mail every day. I trust therefore that the Postmaster General will take that matter into consideration, and that instead of piling up surpluses he will, as the member for North Toronto says, 'open the floodgates,' and let us have a larger number of daily mails throughout the country.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am open to conviction.

Mr. SINCLAIR. While I am talking about the financial state of the country, I wish to refer to the fact that the Intercolonial has shown such a good year, I would not be properly representing the people of Nova Scotia if I did not show an interest in the success of that great railway. That Intercolonial Railway, like the post office during the time of the Conservative regime was also a political machine. In 1896 it had been allowed to depreciate, the rails were worn out the roadbed was bad, the rolling stock was bad, it was a second-class affair all round. It had no western terminus, it ended in a field opposite the city of Quebec. It could not be expected to get business. But this government pushed it forward to the great city of Montreal, to the centre of commercial life in this country, and they did it against the determined opposition of hon. gentlemen opposite. Hon. gentlemen oppo-

site opposed that project, as they opposed every other progressive movement we have in this country for the last eleven years. They were not only opposed to that railway, but they were opposed to the railway through the Crow's Nest Pass, which has done a great deal for the development of the west. They were opposed to the Grand Trunk Pacific, which has broadened the habitable belt of this country and opened up an enormous district in the west. Nearly everybody in Canada is in favour of the Grand Trunk Pacific to-day. But the record of these gentlemen is that they were not only opposed to the Intercolonial coming to Montreal, but they have been opposed to every progressive movement to improve transportation which has been made by this government for the last eleven years. Now I was pointing out that this road had no western terminus. But this government provided one, the old 56-pound rails were taken up and replaced by 80 pound rails; better roadbed was made, new rolling stock was obtained, fine large engines were purchased, bridges were made and strengthened and built of steel, and we have now a splendid railway running down through the maritime provinces. We have some of the best trains you will find on the American continent; I do not think there is a better train anywhere on this continent than the Maritime Express. Not only in the passenger service but in every service a great improvement has been made. Under the old system that existed in those lonesome eighteen years that we all deplore, when you shipped freight on board the Intercolonial you did not know when it would reach Montreal. Sometimes it was for weeks on the way. At present, we have a schedule train called the fast freight, that leaves Halifax and Sidney at a certain hour in the day, and arrives in Montreal under schedule time. It takes about 60 hours I think from Halifax to Montreal. But you are sure when you put your freight aboard that train that it will reach its destination in fair time. That train has done a great deal for the development of the industries of Eastern Canada; it has done a great deal for the fishing industry, because we are now certain that when we put a crate of fresh fish on board that train it will get through in proper time, whereas we could not be certain under the old system. Improvements of that kind have been made, and the Intercolonial to-day is a credit to the people of Canada.

But the Intercolonial is not perfect any more than the post office, and I have this criticism to make, that it has not done enough to develop traffic and to reach the outlying districts along the route, that it has not done enough to work up traffic by acquiring branch lines, and by building branch lines to places where traffic can be secured. The Intercolonial is a great artery passing through the country but has no veins to feed it. No government that has existed so far have adopted the policy of building branch lines. You would scarcely believe it, that in the province of Nova Scotia, one of the oldest provinces in Canada, there is a district lying east of the city of Halifax, about 150 miles in length and forty miles in width, with about 40,000 of a population, with great resources of timber, a good agricultural country, a mining country, with large fishing resources, and that for thirty years this Intercolonial Railway has been skirting the northern border of that district, and I do not think they have ever sent an engineer into that district to explore it, and to see if it were possible to work up a traffic by building a branch into it. That was the policy of the Intercolonial under the past government and so far it is the policy under this government. So far we have not squarely faced the question of building branch lines. I trust that we will, I know that everything cannot be done at once. My hon. friends opposite are on the wrong side of that question also; because a few days ago my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), who is the railway authority that hon. gentlemen opposite follow, said that the capital expenditure on the Intercolonial must stop. Now, Sir, I presume that is the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, that they are following their leader in that as in other matters, and that if they were in power they would not spend another dollar on capital expenditure for the Intercolonial Railway. That means that we can never acquire any of the existing branch lines, that we can never build branch lines, for we cannot build them out of ordinary revenue as everybody knows. That seems to be the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, and is the same kind of policy that I have described in regard to the other railway and transportation proposals in this country. They are on the wrong side of that question as they have been on the wrong side of all the other progressive movements that have been made. I trust, however, that the government will take that matter up, that they will look at it carefully, and see where there are places that traffic could be worked up and where branch lines could properly and successfully be built, so that they may make of the Intercolonial, not only in name but in reality, the road of the people of Canada.

My hon. friends opposite have been condemning us for the expenditure. Now, Sir, it is true that we have spent a good deal of money during the the past eleven years. That question has been settled by the people on two or three different occasions. You will remember, Sir, that in the election of 1900 we were condemned for this expenditure and we were returned by a very large majority when the people had pronounced their verdict. In the election of 1904 hon. gentlemen opposite, with the defeated candidates, who are so numerous among their friends, spoke in every hall and school house

and from every platform in Canada condemning this government for their large expenditure, but when the people marked their ballots you know what the verdict was. My judgment is that the people want expenditure, that they are anxious to have it and hon. gentlemen opposite, with the propositions they make from day to day, such as rural mail delivery, the building of tunnels and the building of this and that, although they condemn the government for doing these things, in their moments of weakness they seem to be in favour of large expenditure themselves. At all events, they have voted for most of these expenditures and they are now condemning the government for them. Not only are the people satisfied with these expenditures, but they are proud of the fact that this government has been able to expend so much money without putting the country in debt. The people are very much impressed with the fact that while the government have spent a large amount of money on capital account they have been able to do this out of ordinary revenue.

Mr. BOYCE. The Grand Trunk Pacific, for instance.

Mr. SINCLAIR. As my hon. friend has reminded me of the Grand Trunk Pacific, I would like to speak of that for a moment. We are proposing to spend this year $30,000,000 on the Grand Trunk Pacific. We are proposing to borrow only $12,000,000 of that amount. Do my hon. friends think that is a very bad record? When we went into the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific we expected to borrow the whole of the money. We were not aware that we would have a surplus with which to build any part of the road, but instead of borrowing this money we are going to be able to build a large portion of this road out of ordinary revenue. We are going to be able to invest $18,000,000 out of the ordinary revenue of the country in a permanent investment—not a debt at all—but an investment of our money that will bring the people 3 per cent for all time to come. Are my hon. friends not satisfied with that? Three per cent on $18,000,000 will bring over $500,000. We are making an investment that will put half a million dollars each year into the treasury of Canada for all time to come. When the youngest man opposite has reached his hundredth year, if he lives to be a hundred, the sum of half a million dollars will be paid into the treasury of Canada for the ordinary revenue of the country on account of the investment that we are making this year. Surely they ought to be satisfied with an expenditure of $30,000,000 and a borrowing of only $12,000,000. Yet they cry out about the terrible thing that we are doing. We expect to have a fair return from that investment, not only a return in interest, but a larger return in the development of the country. I am surprised that hon. gentlemen do not get converted on that question. I could say a good deal, if I had the time, about the question of expenditure. I could point out that certain services of the country were very much neglected in the time of hon. gentlemen opposite, for example, public works on the coast of Nova Scotia. There was very little attention paid to that class of expenditures in the time of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) laid down the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to that question when he said that these little places on the coast of Nova Scotia should not receive any consideration at the hands of the government, but that we ought to expend our money in the larger places, in the big places like Toronto. Those were the places where the Dominion government ought to spend their money and they should allow the people who live in the little places to go without such public works, or construct them at their own expense.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to ask my hon. friend when and where the hon. member for North Toronto ever said that?

Mr. SINCLAIR. In a speech on the 6th day of July, 1905, which my hon. friend will find in 'Hansard,' page 8926. The hon. member for North Toronto, in discussing these expenditures, said:

> I never knew that it would be possible to find in the province of Nova Scotia, for instance, the names of so many places where wharfs and breakwaters and piers could possibly be built, as I find in the estimate which has been placed before us this year. All geography needs to be revised, all knowledge by the most liberal-minded and best travelled has to be extended in order to grasp the almost infinite number of little places in the province of Nova Scotia where large expenditures are made, and I am bound to say, out of nine-tenths of which no corresponding revenue at all comes to this country.

Then, a little further on he makes this statement:

> The expenditure is going up millions and millions every year, this government usurping enterprises which ought to be carried out by individuals, by corporations, by municipalities and by provinces. It is a nice thing for the provinces, but it is a demoralizing thing to the country as a whole.

Mr. FOWLER. It does not bear out the statement that the hon. gentleman made.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it does.

Mr. FOWLER. Absolutely, no. There is not a word about Toronto in connection with it.

Mr. SINCLAIR. My hon. friend was talking about the construction of wharfs and public works on the coast of Nova Scotia and he made the statement in effect that the government should not undertake these works at all in the little places, but that they should be built by the munici-

palities and provinces, meaning that if the fishermen in these places along the coast of Nova Scotia wanted public wharfs or breakwaters built, they must tax themselves for them, while the larger places like the city of Toronto are to get all the money that is to be spent for public works by this government. While the hon. gentleman was condemning the expenditure on the coast of Nova Scotia there was before the House at that very time a very large expenditure for a public work in the city of Toronto and he did not raise his voice against it. That was allowed to go through; but if it is proposed to build a little wharf for the protection of fishermen and for the use of the fishing industry on the coast of Nova Scotia he condemns it. What does he mean, when he refers to an infinite number of little places? Does he mean that those little places should have these wharfs or does he mean that they should not have them? I think if the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) will analyze that speech of his leader from North Toronto, he will find that he is opposed to these expenditures for wharfs and breakwaters on the coast of his own province as well as on the coast of Nova Scotia. That seems to be the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite, but it is not the policy that will be acceptable to the people of the country. The people of Canada are prepared to develop not only the west but the older provinces as well. We have a good country in the east, we are doing to-day everything in our power to develop the industries and the resources that we have in the east as well as in the west, and if hon. gentlemen opposite would take an enlightened view of this question, if they would look at it as we look at it on this side, they would support us in these expenditures instead of condemning us year after year. I could continue this argument at greater length if the hon. gentleman desires me to do so, but I think I have satisfied him that his party have been on the wrong side of this question, as they have been on the wrong side of the transportation question.

Mr. BOYCE. On the wrong side of the House.

Mr. FIELDING. That is what keeps them there.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I do not care to make invidious comparisons between expenditures in one place and in another but when the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) stated that the little places on the coast of Nova Scotia, where this government is building public works, should not receive these benefits.

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. member never made that statement.

Mr. SINCLAIR. He condemned the building of these wharfs and breakwaters on the coast of Nova Scotia—I do not think that is putting it too strongly. I had the curiosity to look up what he did in this respect when he was a minister himself. I selected for comparison the public works in the city of Toronto and on the coast of Nova Scotia, and I find that the expenditures by the late government for the years from 1885 to 1894 inclusive, were as follows:

	Harbours and rivers Nova Scotia.	Toronto Public Works.
1885..	$ 14,050	$ 21,328
1886..	95,400	23,400
1887..	208,162	66,850
1888..	60,450	117,575
1889..	60,700	70,800
1890..	143,200	81,500
1891..	166,810	135,300
1892..	135,990	80,800
1893..	97,154	165,000
1894..	105,102	94,000
	1,077,018	856,553

This shows that when my hon. friend was a minister he spent nearly as much in public works in that one city as he did for wharfs, breakwaters and improvements on the whole coast of Nova Scotia. It will be noticed in this list that the large expenditures are in 1887 and 1891. Perhaps my hon. friend from Hamilton will know why the expenditures in Nova Scotia were so large in those particular years? Perhaps he will tell us? In 1887 the comparatively large amount of $208,162 was spent on the coast of Nova Scotia; whereas in 1885, two years before, only $14,050 was spent, showing that during the year of the election in 1887, my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) increased the expenditure by 1,500 per cent above what it was two years before, and in the year 1891, he increased it 200 per cent above what it was in 1889. What does that mean? My hon. friend is always very fond of percentages, and it is an extraordinary circumstance that in the year of the election 1887, he should have increased the expenditure on the coast of Nova Scotia by 1,500 per cent compared with what it was two years before. This is the hon. gentleman who lectures us, who day after day turns up the whites of his eyes and lectures the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance on buying the people of Canada with their own money. I could hardly believe that when he was Minister of Finance he would open the flood gates in that way during the election years. Surely it was not done in the public interest? He is always asking if these expenditures by this government were made in the public interest. Was it in the public interest to increase the expenditure by 1,500 per cent in the year of the election, or was it done in a moment of weakness?

Mr. BOYCE. Would the hon. member point to any expenditure made at that time which was not in the public interest?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Certainly not. I think they were in the public interest ; the trouble was there were not enough of them.

Mr. FIELDING. If there had not been an occasional election we would never have got anything.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Even the election in the county I represent did not bring any money because we had a habit of sending members here to support the Liberal opposition and during fourteen out of the eighteen years there was no money at all spent in my county. Expenditures were made in certain other portions of Nova Scotia ; lighthouses, breakwaters and improvements of that kind were required in Guysborough but no expenditures were made although eloquent appeals were made by Mr. Fraser and Mr. Kirk, my predecessors. No money was granted and we were told by a minister of the Crown who visited us on one occasion that if we wanted any money we must vote for the government. We were told very plainly by a late Minister of Public Works that that was the only way we could get any money for expenditures in Guysborough. But we chose to support the Liberal opposition and continued to do so during the whole period. We are there still at the old stand, and will continue to support the same party in the next election.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SINCLAIR. My hon. friends are cheering. I tell them it is a fact, that it would be very difficult to return even one Conservative in Nova Scotia if the elections were to come on now. The hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) looks a little alarmed at that, but I think that even the people of Colchester will be of the same opinion as ourselves and will say that the present government is good enough for Nova Scotia.

Mr. BLAIN. New Brunswick is down in the east.

Motion agreed to and House went into Committee of Supply.

Progress reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BLAIN. What business will be taken up on Monday ?

Mr. FIELDING. I understand there was an agreement between the Prime Minister and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, that a motion which my hon. friends of the opposition will make will come up then. In supply, the estimates of the Minister of Public Works will be considered.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.05 a.m. Saturday.

Mr. BOYCE.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, April 13, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

TREATY WITH UNITED STATES RE BOUNDARY AND FISHERIES.

Mr. SPROULE. I would call the attention of the right hon. the First Minister to the following paragraph which appears in this morning's 'Citizen' :

Washington, April 11.—Secretary of State Root and British Ambassador Bryce to-day signed two treaties negotiated recently between the United States and Great Britain One provides for a commission to determine the boundary between the United States and Canada and the other regulates fishing in the great lakes and contiguous streams. The boundary commission will be charged with the work of resurveying certain sections of boundary line and determining disputed questions in that connection. It is said that the fishery question also is placed in the hands of a commission by the terms of the treaty.

Are the government in a position to give the House information ? Have they any control over the appointment of the commissioners or over their selection, especially on behalf of Canada?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I have just received a telegram stating that these two treaties have been signed. One refers to the boundary. It is not contemplated to establish new boundaries but simply mark again the boundaries and describe them on maps. The second deals with the fisheries. In the contiguous waters, we have had difficulties for many years owing to there being a close season on our side and none on the American side. By the treaty all contiguous waters will be put under a commission which will make regulations for the fisheries. The appointments on the British side exclusively belong to the government of Canada.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I would like to ask the government if it will lay upon the table the two agreements which have been concluded between Great Britain and the United States and the correspondence connected therewith. I see in this morning's Montreal 'Gazette' a reproduction of a despatch to the New York 'Herald' making a rather long reference, which I will not read, to Canada's attitude. This despatch is from London to the New York 'Herald' and dated about 12th April. There must be considerable correspondence, and there are also the two agreements. May we expect that these will be laid on the table ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It goes as a matter of course that, as soon as the ratifications of the treaties have been exchanged and we have received them, they will be

communicated to the House, as well as the correspondence. I have not seen the articles to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) refers, but I have seen articles in the American press to the effect that there are some other questions as to which negotiations are pending. Of course, this correspondence cannot be brought down until the matter is concluded.

MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPARTMENT.

Mr. FOWLER. I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) to the alleged misconduct of one of the officers——

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not proper to introduce matter for discussion at this point.

DREDGING CONTRACTS.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). May I ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) if the appropriation to be voted this year at Midland and Tiffin harbours for improvements—which I take it is dredging—amount $75,000, and Victoria harbour, $75,000, has been given to two companies known as the Canadian Construction Company and the Owen Sound Dredging Company, without tenders being asked for?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Certain dredging work, which would form part of these improvements, was let last year by public tender, and by the terms of the contract the time for the completion of the work is to be fixed by the minister. The question of giving until the close of the present season for the doing of the work is under consideration. The matter will be decided in a few days.

Mr. BENNETT. Are any tenders to be called for the work to be done at either point during the coming season, or are those companies to proceed at the commencement of navigation with the work to be done there ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If I exercise the power which is contained in the contract of fixing the time during the present season, either at the close of navigation, or earlier, new tenders will not be called for and the prices will be determined by the tenders called for in the early part of last season.

Mr. BENNETT. Has an order in council been passed to this effect ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. An order has been passed authorizing the Minister of Public Works to fix the time if he sees fit to do so.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the hon. gentleman lay a copy of the order on the table tomorrow, as I propose to make some remarks on going into Supply ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it the intention to give dredging at other places without calling for tenders and for the same schedule prices as last year ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The matter is under consideration. I have had a very strong report made by the chief engineer of my department, stating that, in quite a number of cases, where the prices were obtained fixed by competition after public advertisement, and in which he certifies that they are reasonable and that the contractors are equipped with complete plants for doing the work, it would be in the public interest to fix a period during the coming season for the completion of the work. The matter is under consideration with regard to a number of cases.

Mr. BOYCE. Are there any other cases mentioned in the order in council besides the two spoken of by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The order in council will speak for itself when it comes down.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I have a letter from a dredging firm wanting to know if works in Lake Ontario will be let by tender as well. Is the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) in a position to give any information on that point at the present time ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think I can only repeat the statement that the order in council when it comes down, will show.

Mr. BENNETT. In this connection, will the minister be good enough to bring down the report of the chief engineer, as well as the order in council ?

DISTRIBUTION OF SEED GRAIN.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I desire to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) to an item that appeared in the Toronto 'Globe' of Saturday last.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is this with the intention of asking a question ?

Mr. LENNOX. Yes. The item reads as follows :

An order in council has been passed relating to the distribution of seed grain in the Northwest by permitting advances to be made to settlers who have sown no grain in the season of 1907?

I would like to ask the minister if such an order in council has been passed as is here referred to and, if so, under what authority it was made ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). There was an order in council of the nature of which my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) speaks. It was passed under the same authority as the regulations providing for the distribution of seed grain which were brought before parliament and discussed here, as the House will remember. At that time the view was very generally expressed that it was not desirable that the

distribution should be restricted in this particular as it was restricted in the regulations as they were brought before the House. I explained at that time that it was thought desirable that we should not then expand them, but that, if circumstances afterwards, should seem to justify it, we might do so. Finding that the requirements were not as large as we had anticipated, finding that our purchases were sufficient to cover such requirements as might be made, such as are mentioned in this order in council, we thought we should be acting in the public interest, and, as well, carrying out the views of parliament, by passing the order in question.

Mr. LENNOX. If I may be permitted, I would ask leave to call the attention of the minister to the fact—as I remember—that he refused, at that time, to expand the resolution, and the statute was founded on the resolution as originally introduced without alteration, that is, without providing for these cases now arising.

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely. The statute, of course, provided a certain amount of money. Had the requirements been of a greater amount of money than the statute provided the case would have been different. But as the statute provided that the seed should be distributed according to the regulations passed by the government, and agreed to by the provinces ; and, within the terms of that statute, we believed, this order could be passed.

Mr. LENNOX. And the order provided to whom it would go——

Mr. SPEAKER. I would call again the attention of the House to this custom of reading newspapers and from questions drifting into discussion. This is a clear violation of the rules of the House, and I shall have to rule much more strictly if this is continued.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE. Has application been received by the department for assistance to people in northwestern Ontario—Algoma for instance ? And, if so, is it the intention of the minister, or is it under consideration, to give assistance to people in that section similar to that to be extended people in the Northwest provinces ?

Mr. OLIVER. My memory is that I did receive a communication from some part of northwestern Ontario on the subject of seed grain. My reply was that the conditions were not similar to those existing in the western country, as, in the first place, so far as homesteaders were concerned, the Dominion government had no obligation in regard to the homesteaders in Ontario as it had in regard to the homesteaders in the three western provinces, and, in regard to those who were not homesteaders, as our action in the western provinces was in co-operation with the provincial governments, and, as there was no co-operation with the government of Ontario, the cases were not similar.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION REPORT.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). I desire to ask the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) with regard to a matter which, so far as I know, has not been fully answered. Last Thursday, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asked if Judge Cassels would soon commence his investigation, and if he was appointed to investigate any wrong-doing in any of the departments. To this the right hon. gentleman answered that Judge Cassels had been appointed, but he did not know when the judge would commence his investigations. Another question was asked whether a departmental investigation was going on in the meantime, to which he replied that he could not say. The same question was put the next day, Friday, at a time when the right hon. Prime Minister was not in the House, but the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) said he would call the attention of the right hon. gentleman to the matter when he came in. I cannot find any record showing that the matter was called to his attention or that he answered the question. Is any departmental investigation, under oath, going on in the Department of Marine and Fisheries ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I stated that I was investigating certain matters brought to my attention, but, of course, the investigation cannot be under oath because I have no authority to swear witnesses. I am making the investigation for my own satisfaction.

Mr. BERGERON. But there is an investigation going on ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am investigating for my own satisfaction, the facts which come to my knowledge every day.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 153) to incorporate the Saskatchewan Power Company (Limited).—Mr. McCraney.

Bill (No. 154) respecting the Board of the Presbyterian College, Halifax.—Mr. Sinclair.

Bill (No. 155) respecting the Pontiac Central Railway Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 156) respecting the Northern Bank and Crown Bank of Canada.

QUESTIONS.

CONTRACTS LET ON GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

1. What contracts and for what mileage, and the price at which each have been let, upon the eastern and western sections of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway?

2. What is the date of each contract, and the period set for completion?

3. What is the estimated cost of the unlet portions?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Contracts have been let on the eastern division of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, on schedule rates.

STATEMENT NO. 1.—COMMISSIONERS—EASTERN DIVISION.

Mileage from Moncton. From	Mileage from Moncton. To	Description.	No. of 1 Miles.	Amount of Estimate on which Contracts were let.	Date of Contract.	Date of Completion.
				$ cts.		
0·00	50·00	Moncton to near Chipman	50·00	989,895 90	Mar. 14, '07	Sept. 1, '08
50·00	58·55	Near Chipman easterly 8·55 miles	8·55	289,190 62	Aug. 23, '07	Aug. 1, '08
58·55	97·60	Near Chipman westerly to I.C.R. crossing.	39·05	767,434 95	Mar. 28, '08	Sept. 1, '10
97·60	164·00	I.C.R. crossing to Mile 164	66·40	1,898,124 21	" 28, '08	" 1, '10
164 00	195·80	Mile 164 to Grand Falls	31·80	1,646,253 65	" 28, '08	" 1, '10
195·80	256·68	Grand Falls to New Brunswick boundary..	60·88	1,385,941 09	" 9, '07	" 1, '08
256·68	309·74	N.B. boundary to 150 miles east of Quebec Bridge	53·06	2,377,409 00	" 28, '08	" 1, '10
309·74	459·74	From Quebec Bridge 150 miles eastward. Quebec Bridge link (not included in estimate)	148·89 1·11	5,011,346 50	" 9, '07	" 1, '09
459·74	509·74	Quebec Bridge westerly 50 miles	50·00	1,489,537 92	May 15, '06	" 1, '07
509·74	609·74	50 miles west Quebec Bridge to 150 miles west	100·00	3,807,719 54	" 15, '06	" 1, '07
609·74	654·74	150 miles west Quebec Bridge to near Waymontachene	45·00	1,691,073 41	Mar. 14, '07	" 1, '08
654·74	656·07	To be included in this contract	1·33			
656·07	877·75	Near Waymontachene to near Harricanaw River	221·68	Not let.		
877·75	1,027·75	Near Harricanaw River to Junction T. & N. O. Ry	150·00	3,986,901 42	" 14, '07	" 1, '09
1,027·75	1,127·75	Junction T. & N. O. Ry. for 100 miles west	100·00	3,936,566 00	" 28, '08	" 1, '10
1,127·75	1,171·85	100 miles west of Junction T. & N. O. Ry. to west end of District 'D'	44·10	Not let.		
1,171·85	1,334·35	West end of District 'D' westerly	162·50	"		
1,334·35	1,409·35	From 19½ miles west of Mud River, easterly	75·00	2,101,499 88	" 28, '08	" 1, '10
1,409·35	1,429·76	" " " to west end of District 'E'	20·41	Not let.		
1,429·76	1,557·80	From westward District 'E' to Lake Superior Junction	128·04	"		
1,557·80	1,804·66	From Lake Superior Junction to west bank of Red River	246·86	13,010,398 92	May 15, '06	" 1, '07

As to the portions not let; the estimated total cost is $19,030,173.

On the western division; contracts have been let as follows, on schedule rates.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC—STATEMENT No. 2.

For grading the roadbed, building culverts and small bridges :—

Date of Contract.	Name of Contractor.	Location of Work.	Date set for Completion.
June 22, 1907..	Treat & Johnson, Brantford, Ont., or Winnipeg, Man.	Winnipeg to Portage la Prairie, 54 miles.	Nov. 1, 1907.
Aug. 28, 1905..	McDonald & McMillan, Winnipeg, Man.	Portage la Prairie to Touchwood Hills, 275 miles.	Completed.
Feb. 20, 1906..	Canadian White Co., Montreal, Que.	W. line Sec. 6, Tp. 27, R. 13 W. 2nd Mer., to W. line Sec. 24, Tp. 36 R. C. W. 3rd Mer., 140 miles.	Completed.
Feb. 20, 1906..	Foley Bros., Larsen & Co., Battleford.	W. line Sec. 24, Tp. 36, R. 6 W. 3rd Mer., to a point near Edmonton, Alta., 316 miles.	Nov. 1, 1906.
Jan. 4, 1908..	Foley, Welch & Stewart, Kenora.	East line of Sec. 13, Tp. 53, R. 24 W. 4th Mer., to east bank of Wolf creek, 129 miles.	Nov. 30, 1908.
Mar. 19, 1908..	Foley, Welch & Stewart, Kenora.	Prince Rupert to Copper River, 100 miles.	Aug. 31, 1909.

The estimated total cost of the prairie section is $21,872,200.

A great many other contracts have been let by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, for which no information is available.

With reference to the mountain section of the western division: The Grand Trunk Pacific people have completed a preliminary survey to ascertain what grades can be secured; and are now engaged in revising and working out in detail the final location, from which, the quantities not being available, no estimate can be supplied.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Answered by No. 1.

The department is advised that contracts have been awarded for the items mentioned hereunder, but no details are available at this date.

Concrete piers, pedestals and abutments of steel bridges.

Steel superstructure of large bridges.

Station buildings.

Engine houses and machine shops.

Water services.

Steel rails and fastenings, frogs, diamond crossings, &c.

Ties.

Fence posts.

Telegraph posts.

ADULTERATION OF MAPLE SYRUP AND SUGAR.

Mr. BOYER asked :

1. Does the government intend to rigorously enforce the law against the adulteration of maple syrup and sugar?

2. Has it had samples of that product of last year analysed?

3. What was the result per district in the province of Quebec, as well as per province?

4. Have proceedings, fines or penalties of any kind been taken against or imposed upon certain persons found in possession of adulterated syrup or sugar?

5. If so, what are the names of such persons and the results of such proceedings?

6. Has the government one or many special inspectors to superintend the sale of maple syrup and sugar?

Hon. WILLIAM TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). The law against the adulteration of maple syrup and sugar will be enforced and special instructions have already been given to that end.

Samples were collected last year with results as below :

	Adulterated Samples.
Nova Scotia	6
Prince Edward Island	4
New Brunswick	3
Quebec	1
Ontario	51
Manitoba	6
Alberta and Saskatchewan	6
British Columbia	0

Mr. GRAHAM

The department has food inspectors who collect, throughout the Dominion, such samples as may be required.

CONCRETE PIPE FOR INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked :

Are tenders for concrete pipe asked for on the Intercolonial Railway at Moncton? If so, what are the dates of the last two tenders, to whom were they granted, the amount of goods purchased, and the cost of same?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Yes. June 6, 1907, and March 6, 1908. The first contract was given to the Dominion Concrete Company of Kemptville, Ontario, for the following quantities and the price set opposite each :

June 6, 1907—

					Lineal foot.
410	feet	18	inches	round at	$ 70
350	"	21	"		85
742	"	24	"		1 10
460	"	30	"	flat bottom at	2 25
130	"	36	"	"	2 90

The second tender was awarded the Dominion Concrete Company, of Kemptville, Ontario, for the following quantities, and at the price set opposite each :

March 6, 1908—

					Lineal foot.
748	feet	36	inches	flat bottom at	$2 90
34	"	30	"	"	2 25
1,500	"	27	"	round	1 30
522	"	24	"	"	1 10
25	"	18	"	"	70
700	"	12	"	"	40

This last tender has only been awarded lately.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—PROTESTS RE LANDS.

Mr. BARKER asked:

1. Has either the government or the National Transcontinental Railway Commission received from the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company or the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, or from any person on behalf of either such company, any protests or objections respecting the acquisition of lands for the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway, or as to the cost thereof, or respecting any works of construction upon the said division, or as to the cost thereof?

2. What was the nature of such protests or objections, if any?

3. Have all such protests or objections, if any, been finally disposed of and settled?

4. If not disposed of and settled, has any and what arrangement been made to postpone or suspend the matters involved?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). As to the first part of the question, no; or as to the cost thereof, no. As to the third part of the question no

dispute has arisen as to any work of construction. Mr. H. A. Woods, assistant chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, by a letter dated October 7, 1907, objected to the classification, as to grading material on certain portions of the work in district 'B.' The matter was investigated by the chief engineer of the commissioners, who gave his ruling as to the interpretation of the clauses of the specifications relating to the classification; and Mr. Woods' objections were found not to be correct. Nothing further has been heard by the commissioners of such objections.

WRECK OF TUG 'CASTLE.'

Mr. BENNETT asked:

1. Were tenders invited for the removal of the wreck of the tug 'Castle,' sunk in the Detroit River?
2. If invited, how many were received, and what were the figures of each?
3. If more than one tender, was the lowest accepted?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Yes.
2. Two. The Midland Towing and Wrecking Company, Midland, Ontario, $1,750; Eug. Lamontagne, Quebec, $8,750.
3. Yes.

PIERS IN ST. FRANCIS RIVER, RICHMOND.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

1. What was the total cost of the building of piers in the St. Francis river below the town of Richmond?
2. What was the total cost of piers above the town?
3. What was the cost of repairing the piers below the town in 1907?
4. What was the cost of blasting rock and repairs to piers during the present year?
5. Was the work so done let by contract or by public tender?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Questions 10 and 11 relate to the same work. I am getting the information, and I will have it to-morrow. I would call my hon. friend's attention to the fifth part of question 11: 'Was the work so done let by contract or by public tender?' I am not quite sure what he means. Does he mean by days work or by public tender?

Mr. BLAIN. That is a misprint.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What should it be?

Mr. BLAIN. Was the work so done let after public tender.

POSTMASTER AT RUSAGORNIS.

Mr. WILMOT asked:

1. Does the government know that it is stated Mr. Albry Brass, postmaster at Rusagornis, Sunbury county, New Brunswick, was an active political partisan in the Dominion election, 1904, also in the late provincial election in New Brunswick; that he was a nominee of one of the candidates at the latter election, and that the post office is used for political meetings?
2. If upon investigation it is found the above inquiries are substantiated, will the present incumbent be retained in office?
3. What is the government policy in regard to postmasters engaging in the active work of political contests?

Hon. R. LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. No.
2. If charges are made against the postmaster, they will be investigated and a decision come to on the facts.
3. The government discourages postmasters engaging in active work of political contests; if they do so, they are aware they do so at their own risk.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY—STATION AT ALMA.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Blain—asked:

Has any petition been received for the building of a station at Alma, on the Prince Edward Island Railway? If so, when, and what is the intention of the government in regard thereto?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Yes, a petition was received by the Department of Railways in February last. The matter is now under consideration.

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. RALPH SMITH asked:

1. What number of provincial Acts in all the provinces have been disallowed by the Dominion government since January, 1904, to January, 1908, and in what provinces, respectively?
2. What was the title and date of each enactment of each Bill?
3. What were the reasons given for such disallowance?
4. What number of petitions have been received from British Columbia for or against the disallowance of provincial Bills enacted by the above legislature, and by whom were such petitions presented?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1. Five; all Acts of British Columbia.

2.

Act.	Chapter.	Title.
3 and 4 Edw. VII.....	26.....	An Act to regulate immigration into British Columbia.
5 Edw. VII...	67 or 28...	An Act to regulate immigration into British Columbia.
	81 or 30...	An Act relating to the employment on work carried on under franchises granted by Private Acts.
	85 or 36...	An Act further to amend the Coal Mines Regulation Act ....
	18...	An Act further to amend the Supreme Court Act..

3. The first four statutes were re-enactments of statutes which had been previously disallowed and were allowed for the same reasons as had been given for previous disallowances. See Reports on Legislation for years 1899-1900, pp. 135 and 144, Reports on Legislation, 1901-1903, pp. 80 and 88, and Reports on Legislation, 1904-1906, pp. 130 and 137.

The Act to amend the Supreme Court Act was disallowed because it purported to limit the scope for the selection of judges appointed by His Excellency the Governor General.

4. Two petitions in connection with the disallowance of provincial Acts were received from British Columbia within the time stated; one from the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company and one from the city of Vancouver. (Vide Reports on Provincial Legislation 1904-1906 pp. 120 and 126).

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. How many miles of the National Transcontinental Railway, Winnipeg to Moncton division, have been actually completed within the limits of the province of Quebec?
2. Where are the said completed sections situated?
3. How much has been expended to date on said completed sections?
4. Are there any parts of said completed sections in actual operation?
5. Are there any parts of said National Transcontinental Railway, Winnipeg to Moncton division, within the limits of the province of Quebec, under contract for construction? If so, what parts?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1, 2, 3 and 4. No portion of the Transcontinental Railway, within the limits of the province of Quebec has been actually completed.

5. That portion of the entire line within the limits of the province of Quebec, from a point known as Weymontachene, about 196·33 miles west of the Quebec bridge, easterly to the boundary between the province of Quebec and New Brunswick, is under contract.

REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE LOBSTER FISHERY.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Has the government received any communication from the Fishermen's Union of Nova Scotia, or from Mr. Bernard Cummings, Secretary of that union, containing suggestions or requests as to alterations in the regulations concerning the lobster fishery?
2. What is the nature and purport of such requests or suggestions, and when were they received?
3. Has the government given any reply or come to any conclusion in respect to the suggestions or requests?
4. What is the policy of the government in respect to the matters referred to in the above-mentioned communications?
5. Will the government lay copies of all the papers upon the table of the House?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Yes.
2. That the size limit for lobsters in Cape Breton be reduced, Mr. Cummings' letter is dated March 12, 1908.
3. A reply was sent to Mr. Cummings on March 18.
4. The whole question of the lobster fishery regulations is under consideration.
5. Yes.

STATUTES OF THE PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. LAVERGNE asked: (Translation).

1. Is the government aware that Chapters 2 and 25 of the Statutes of the province of Saskatchewan, 1907, respectively, "An Act for raising money on the credit of General Revenue Fund of Saskatchewan", and "An Act to provide for the organization and maintenance of Secondary Educational Institutions", contain provisions contrary to the Educational Clause of the Act establishing the province of Saskatchewan, 1907.
2. Is the government aware that the delay for the disallowance of these Acts expires on the 22nd April next?
3. Does the government intend disallowing these Acts?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1. No.
2. Yes.
3. No.

PURCHASES OF LEE-ENFIELD RIFLES.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked:

1. How many Lee-Enfield rifles has the government?

2. What are the dates of purchase of these rifles by this or any other government, and in what lots or from whom were they bought?

3. What prices were paid?

4. What was the cost of the bayonets for the Lee-Enfield rifle?

5. In what lots were they bought, from whom, and on what dates?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence) :

1. About 37,000. The South African contingents were allowed to retain their rifles, thus accounting for the difference between this and the original number purchased.

2. On March 4, 1896, 40,000 magazine Lee-Enfield rifles, Mark I, complete, were purchased by the Canadian government from the War Office. They were supplied as follows :

(a) From Royal Small Arms Factories, 18,850.

(b) From Birmingham Small Arms and Metal Company, 13,000.

(c) From London Small Arms Company, 8,150.

Nothing is known of the purchase of rifles by any other government than the Canadian government.

3. The net prices, at the factories, including a charge for War Office departmental expenses, were:

(a) For rifle complete, from Royal Small Arms Factories, £3 1s. 9d.

(b) For rifle complete from the trade, £4 4s. 5d.

The cost of each rifle complete, laid down in Canada, exclusive of duty, was:

(a) For rifles supplied from Royal Small Arms Factories, $15.75.

(b) For rifles supplied by the trade, $21.25.

The English War Office list price for the present magazine Lee-Enfield rifle is £4 5s. net, making the cost laid down in Canada, $27 for each rifle.

4. The net prices at the factories, including a charge for War Office departmental expenses, were:

(a) For bayonets with scabbards, complete from Royal Small Arms Factories, 10s. 3d.

(b) For bayonets with scabbards complete, from trade, 13s. 11d.

The cost, laid down in Canada, exclusive of duty, was :

(a) For those supplied from Royal Small Arms Factories, $2.60.

(b) For those supplied by the trade, $3.53.

The present War Office list price for bayonets with scabbards complete, is 13s. 6½d., net, at the factories; making the cost laid down in Canada, $4.10 each, as against $2.60 in 1896. These War Office prices do not include trade charges or profit.

5. On March 4, 1896, 40,000 bayonets complete were purchased from the War Office. They were supplied as follows:

(a) From Royal Small Arms Factories, bayonets, complete, 20,000.

(b) From Saunderson Bros. & Co., bayonets, 20,000.

(c) From Allan Cooper, scabbards, 20,000.

6. Col. Lake, who made these purchases on behalf of the Canadian government, reported, in regard to the arms purchased by the War Office from the trade, as follows:

'The War Office took into consideration this large order when concluding its contracts, just then under revision, with the trade, for the manufacture of magazine rifles; and as a consequence of this revision of contracts, the prices of those stores were very much lower than the list prices upon which my estimates had been based.

The prices for the arms manufactured in the government factories were also unusually low in consideration of a part payment having been made in advance.

The prices obtained were thus much lower than usual, principally owing to the accident of the order having been received by the War Office when the War Office contracts with the trade were being revised. This revision was found necessary because the former price had included some provision for the payment of the contractors' initial expenditures for plant, machinery, etc.; and it was considered that this initial expenditure had by that time been paid for.

CONSTRUCTION OF FORTIFICATIONS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

1. Are any fortifications in course of construction at or near Quebec or Lévis?

2. What is the nature of these fortifications?

3. Are they being constructed by the British or Canadian government?

4. What is the estimated cost to be, and when will they be completed?

5. Is the construction being done by contract or by day labour?

6. If by contract, to whom has such contract been let?

7. Who is in charge of construction?

8. With what guns is it intended to arm these fortifications?

9. What is the date of their purchase, their manufacture, their calibre, and their range?

10. When were these guns bought?

11. Did any one act as purchasing agent for the government in the purchase of these? If so, who?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). I hope this question will be dropped. It is not a question, I think, that would ever be put in any parliament in any country, certainly not in England or in the United States. If the leader of the opposition desires information as to the construction of fortifications that information will be given to him at any time.

Mr. SPEAKER. Dropped.

MEDICAL OFFICER AT CANSO.

Mr. STANFIELD asked :

Has the Port of Canso a special medical officer to look after infectious diseases? If so, who is the officer, when was he appointed, and what is his salary?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (for Minister of Agriculture). The Department of Agriculture, which has care of infectious diseases, states that there is no such officer at Canso.

SUPPLY—STATUTES OF THE PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to give notice to the government that upon the next day upon which the motion is made for the House to resolve itself into Committee of Supply I shall discuss the legislation of the province of Saskatchewan about which I have put a question to-day.

INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (Kings, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the government to the fact that some of their officers in the city of Halifax are taking undue and improper interest in an election to the neglect of the duties for which they are appointed and for which they are being paid by this country. It seems that at the present time there is a civic election going on in Halifax and that Dr. A. C. Hawkins is a candidate for mayor. This Dr. A. C. Hawkins is also the health officer at the port of Halifax, for which he receives a salary of $1,000 a year, together with a couple of very nice uniforms covered with gold lace, an overcoat and two or three hats and caps. He has also called to his assistance in this civic campaign a number of other officers of the government, notably one E. M. Wilson, foreman of the car cleaners at the North street station, and one Albert Tobin, of the round house staff at Richmond. I would call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) to this fact. There is also one Wm. Merlin, of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Merwin ?

Mr. FOWLER. Not Merwin, but Merlin, the enchanter. There is also one Geo. McNamara, of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. These people are taking a very active interest in the election, and I believe that so intense is the devotion of Dr. Hawkins to his campaign that a ship with a thousand immigrants has been held at quarantine—delayed—because this gentleman is canvassing for the position of mayor of the city of Halifax rather than attending to the duty for which he is paid. I think this is a matter of very great importance, and in view of the declarations that have been made by the various ministers in regard to public officials taking part in elections some severe examples should be made of these gentlemen.

Mr. SPROULE. We should have some explanation from the Minister of Railways, particularly as a similar matter has been brought to his attention two or three times this session already. Surely the minister is going to take some action. Is he going to treat with contempt the circular which was issued by Mr. Pottinger and which said that employees of the Intercolonial Railway should not as a general thing run for municipal office.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is different.

Mr. SPROULE. In what respect?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no suggestion in this case that an Intercolonial Railway official is running for office.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that some of these are Intercolonial Railway employees.

Mr. GRAHAM. No. It is merely stated that he is calling to his aid some men to help him. These men are citizens and I suppose they have the right to vote.

Mr. SPROULE. They are employees of the Intercolonial Railway who are doing partisan work in connection with municipal affairs .

Mr. FIELDING. What is there partisan about it?

Mr. SPROULE. There is this : An employee of the Intercolonial Railway goes into the shops and threatens the men if they do not vote so and so. That is partisan work.

Mr. GRAHAM. That never was suggested.

Mr. FIELDING. Who says that ?

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member who took his seat.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. SPROULE. In my opinion he has a letter in his hand which specifies that.

Mr. FIELDING. He may, but he did not say so.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this quarantine doctor to be allowed to employ his time, for which he is paid by the country, in canvassing for the position of mayor and leave a vessel detained outside the harbour with 1,000 immigrants and no one to attend to them. Has the Prime Minister nothing to say about that ? The Minister of Railways laughs as though it were an amusing thing.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is, very.

Mr. SPROULE. What is there amusing about it ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The amusement is that my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) is lecturing me while he is discussing the acts of an official who does not belong to my department at all.

Mr. SPROULE. I was speaking about employees of the Intercolonial.

Mr. GRAHAM. They are not candidates.

Mr. SPROULE. They are canvassers, and partisan canvassers at that, and they are deliberately violating the rule laid down by the Prime Minister a few years ago.

Mr. EMMERSON. Is this doctor a Grit or a Tory.

Mr. SPROULE. I never inquired, and I don't know anything about his politics. Recently I was told when I called attention to a similar case with regard to employees on the Intercolonial that I was pitching into a Tory. I don't care a straw about that, because if it is wrong in a Grit it is wrong in a Tory, and I have no standard by which I draw a distinction between the two in these matters. No matter what party an official belongs to I say it is wrong.

Mr. STANFIELD. I understand the Minister of Railways to say that no charge has been made against officials of the Intercolonial taking part in elections, but I have a letter with regard to the same matter. Let me read this passage from the 'Gazette':

> Not only did this terrible delay mean that the passengers were kept in confinement and without food for a day, but everything at the immigration station during the doctor's absence was at a standstill. Four trains were delayed for six hours, and all the other immigration officials and the railway men were kept idle.

I think that should be looked into.

Mr. GRAHAM. That does not at all refer to any member of the Intercolonial staff being a candidate or being absent from his employment.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It is the medical officer.

Mr. GRAHAM. It does not follow at all from the statements read by the hon. member that any employee of the Intercolonial Railway is a candidate in an election. Now, as to the general question and so far as the employees of the Intercolonial Railway are concerned, I may say that this matter is probably more strictly considered on that railway than on any other railway in Canada. In my own town the employees of the Grand Trunk are not only candidates themselves but they take an active part in municipal elections. Are you going to say to a brakesman or to any other employee of a railway: You are to be disfranchised, you must not say a word to your neighbour about municipal politics; you must not take any interest whatever in municipal affairs. Well, I believe the peop'e of Canada do not want that kind of thing.

Mr. SPROULE. The Grank Trunk is not a government railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a thing that has to be considered from the point of view of common ordinary horse sense. I say that an employee of the Intercolonial Railway should not be offensive, and it is better he should not be a municipal candidate unless there is some exceptional consideration, but to say that he must not take any part in the municipal government for which he is taxed is going to the length of absurdity, even if the railway is owned by the government.

Mr. FIELDING. There is only one point in the observations of hon. gentlemen opposite which really deserves consideration, and that is that a steamship with a large number of immigrants has been detained unduly by reason of the neglect of the medical officer. That is a matter which certainly well deserves consideration. But hon. gentlemen will see that the mere publication of a statement in a newspaper, and a newspaper which is not supposed to be entirely beyond the suspicion of political bias, is hardly sufficient ground for the government to take action against the officer. If any hon. gentleman who has knowledge himself will send a statement to the proper minister that any officer of his department has neglected his business in the manner described, that would be a proper matter for investigation. Now as to the partisan side of it. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) says he does not know whether this candidate is a Grit or a Tory. I accept his statement, but if he does not know whether the man is a Grit or a Tory how does he bring the partisan element into the question at all?

Mr. SPROULE. The partisan element is that he threatened employees they would be dismissed if they did not do so and so.

Mr. FIELDING. We have had no such statement made to the House. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) has imported that into the discussion. The hon. gentleman from King's and Albert did not make that statement, and it would appear that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is giving away more of the game than was intended. However that may be, the only point worthy of consideration is as to whether this officer in Halifax has neglected his duty. There is a distinction between a municipal and a Dominion or provincial election. We were asked earlier in the session to lay down some rule with regard to municipal elections elsewhere, and it is a very difficult matter to do so. A rule may be laid down with respect to a Dominion election and probably with respect to a provincial election also, but it may be a question as to whether you would be justified, in the case of a man who happens to be a citizen of a municipality and a Dominion official at the same time, in refusing him the right to take part in a municipal elec-

tion. But if in doing so he should neglect his public duties, then unquestionably that would be a proper matter for investigation, and I am sure that the minister in whose department such an officer is employed would feel it his duty to investgate any representations to that effect which might be properly made.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG. (East Lambton). Mr. Speaker, after listening to the remarks of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) and the replies of gentlemen on this side of the House, I wish to call attention to the fact that Mr. Hawkins is receiving money from the government. He is medical officer at the port of Halifax under the Interior Department. I shall read an article in the Ottawa 'Journal' of to-day, which gives a full description of the occurrences at Halifax. The article is as follows:

Halifax, Nova Scotia, April 13.—The immigration department at Halifax have furnished another subject for government investigation. Formal complaint has been made to the Ottawa government of what amounts to inhuman treatment of a large number of the 1,100 passengers who came by the Allan steamer 'Tunisian' from Liverpool.

The official who is charged in this complaint is Dr. A. C. Hawkins, the chief medical officer, without whose certificate no passenger can leave the detention room at the immigration sheds. The passengers had breakfast on board the steamer, and many of them were kept without food till 11.30 that night, when the last of the crowd was passed.

Dr. Hawkins began his examination at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, the people then tired out with the long waiting. He worked for three hours and stopped at six, then leaving the building not to return till 9.45 p.m., when the task was resumed on an almost famished assemblage of angry people. He got through shortly before midnight.

Not only did this terrible delay mean that the passengers were kept in confinement and without food for a day, but everything at the immigration station during the doctor's absence was at a standstill. Four trains were delayed for six hours, and all the other immigration officials and the railway men were kept idle. The half-starving passengers, as well as those who had got through and were waiting to get off, naturally made a great outcry and vowed vengeance.

The doctor is conducting an active election canvass, which may account for his absence, but this did not mitigate the condition of the hundreds of passengers, who were practical prisoners without food.

Under the circumstances I feel that members on this side of the House are thoroughly justified in bringing forward this question and demanding from the Minister of the Interior some explanation in regard to it.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, I agree with those who have gone before me that when any formal complaint is made to the Minister of the Interior with regard to the conduct of any of his officers, the minister should take formal notice of it. The very worst construction which my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) can place on the article he has read is that the fact of Dr. Hawkins being a candidate for the mayoralty may have accounted for his being absent from his duty in examining the ship. Is that not so?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I read the article, which I think is a sufficient explanation.

Mr. JOHNSTON. In fact, the worst he can say is that this may have been the cause of the action complained of; the hon. gentleman is not in a position to make a definite statement of fact.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I was addressing the Minister of the Interior. I cannot understand how the hon. gentleman comes in.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am addressing my hon. friend and pointing out to the House the absurd position in which he places himself, a position of which he should be ashamed, if he has any regard for the dignity of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. Both hon. gentlemen will recollect that they must address the Chair.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I addressed my hon. friend, and I was pointing out to him, through you, the very absurd position he occupies before the House and before you. If a charge is brought against this officer of the Department of the Interior I have no doubt the Minister of the Interior will look carefully into the matter. I am sure every hon. member on this side of the House will agree that this course should be taken.

However, we have here a question of much greater importance than the question of whether a certain official in Halifax is a candidate for the municipal elections. On the general question of the relation of government officials to municipal politics I hold the view that acceptance of office by any citizen of this country should not debar him from participating in municipal matters in the community in which he lives. I hope every member on this side will take the same view, and I wish the position taken by the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) to-day to be distinctly understood not only in this House, but in the country at large. Hon. gentlemen opposite have laid down a position which I am sure when it is understood by the people of Canada will not meet with their approval. It is that if a man accepts office at the hands of the Dominion government, no matter how small or how great that office may be, from that time forward he is to take no part whatever in municipal matters in the town or city in which he resides. It means that government employees abandon all claims of citizenship where they reside. That is the position taken by the hon. member for

Grey (Mr. Sproule), who is leading the opposition at the moment, and who speaks as the leader of his party and lays down the policy of his party in this matter. It is to the effect that henceforth men occupying positions on any part of the Intercolonial Railway must not take any part in municipal matters. It is well for the people of the country generally to realize the position taken by these hon. gentlemen. I hold, as I have always held, the view expressed by the Minister of Railways this afternoon, that men employed on the Intercolonial Railway have a perfect right to assert themselves in municipal matters in the towns or villages in which they reside. I shall do all in my power to maintain that right for them. They are residents of the municipality; they pay taxes, and why should they not participate in civic matters? Why should they not with me have the right to determine who is and who is not a fit person to represent them on a municipal board? Our hon. friends opposite will deny that right. We on this side are content to have our policy on this matter go to the country side by side with that of our friends opposite, who assert this afternoon that henceforth their policy is to be to deprive these men of all rights as citizens.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmoreland). I do not wish to prolong this debate, but I entirely endorse every word uttered by the hon. member for Sydney (Mr. Johnston). If the government undertake to control the officials of the Interior Department or any government official with respect to the exercise of their civic rights, they might just as well undertake to say what fraternal societies their officials should join and what churches they should attend. It seems to me that the doctrine laid down by the present leader of the opposition (Mr. Sproule) is entirely too absurd and will not be accepted by the citizenship of this country in any province.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). I am sure the House and the country will feel themselves deserving of congratulation on the permission that has been extended to the leader of the government by the hon. member for Sydney (Mr. Johnston) to exercise his functions in allowing these gentlemen to take part in elections. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) and the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) should feel complimented at the benediction pronounced by that hon. gentleman and the authority he has given them to exercise their functions in the premises. I must congratulate the hon. gentleman himself on his promotion from the somewhat menial position he had a few years ago to the position of dictator of the party. I must also congratulate the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) on the stand he has taken. I would like to have an explanation of the circular which I find dated 23rd of December, 1907. I forget whether or not he was at the time Minister of Railways. Possibly he had vacated the office at that time and was not responsible, or he will have to account for this circular to the present Minister of Railways. I would ask the present minister whether he repudiates the circular issued by him and his own general manager and which is directly at variance with the statements made by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) and the ex-Minister of Railways. That circular is as follows:—

Office of the General Manager, Moncton, New Brunswick,
December 23, 1907.

Circular No. 381.
To employees—
The Minister of Railways——

Not the ex-minister and not the hon. member for Cape Breton, but the Minister of Railways.

—having been requested to allow employees of the railway to offer themselves for candidates and to accept municipal offices, has carefully considered the matter——

Mr. HENDERSON. That is quite a different thing.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (reading):

—and his conclusion is that it is not in the interest of the railway that this should be allowed and that only in such very exceptional cases as the minister may determine——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (reading):

—as the minister may determine the public interest can be served without the interest of the railway being prejudicially affected, shall employees be permitted to offer for and accept such office.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (reading):

This decision is based upon the usual policy of railways in such matters, such policy being considered on the whole as best adapted to serve the respective interests most concerned.

D. POTTINGER,
General Manager.

Mr. TALBOT. Where is the contradiction?

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Through you Mr. Speaker, I am addressing the Minister of Railways and Canals. And this circular is in the face of the statement made by the Minister of Railways a short time ago. However the matter is not worth discussing

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. They can take whichever horn of the dilemma they choose. I am very much surprised that the present Minister of Railways should take a reprimand from the ex-Minister of Railways and

the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston). It is quite evident these two have placed their ban on the present Minister of Railways and he has had to bow down and collapse.

Mr. GRAHAM. The circular read absolutely confirms what I said a few moments ago.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—ACCIDENTS ON CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. R. BLAIN (Peel). I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways to a despatch which appeared in the Winnipeg 'Telegram' dated April 1st, 1908:

Fearful death record in work on National Railway.

In a period of one year from March 29, 1907, to March 31, 1908, the lives of fifty men have been sacrificed through negligence or carelessness on a hundred mile stretch of the National Transcontinental Railway between the Manitoba boundary and the east end of Canyon lake, a distance of a hundred miles. This does not include those who have been killed on the section east of Vermillion, nor does it take note of the scores of poor fellows who have lost eyes or limbs on those sections of the National Transcontinental.

Further the article says:

It is a weekly, often daily, affair to hear of the horrible deaths which men meet with, to say nothing of the hundreds who are brought to the hospital here mangled, maimed and dying, either to linger on through countless hours of agony, or to recover and go through life with the loss of a limb, an eye, or sometimes of both.

Further on the writer adds:

Jury asked for safeguards.

When death's harvest first began, some two years ago, a coroner's jury memorialized the Department of Railways to take some action to safeguard the lives of the workers. How much notice was taken of the memorial may be judged by the fact that the act of that jury had to be repeated by another, only a fortnight ago, and still Ottawa is silent.

And further on:

Over a man a mile.

It is freely stated in Kenora that on a section of Dutton & McArthur's work, stretching ten miles east of the Winnipeg river, the toll of human life expended was over a man a mile. Perhaps the fifteen miles on the south side of Canyon lake, north of Vermillion, will mark the deathbeds of more men than any other on the hundred mile stretch already alluded to and depicted on the accompanying map.

This newspaper gives the names of forty-eight who have been killed on this line of railway. It would take too long to read the list, but I am quite sure the attention of the minister has been directed to this and other articles referring to the same question. Two causes are given. One is criminal negligence in the use of low grade explosives, and the second is inexperienced workmen. These two points should receive special attention from the Minister of Railways. The minister should not permit his contractors to use cheap explosives or he must expect to have a heavy death rate. I am much surprised that after the grand jury had directed attention to this some time ago, it was necessary for another grand jury to make a second reference to it. We cannot afford, as a Canadian people, in the construction of our railways, to have hundreds of lives taken by carelessness, either on the part of the government or the contractors.

Mr. GRAHAM. The question raised is one of considerable seriousness. The construction of the government portion of the Transcontinental is in the hands of a commission. That commission is responsible to the government and to parliament and has absolute control of the details. Accidents have taken place under the contractors; my hon. friends say there are two causes, namely, carelessness and low grade explosives. I am not in a position to dispute this statement nor do I suppose he is in a position to confirm it. There may be low grade explosives and there may not. That is a statement made by a newspaper. And possibly neither he nor I know if it be true. One thing is certain and that is that the death rate caused by accidents is of sufficient seriousness to attract attention and investigation. It has not escaped my attention altogether. I have had several interviews with the chairman of the Transcontinental Commission. It is pointed out to me that men using explosives become so accustomed to their work that they become oblivious of the danger and it is to their own carelessness largely that these accidents are due. That may be partially the case or may not, but my hon. friend will remember that this is one of the difficulties in getting at the truth of these matters. The legal way to locate the blame is through a coroner's inquest. The holding of an inquest is supposed to be the modus operandi by which the Crown or the public will get at the cause of the accident and will ascertain whether there has been criminal negligence in the case. A few years ago, the Ontario legislature, not being satisfied with the results of coroners' investigations in cases of accident in the construction of great works, passed an amendment to the Act making it more stringent. One of the clauses provided, if I remember correctly—and I am speaking from memory,—that no coroner could hold an investigation who was the medical attendant upon the men for the railway companies, and that no coroner could take part in such an investigation who had an interest directly or indirectly in a contract with the company. There were other provisions, if I remember well, by which the Attorney General took special steps to see that the

investigation was carried on properly. I have asked this question recently of the chairman of the commission and expect to have an answer in a few days as to some of the particulars, if the spirit as well as the letter of the provincial law was being carried out in the holding of these inquests. If it be, there will be no difficulty in arriving at a conclusion as to the direct cause of these accidents. If carelessness on the part of the workmen be the cause the coroner and the representative of the Attorney General should be able to ascertain the facts. If the contractors are using low-grade explosives, there should be no difficulty in the coroner arriving at that fact.

Mr. BLAIN. Why could not the government, through their commission, put a stipulation in the contract that no class of explosives could be used other than high-class explosives ? If that were done, it would settle the matter.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think that if my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) were a practical railway contractor, perhaps, he would not express himself in that way. It is a difficult thing to arrive at, for the examination of explosives might be a more difficult thing than was anticipated.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If the minister's officers cannot ascertain these matters, how can he expect a country jury to ascertain them ? Does he expect them to take a crack at the explosive with a hammer ?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) is a great joker. But this is too serious a matter to talk about lightly. My hon. friend will see that a coroner's jury empanelled under the law, with the coroner taking evidence under oath, can summon the contractor, the manufacturer of the explosive, the seller of it, the men who have used some of the same explosives, and every body else who can give information. They have every facility under the law to arrive at a conclusion.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Who pays the cost of all these witnesses ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman knows that every province has now the machinery for these cases, including providing for costs. The question of provincial rights would be raised at once if we attempted to interfere with the duties of the provinces in this respect. The law of this province and every other province provides machinery to find where the blame rests. But I am making inquiry along these lines and will be able to make a statement, if I can get the information, which will clear the air. I agree that this is a very serious matter, one well worthy the attention of the department. I agree that the government should inquire into the reasons for these accidents in order to learn how this loss of life is to be prevented or reduced.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). A somewhat similar condition existed in connection with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway so far as the hospital provision for the labourers on that railway were concerned. A very bad condition of affairs was shown to exist. Some kind of action was taken by the government and the abuses were corrected.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That was on the Crows Nest Pass ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes. I am glad the minister says that he will intervene in this matter, because it is necessary that some high authority should intervene on behalf of these men. The contractors do not care for human life,—or that is too strong a way to put it ; I mean they have no financial interest other than burying these men who are killed. It would be a humane act on the part of the government to see to it that these men are surrounded with the necessary protection. If there is a reckless loss of life, the government should interfere and prevent it as far as possible.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE (Norfolk). If there is any truth in this report—and I apprehend there is, because this is not the first case of the kind of which we have read —it is quite evident that something is wrong. There are other public works going on, on the Canadian Pacific Railway and on the Grand Trunk, under Larsen and Foley, where explosives are much more extensively used and in which such a state of facts does not exist and cannot exist. The Minister of Railways speaks of the protection afforded by the coroner's inquest as a means of making known the facts in these cases, but it is evident that this machinery is deficient, because this loss of life goes on continually and increasingly, according to what we have heard to-day. I must say I had no idea of it before, and I do not believe the people of the country had any idea of it either, but it is an intolerable condition. We have the Minister of Railways and also the Railway Commission, and these are the people most blameworthy for allowing this condition to continue. I am glad to hear that the Minister of Railways has stirred up the commission, but apparently he has not stirred them up enough. But we have another department that boasts of what it has done, and that is peculiarly in charge of the interest of the working people. I refer to the Labour Department. I have not heard that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Lemieux) and his department has taken any interest in this question. Yet the settlement of it is a simple matter. In the first place, only proper explosives should be used ; and, in the second place, they should

be handled only by experienced people. No contractor should employ an inexperienced man for the handling of explosives, and no government should allow such a thing to be done. There is no need for using poor explosives, because there are so many excellent kinds that I cannot believe the contractor would purchase the inferior. But the fact remains that we have two departments and a railway commission directly interested and directly responsible and yet this terrible loss of life seems to go on and to increase. I think it is time that parliament said something about it and that the minister—both ministers—should move in the matter. It is well enough to speak of coroner's inquests, but where do the jurors in these inquests come from? They are probably interested, or prejudiced or indifferent. I would not insinuate that these men would wilfully render improper verdicts, but if these inquests are held in places where there are no people except the workmen of the contractors, with the boss over them, that is enough reason for saying that an examination should be made by one of these departments to find out whether there is negligence in these cases. It ought to have been done before this time and it cannot be gone about too soon.

Mr. JAMES CONMEE (Thunder Bay and Rainy River). I think that the writer of the newspaper article which has been quoted here is not well posted as to how these accidents may possibly occur. They do not occur through the use of poor or bad explosives. I have had some experience in railway construction, and I am free to say that that has not been my experience. Speaking generally, it is admitted by all who have knowledge of the subject that the higher the explosive the more danger there is. Section B of the Canadian Pacific Railway parallels largely the portion of the Transcontinental Railway now under construction in the west for nearly 200 miles. In the construction of that section of the Canadian Pacific Railway glycerine oil was used, not dynamite, and accidents were more numerous. So when you come to add 80 or 90 per cent of glycerine oil in dynamite, the danger is increased. Accidents occur under the most strict regulations, and there are two or three causes for them. Carelessness is one great cause. But it is not always the inexperienced man who meets with an accident, it is very frequently the man of long experience who makes a mistake, notwithstanding that he ought to know better, and does know better, and ought to use more caution. But experienced men do make these mistakes. I think the history of railway construction will show that to be the case. I have had correspondence on this subject, having my attention lately drawn to it, and I took pains to make inquiry. I have written to a number of contractors whom I know and have received some letters in reply. The hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) stated that the contractors didn't care. I do not think that statement was warranted, it is very much out of place. I think the contractors do care. I think perhaps they have just as much honour and just as much feeling as other people have. Besides, they are deeply interested; accidents cause great loss to the contractors. Most of the contractors insure their men. I think you will find on inquiry that all the men under Mr. McArthur, or any prominent contractor I know of, are insured. Such contractors take precaution to have their men insured, by means of a small subscription monthly from the men themselves, which is supplemented by the contractor himself. So he is more or less interested. It is not quite fair to assume that he is not deeply interested or does not take all the precautions possible to be taken. I know of cases where the most strict regulations were in force, where notices were up in all the camps instructing men how to use dynamite in winter, telling them of the proper method of thawing it, as provided in water jacket cans. Notwithstanding that these strict regulations were in force, enforced as thoroughly as it was possible for the contractor to enforce them, and notifying every foreman and walking boss that if the rules were not enforced he would lose his position—notwithstanding all that, accidents have occurred, for the reason that men disobey these rules, and sometimes they get careless. Now the hon. member who spoke last said there were not as many accidents on the Foley contract as on the Transcontinental. I think he is mistaken. The work is not of the same magnitude. There have been a great many accidents on that work. I know of two young men residents of Port Arthur who met death upon that particular work only a few months ago. The cause in that case was that the charge did not go off, and the men went back, as men sometimes do, to recharge, and the accident occurred. That is a cause of a good many accidents. Men become a little careless when the charge does not go off. These men I refer to were not labourers, they were contractors themselves; they did not send their workmen to run the risk, but they went themselves and took the risk. So it is a very hard matter to determine where responsibility lies. I quite agree with the hon. member that anything that can be done should be done to lessen the number of accidents. But it is a mistake to assume that the article in the newspaper is altogether warranted. The hon. gentleman spoke about the form of contract. I have run my eye over the present form of contract drawn up by the Transcontinental Railway Commission, and it does place all responsibility upon the contractor. He is bound to employ only competent men. The engineer in charge has power to dismiss any men on the works

who are not competent for the duty entrusted to them. There is a very strict condition in the contract under which the work is done in regard to hospital accommodation. The contractor is bound to furnish hospital accommodation and medical attendance for the employees. So far as these matters can be provided for by the ordinary form of contract, they are provided for in this case. I am not taking the ground that something more should not be done. I do not know whether that could be done best by the Minister of Railways, or some official in his department, or whether it could be done best by the provincial authorities. But if anything can be done, certainly an effort should be made to minimize as far as possible the number of these unfortunate accidents.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford). The loss of life in the construction of the Transcontinental Railway, so far as it has gone, has become a very serious matter. I think the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) has done a public duty in calling attention to it. The item he has read shows that 50 lives have been lost on one stretch of a hundred miles, or one on every two miles of that road, and it is not completed yet. I read a few weeks ago that eight men were killed by one explosion and several others injured upon that same stretch. We see that five men are dead and many others are mutilated for life by reason of these explosions that have taken place. They may have been premature, they may have been accidental, or they may have been the result of criminal carelessness. If the accidents were the result of any of these causes, certainly some one should be responsible. The country looks upon this railway, whether rightly or wrongly, as a government enterprise, a government work; the government are putting up the money to build the road, and the people look upon it as a government work. These contractors under the Transcontinental Railway Commission are certainly responsible to some one, and it should be the duty of the minister in the very near future to ascertain whether any precautions are being taken to preserve the lives of the men engaged on that arduous undertaking. We are too apt to say, Oh, they are only Italians, they are only navvies, they are no concern of ours. The ordinary feelings of humanity seem to be almost non-existent these days, because we read in almost every paper about the death of several workmen on some great work. Take the 'Evening Journal' that has been quoted to-day, turn to page 7, there you will find a very sensible letter from an experienced contractor on this very point. I do not know who the writer is, I do not presume that he knew this question was coming up in the House to-day, or had anything to do with it. But he refers, not only to the death of these men in the west upon this rock construction work, but also to the deaths that occurred on another branch of this Transcontinental Railway, that is the Quebec bridge. He makes the statement in that report that if ordinary precautions had been taken, if anybody with any experience had been on the spot, every life that was lost in the Quebec bridge accident could easily have been saved. He says that no man was justified in being on that work at least two or three days before the bridge fell and there was no one to warn the men on the bridge of the danger. There is another section which is responsible for the death of from 80 to 90 persons—I forget the exact number, but it is not less than 80 and not more than 90. Up to this time the loss of life on this Transcontinental Railway has baffled all description in comparison with any other great work that has ever been undertaken in Canada. What is the reason of it? There must be some special reason. This article says that inexperienced men are employed. It said that in the old days when nitro-glycerine or dynamite was being used an experienced man was at the head of every gang and he was responsible. The writer says that they paid these men $4 or $5 a day as bosses of these small gangs and every man acted like a soldier under the direction of the foreman in charge of the gang. A similar precaution should be taken in a case of this kind. Surely the government will not allow men to be sacrificed unnecessarily. We know that accidents will happen, we know that some lives will be lost in a great enterprise of this kind, but is it not unreasonable that fifty lives should be lost in the construction of 100 miles of rock road and that road is not completed yet. It certainly is out of proportion of the work done and if you take the Transcontinental Railway, 4,000 in length, I presume there will be 1,000 miles of hazardous work out of this 4,000. If they go on in the way that my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) has pointed out on that 1,000 miles you will have a loss of 1,000 or 2,000 lives before the road is completed, altogether too much of a sacrifice and not at all necessary. Where lives are lost and no one can prevent it we must view it as an act of Providence, but where men are ruthlessly slaughtered, as they are being to-day, we in this House have no right to keep silence on a point of that kind, and it is the duty of the government to see to it that the Transcontinental Railway Commission, or whoever are responsible, immediately do their duty and see that ordinary precautions are taken to preserve the lives of the workmen of Canada who are hazarding their lives in the building of this great national work. I trust that prompt action will be taken and that we will see a very large diminution in the future in the loss of life that we believe is unnecessarily taking place.

IMMIGRATION.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, before the motion that you have put for the House to go into Committee of Supply is adopted, I desire to move an amendment on the lines that I announced some days ago, seconded by my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Uriah Wilson). The motion I have just placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker, is in the following terms:

While recognizing the importance of legitimate, well directed efforts to encourage desirable immigration, this House declares that it is time to cease paying a bounty at so much per head to agents for immigrants coming to Canada.

The total population of Canada, according to the last completed census, from information which I procured a day or two ago from the chief officer of statistics, Mr. Blue, is 5,371,315 souls. We are, therefore, Sir, considering the vast extent of our territory, a small community numerically and our country could, no doubt and will, support a far greater number of people. There is no congestion in Canada and all will and do, I am sure, agree that an increase of population in Canada is desirable. All must also readily agree that if an increase of population in this country is to accrue to us through immigration from other countries it is essential also that none but desirable persons should be admitted to Canadian citizenship and to the Canadian family. There is no immediate or urgent necessity for filling up the country. A few years more or less in the history of a young nation like ours are of very little account. In building up a nation and especially in merging large masses of foreign people, or even of elements not Canadian born, into the home population, I think that all of us will agree that too much precaution cannot be taken to secure the best elements, morally, mentally and physically to the end that what is imported into the nation will always be of the best, will readily conform to our customs and manners, and will arrive and be disseminated among our own people in such suitable proportions only as you can readily and without undue friction absorb. All this implies selection and the most careful selection, I think, we must admit. Face to face with the tendency to invade America, which is apparent to-day on all sides, from Europe, where an overcrowded population looks eagerly to this western hemisphere, as an Eldorado and a refuge, from the east, where a wave of Mongolians is beginning to surge towards our continent, the figures I will give will show that we will soon be overrun by an immigration which must become an element of large importance in our midst. If that element is not sound, if it does not conform to our recognized and well defined conditions our young nation will suffer great prejudice, and our advancement must be retarded by the arduous problems which will be thrust upon us through our indifference and thoughtlessness.

The question is not a new one; it is a burning question in the United States. We know that about twenty years ago it reached an acute stage in that country. Its immigration reports for the last few years show the truth of what I have just stated, that the question of immigration there presents to the people and to the consideration of the government one of the most formidable problems they have to deal with. It seems to me that in many respects the Americans have dealt with this question as a great nation face to face with this problem. Any one who reads the four last annual official reports of the United States on immigration will very well realize the truth of what I have just stated: That they have allowed the tide of immigration to rise unduly and dangerously in their midst they themselves generally admit and it cannot be denied. They are seeking earnestly to-day to meet as best they can the serious national problems which this has brought upon them. They have endeavoured to check and dam in a certain measure the rush of immigration to their shores. They have increased from time to time the head tax—a tax which is collected from each individual immigrant arriving in the country—they have forbidden for many years all and every aid to immigration in whatever shape, and they have set down restrictive conditions upon entry to their country. The federal government which, in the United States, is charged with the control of immigration, has decided this year to send to Europe a commission, under section 39 of the law which was approved on February 20, 1907, still further restricting immigration. Nine of the most competent men to be found in the United States have been sent to travel in European countries whence immigration comes, and to acquire there all the information necessary for the United States to provide proper legislation with a view towards a solution of the problem which this question presents.

The motion of which I have given notice has been pending for some days and I have in the meantime collected from the official publications of the United States government some figures which may interest the House. These figures I have procured with some trouble, and they are I believe absolutely reliable. I quote the following figures from the official report of the superintendent of immigration in the United States, showing the progress of the wave of immigration into that country:

Total immigration to United States for years mentioned.

Year ending June 30—	
1904	812,870
1905	1,026,499
1906	1,100,735
1907	1,285,349
Total for four years	4,225,453

In spite of the growing restrictive measures, and in spite of the increased head tax on immigrants it will be seen that the immigration into the United States is increasing each successive year. The commissioner for immigration in the United States writes as follows in his last report for the year 1907, page 3, and which is the last report we have at hand :

An army of 1,285,349 souls that have come, drawn hither by the free institutions and the marvellous prosperity of our country; the chance here afforded for every honest toiler to gain a livelihood by the sweat of his brow or the exercise of his intelligence, surpassing in numbers the record of all preceding years. In the light of the past who can prophesy the future. The world can but view with wonder and awakening concern the facility with which we have absorbed the surplus millions of Europe and are now beginning to draw upon the reserve stock of some of these countries, and are even attempting to merge into our population some of the countless hordes of Asia.

I may say en passant that the United States immigration reports are far more ample and more detailed than are the Canadian reports. It is impossible to go through any one of the United States reports for any given year without learning a multitude of very interesting facts, for which we look in vain in the Canadian reports; not only as to the increase in the number of immigrants, but what is far more important, as to their disposal when they reach the shores of the United States. I think our Department of Immigration could very well follow the example of the Immigration Department of the United States in the preparation of its immigration reports. And Sir, let me add that the 4,000,000 immigrants who came to the United States during the years 1904, 1905, 1906 and 1907, were brought to the United States without a single cent of expenditure by the American government, except that expense with regard to which there is no economy in the United States namely, the expense for inspection of immigrants and for the protection of the American people. There is inspection of the most minute character of all arriving in the United States and every precaution is taken to protect the nation from the influx of undesirables. So far as I have been able to find not only from the official reports of the United States but from personal information sought by me in Montreal and in the United States itself, their inspection laws at present are well nigh perfect. Let me say also that this immigration has come to the United States in spite of the head tax upon the incoming immigrants which has produced in these four years the following results :

United States head tax on immigrants.

Head tax collected on immigrants entering the United States—	
1904	$1,599,472 25
1905	2,082,873 50
1906	2,290,901 56
1907	2,782,103 68
Total collected for four years	8,755,350 94

This sum was more than ample to provide a perfect service of inspection and to leave a large balance at the end of each year to the credit of the American government. Now, as I have said, the law in the United States debarring immigrants is very strict and I may mention that the total number of debarred immigrants from the year 1892 to the year 1904, was 47,768. For the four years for which I have already given statistics the number of immigrants debarred from entering the United States was as follows :

Immigrants debarred from entering the United States.	
1904	7,994
1905	11,879
1906	12,432
1907	13,034

These figures are taken from the official reports published by the United States Department of Commerce and Labour. Another feature of the question to which I would call the attention of the House and which is of deep interest to us at the present time, and which must daily become of greater moment, is that feature of the American law which obliges each immigrant landing in the United States to be in possession of a certain sum of money. They consider it a safe provision to absolutely oblige the immigrants to be provided with sufficient funds to maintain themselves and their families upon their arrival in the Republic. Let us see the effect of this law or regulation in the four years for which I have given the figures. Under the operation of this resolution, the following amounts of money were brought into the United States by immigrants, as certified by the officers of inspection.

1904	$20,894,383
1905	25,159,012
1906	25,109,413
1907	25,599,893

That is, in those four years something like $100,000,000 of cash, apart from goods and effects, have been brought by immigrants into that country. This is an item of some importance because I feel that in this respect our law is not sufficient. It is true that under the stress from which we have suffered lately we have temporarily required that immigrants must have with them a certain sum of money, $50 I think during the winter, reduced on April 1, to $25 or entirely discontinued. It is evident that we must amend our regulations more in accordance with the American system if we are to secure in Canada a larger number of people than we are now securing who are able to support themselves after reach-

ing our shores, so that we shall avoid the experience of last winter.

I have deemed it important to place these figures before the House and their preparation has required some care and research. I shall now come to matters more directly affecting our own country. In the American reports we find valuable information as to the immigrants who have reached the United States from Europe through Canada.

In 1904, 30,374 immigrants entered the United States in this way. In that year 2,100 who attempted to enter the United States through Canada from Europe were debarred on account of the laws and regulations of the United States and therefore had to remain in Canada. Of these 762 were paupers, 582 were suffering from loathsome disease, and 293 were prostitutes.

In 1905 the total immigration to the United States through Canada amounted to 44,264, an increase of more than 14,000 over that of the preceding year. The United States, in 1905, finding that the immigrants coming through Canada were very numerous, and finding also, as appears by the four reports to which I have referred, that our own laws in respect to immigration were extremely defective, incomplete and lacking in regard to causes of exclusion and their application, adopted regulations providing the immigrants arriving in the United States through Canada into more than one class. Thus, in that year, we find the 44,264 arriving in the United States through Canada divided into three classes.

(a) Those destined to the United States landed at Canadian ports.

(b) Those arriving in Canada from Europe and proceeding to the United States within a year, and

(c) Those destined for Canada who after the expiry of a year proceeded to the United States.

Of those arriving at Canadian ports with the avowed and declared intention of going to the United States there were 12,663 and 183 were debarred. What became of them when they were debarred at our Canadian ports I do not know, it is impossible to find any trace of their disposition. Were they sent back to Europe in the vessels in which they came to Canada? I doubt it very much. If, on the contrary, they did land and proceeded without examination to one of the examining stations on the Canadian frontier and were there debarred, I doubt very much if they were deported back to Europe.

The second class are those destined to Canada and who have gone to the United States within a year after their arrival in this country. They have to submit to examination at one of the numerous examining stations which the United States government have established along the border, on the ground that we admitted a great many undesirables who found their way into the United States. After having made representations to the Canadian government on that subject which to a large extent the American Commissioners admit have been carried out, still they have found it necessary to establish these posts of examination. In the second class of immigrants we find 8517 and 589 were debarred. I shall not go into the details of the causes of their exclusion from the United States, many were refused admission for those causes which were causes of exclusion from Canada and how they succeeded in entering Canada I do not know. Nor do I know what became of them when they were refused admission to the United States. It is impossible to trace the matter any further, but my own view is that they remained in Canada, and that we have to-day in Canada these immigrants who were deemed undesirables under the American law for pronounced and stated causes.

We have to-day in Canada these immigrants who are deemed undesirable under the American law and pronounced so from causes which no doubt really existed, judging by the thorough examination made by American officers. These undesirables we have in Canada. My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) asks if we paid a bonus on these immigrants. No doubt we did. No doubt they came within the classes, so very extensive and comprehensive, upon which we pay bonuses. Where these people are to-day I do not know, but they were found absolutely unfit for admission into the United States. 8,000 of them were not refused entry into the United States. On these no doubt the government paid a bonus. Why should they not? If these people were booked from England or any other country in which we grant a bonus to immigrants of certain classes—very comprehensive classes—the booking agent got his bonus on them, when they came here, and they afterwards went to the United States. There is a third class and that is those who were destined to Canada and who went to the United States after the expiry of a year. Here we have a still more doubtful case. After the year expired—how long after we do not know—they went to the United States. That is a very large class indeed. They numbered in 1905, according to the official report, 19,308, of which were debarred 749; and the remarks I made in connection with the second class apply with still greater force to this class.

I wish to anticipate an objection which will probably be made by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). After it became evident that a very large number of these immigrants went off to the United States within the year or after the year had expired, the Department of the Interior, through the initiative of the American officers—that was when we were under the unfortunate and mysterious regime

of the North Atlantic Trading Company—arranged with the head office of the American Immigration and Inspection Department in Montreal, where all the returns from these border stations along the Canadian frontier are made before they are forwarded to Washington, to have returns made to the Department of the Interior of those immigrants who, after having come to Canada, went off to the United States. I presume the object of that—I think that was shown by one of the officers of the department under examination in the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization—was to find out what percentage of these continental immigrants, upon whom we paid these very large sums as a bonus to the North Atlantic Trading Company, went to the United States. What resulted from that I do not know. I remember examining at some length an officer of the department in the committee, and he there said that these reports were sent to the Department of the Interior, and that before the accounts were settled with the North Atlantic Trading Company they had some means of tracing these immigrants forwarded through the instrumentality of that company and striking off those who went to the United States. Whether that was ever done I do not know. Whether that arrangement is continued to this day I do not know. Probably the Minister of the Interior can tell us, but I do not think it has been kept up, and I do not think we are in a position to say exactly what becomes of our bonused immigrants after they reach here and what proportion go to the United States. I do not think we have a system of proper check, and there must be an immense leakage, because the temptation of the immigrant is very great to go to the United States once he arrives here. And although the government, in face of the continued increasing tide of immigration, has improved the law or at least carried out more carefully the inspection, there is no doubt whatever that in Europe the impression prevails among booking agents and others interested and the migratory population in general, that it is much easier to get into Canada than into the United States. Therefore those who are objectionable are generally attracted towards Canada. If the House desired to go further into the question, I could quote extensively from the very able report of Inspector Braun, who was sent from the United States in 1903 to survey the whole field of immigration, and he gives, in regard to that tendency, very valuable information to his government. He says there are people from some of the easterly countries of Europe, doubtful, objectionable people, who are directed to the great ports of embarkation, and who are given signals which they carry with them, indicating that they are not likely to obtain entry into the United States and therefore are to be directed to Canada. That existed to a very large extent until we made our laws more severe, but at the time Inspector Braun made his report, this abuse was very extensive.

Turning again to immigration, in 1905, 800 were debarred as likely to become public charges. I think they remained in Canada. I see no way whatever by which they could have been reconveyed, having been once admitted, to the sea-board and deported to Europe. Out of these 800 there were 492 who were debarred as suffering from trachoma. I have already had occasion to refer to that very dangerous disease which exists in a chronic state in the southern and eastern parts of Europe. It is, at certain stages, incurable and extremely infectious. Two or three years before there were 600 debarred from entering the United States through Canada on account of trachoma, and these have remained in Canada as well as the 492 first mentioned. The last time I spoke on this subject I spoke of the able report of one of our Montreal specialists, in which he gave the proof that trachoma had been treated at the Montreal General Hospital. The House knows we have a trachoma hospital at Quebec to which immigrants are taken who suffer from that disease. Too much care cannot be taken because once this disease has taken firm hold it will be practically impossible to eradicate it.

Let me give a few figures of the total immigration in 1906. The total emigration from Canada to the United States was 43,997. We have no detailed report as to the three classes to which I have referred. There were 486 debarred of which 331 are likely to become public charges.

In 1907 we have again an increase of immigration through Canada to the United States :

By Atlantic ports..	18,671
Through border station....	20,882
Pacific ports....	1,414
Total..	48,967

Out of which were debarred 2,273.

It is impossible to find in our own reports anything to even remotely indicate an answer to that very interesting question as to what becomes of these numerous people who were debarred from entering the United States after having come to Canada. In the American reports you will find answers to all these questions. You will find absolutely reliable information as to the number of people who leave the United States within the year. They give us comprehensive statements as to the immigration to the United States.

It must be evident that we require that information. We require to know particularly who are the people going out. What about the large numbers of people who come to our country and then go to the United States ? The question was put to my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, and he was asked why we had not that in-

formation. He answered because that concerned emigration and not immigration. It must be evident that our information regarding immigration is incomplete, in view of the bonuses and the money we spend on immigration. Our data are not sufficient unless we have what is given in the United States, and that is the amount of people who leave Canada after coming there.

The total number for the year 1907 of the immigrants to United States through Canada was 48,967. Besides these 2,273 were debarred from entering the United States.

Mr. BERGERON. They may be in Canada.

Mr. MONK. No doubt. There are no tables in the general report beyond those from which I have culled the information which I have just given the House, but the Canadian Commissioner for the United States, a very able man who was in charge of that branch and administered the whole Canadian service connected with immigration through Canada to the United States, says at page 85 of the United States Immigration Report for 1907:

The tables above mentioned however contain other data however, upon which I am prompted to feel the bureau will not look with such satisfaction reference being had to the unusual increase of the number of aliens who originally giving Canadian destinations proceeded to the United States within one year from date of arrival in Canada. From 9,724 during fiscal year ended June 30, 1906, this class has increased to 15,677 for the year just closed. This remarkable increase is partially explained by the fact that while less than ·60 per cent of these manifested to the United States at time of embarkation are excluded more than 10·06 per cent of the year in Canada class, find it impossible to meet the requirements of our laws when examined.

Only ·60 per cent of those manifested to the United States were excluded, but when we come to those who pass into the United States after being manifested through Canada, you find an immense increase in the proportion exclude namely 10·06 per cent. That strengthens the conviction that the immigrants are shipped, even to-day, to Canada direct when there is some doubt of their admissibility into the United States. I deemed it important to give these data to the House because the question of immigration is one which demands our immediate attention.

I have stated enough respecting the American immigration features which concern us, let me refer now to our own system. What are the causes of exclusion from Canada? They are to be found in chapter 93 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. These are the immigrants prohibited, under the provisions of this law, as it has since been amended, and amended a great deal on the representations made from time to time by the American authorities.

Mr. MONK.

1. Feeble-minded, idiotic, paralytic and insane persons. Deaf, dumb, blind or infirm persons, unless accompanied by family or persons to take care of them. This is under the amendment of the law made by 6 Edward VII., chapter 19.

2. Immigrants afflicted with loathsome contagious or infectious diseases which may be dangerous to public health or widely disseminated, unless curable within a reasonably short time.

3. Paupers, vagrants, beggars or those likely to become a public charge may be deported if they become a public charge within two years of their arrival.

4. Criminals, prostitutes and procurers.

There are boards of inquiry who hear appeals made from the decision of the inspector. This, I think, has been the case only since the law of last year or the year before. I think these boards of inquiry, which sit very frequently in the United States have not been called upon to act here very often. I say that subject to correction by my hon. friend. There is also a final appeal to the minister. There is one provision of the law that may usefully be pointed out and that is not generally known. It is that the immigrant who has been convicted of crime or has become a public charge within two years of his arrival here, may, upon a certificate notifying the minister to that effect from the clerk of the municipality where he has become a public charge or been convicted, may be ordered by the minister to deportation. I say that that clause is not familiar to the people of this country, for, within the last seven or eight months undoubtedly, a great many immigrants have become public charges in the municipalities of Canada. I can speak with certainty concerning the case of Montreal.

Mr. BERGERON. How about the Doukhobors?

Mr. MONK. That law would not apply to them now, because when the Doukhobors came in this provision did not exist. But look at the number of immigrants who have been convicted of offences, both petty and extremely grave, within the limits of Montreal alone and within the past year. They would come under this provision of the law as well as if they had become public charges on the fact being certified to the Minister of the Interior that he has power to deport them.

Mr. BERGERON. At whose expense?

Mr. MONK. That is a question I desire to refer to briefly. Suppose that an immigrant has reached the west, and is to be deported. He must be brought to the port of embarkation at the country's expense. He must be sent, and a man with him, at the expense of the country, and traces of these expenditures are found in our public accounts. He is taken to the port of embarkation, and only there is he handed over to the steamship company. And I find re-

cords of moneys paid to steamship companies in connection with deportation—I do not know under what circumstances. But, under the law, the steamship company is obliged to take the immigrant back.

It would be very interesting—to come more close to the subject of the motion I have placed in your hands—to find out how the system of paying so much per head for immigrants first started in this country. It was started very long ago. I believe that inquiry would unquestionably reveal the fact that this singular, this almost unheard-of, mode of recruiting for our national family was invented and urged upon the government by transportation companies, booking agents and employees connected with the department. It is impossible for me to think that a man having at heart the interests of the country, and totally dissociated from the interests to which I have referred—great, powerful and influential interests—could ever have believed that a scheme of paying so much a head per immigrant, was a suitable, feasible and wise method for a country to follow that was desirous of increasing the national family by the addition of good, suitable and carefully selected subjects.

Mr. BERGERON. It is only within eleven years, is it not?

Mr. MONK. I think this system dates further back than that. Of course, when our immigrants were very few, when we spent from $20,000 to $100,000 on immigration, though the bonusing system may have existed, it amounted to a negligible quantity. But to-day, when we spend over $1,000,000 on immigration, a large portion of it in bonuses, it becomes an important question to find out who invented this method. If you wanted to increase a valuable herd of cattle, you would not adopt the sole principle of paying so much per head. When it is a question of the national family, and adding to it in the immense proportions which will appear in a moment, that principle seems to me a very bad one. Certain it is that it has existed for many years, but as I have stated, it has only been of large and alarming proportions since 1898, since which time it has become a subject of study. As I stated before, I do not think anybody would adopt such a principle even in an effort to increase a herd of animals. Remember, the party earning the bonus is bound by no strict rule. The rule that binds him is only that he gets his immigrant through the cursory examination that takes place upon the arrival of the immigrants here. If his immigrant is deported —though it is not so stated in any of the regulations I have seen—the presumption is he would not earn his bonus. But no code of stringent rules has been laid down for him. With respect to this, I may quote from a report brought down at the instance of the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Uriah Wilson) by the Minister of the Interior on Thursday, February 13, 1908, in which is to be found very valuable information in regard to this and other points. The agent is not called upon, for instance, to make any special examination. He is not called upon to make any special selection. He knows upon what immigrants we pay bonuses, and there is nothing in any of the regulations I have seen that obliges them to exercise careful, prudent discretion in the selection of immigrants. He is not bound to see who this gentleman is whose destination is Canada, and to be added to the Canadian national family. No duty is imposed upon him to look into the man's record. He may be a criminal. Of course if he is a convicted criminal, that is found out, but it is very difficult to find it out, but when found out it may prevent his landing. There is no duty imposed upon the booking agent, or the man who earns the bonus, to look into the history of the incoming immigrant. He is not called upon to procure any certificate to show that this man is not a scoundrel or a loafer, a class that every nation in Europe is anxious to get rid of. There is nothing in the regulations which binds the booking agent to guarantee that this man is an honest or a suitable man to be admitted to Canada.

An hon. MEMBER. The American law.

Mr. MONK. Under the American law there is no bonus, there is no immigration agent, and never has been. They would not think of such a thing as paying a bonus on immigrants. I am pointing out the situation of this agent over in Europe who earns the bonus, and showing that he is not in any way responsible for the character of the immigrant. He has to pay no fine when he ships over to this country, as he often does, unsuitable and undesirable men. He is subject to no penalty, though the immigrant that he sends out here may be debarred as a pauper, a criminal, or likely to become a burden. As a matter of fact, this agent who earns the bonus can not be reached by us because he is not under our jurisdiction. I know as a matter of fact that the booking agents in Europe, and even in England, I know it from reliable information, frequently know nothing about Canada except what they may have picked up from circulars. Half of them do not know about the conditions of labour here. I am speaking of the booking agent, the man who gets the money. Let any man go to Europe and interview these men, and he will find that they know nothing about Canada, and as a matter of fact they care nothing about Canada, and have no interest in this country. They simply tell the immigrant, All you have to say, if you want to get into Canada, is that you are a farm hand or a railway navvy. Many times the immigrant does not know the language of the country, either French or English, but

he is carefully taught to say 'farm hand' or 'railway hand' when met by the inspecting officer. Frequently these people arrive in great numbers in port, and when an inspector has to pass a thousand of them, what is he going to do? Look into the mouth of every one of them? Examine his conscience? He has to pass a thousand in an hour or two, the train is under steam waiting to take them west, and everybody is in a rush. Let any man go down and witness the arrival of these immigrants. Probably they could not understand you if you spoke to them in French or English. Now I have made a rather hazardous assertion, Mr. Speaker, and that is that this extraordinary policy of giving so much per head to immigrants, under the circumstances to which I have referred, has been initiated by the transportation companies.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. When?

Mr. MONK. In the origin, probably. What my right hon. friend wishes me to say is that it was originated under the Conservative government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not care about that.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Would that be a reason for us to change it?

Mr. MONK. It would be a reason for us to change it, though I do not consider that the sins of the fathers should be visited upon the sons beyond the third and fourth generation. But I find no trace of its origin anywhere else. You have the transportation companies pressing upon the government, and they are very influential, to adopt this scheme. It is to their interest. You have the booking agent who makes representations to our immigration staff, and the immigration staff itself, as has been proved in relation to the North Atlantic Trading Company, was at one time at least deeply interested in immigration. But to-day you have, in addition, the influence of these large land owners in the Northwest who are greatly interested in increasing population. So you have three distinct interests. You have the interest of the transportation companies, which is immense. Let the House consider for a moment how a large transportation company makes money out of the immigrant, from the moment they get hold of him. The immigrant as a rule pays $27 to the company to take him across the Atlantic. I suppose 25 cents per day pays for his food and the space he occupies on board the steamer. The food is simple and bought in large quantities, and the immigrant is often seasick. At any rate, an investigation will establish that 15 or 20 cents a day will pay for his food, and 25 cents a day will pay for all the cost in bringing him across the Atlantic. He has paid the company $27. The moment he lands here the transportation company conveys him to the west. He arrives in the west, and gives value to the land owned by these transportation companies. Sometimes he buys the land, at any rate, his mere arrival adds value to the land. Then on everything he buys in order to live, the transportation companies reap a profit; that is to say, the boots he wears, and the clothes on his back, and the food he eats are all freighted to the Northwest by these transportation companies.

I say that, with the immense profits this immigration gives to these companies, they are immensely interested in the maintenance of the status quo in regard to our law respecting immigration. Now Sir, in confirmation of that, let me say that it must strike the House as a rather singular fact that, after the disappearance of the North Atlantic Trading Company in 1906, by order in council of the 19th February, 1907, the bonus was fixed at ten shillings per adult and six shillings for children. That was on the 19th February, 1907, at a time when we had ceased to do business with the North Atlantic Trading Company, and it had been found absolutely necessary, I may say, in response to public opinion, to cancel that contract. On the 6th January, 1908, less than a year afterwards, the government increase and double that bonus. Why is the bonus on the territory covered by the North Atlantic Trading Company increased and doubled? It is impossible to understand why the order in council of this year doubling the continental bonus was passed. There is a pretext alleged in the order and it is that the bonus is found inadequate to induce immigration. That is the textual reason given in the order. Let us see if there is any foundation for that allegation which was the basis of that new order in council doubling the amount of the bonus. In the year ending the 30th June, 1906, we had 189,064 immigrants. In the year ending the 30th June, 1907, we had 252,038 immigrants. In the year in which we have 252,038 immigrants, with a very large increase in continental immigration, we increase and double the continental bonus. Let me give the precise amount of that increased continental immigration. For nine months to the 30th March, 1906, the number of continental immigration was 19,216. For the nine months to the 30th March, 1907, it was 34,217, an increase of 15,001, and in the following three months the increase was greater still. I see see no reason here for increasing and doubling the continental bonus. Although the North Atlantic Trading Company as such has disappeared, has dropped out of existence, I think that anybody who carefully examines our system of immigration and the way the propaganda is carried on at present will conclude that there exists several North Atlantic Trading Companies, combinations, I mean, of booking agents, of people interested in immigration and in getting the bonuses. There is not only one. It has been a fecund institution, it

was very prosperous and it produced numerous offspring. Let us look for a moment at the conditions which have surrounded our increase of population by immigration since 1898. After a careful examination of this tabulated statement, compiled from absolutely reliable official sources, controlled by the officers of the department, the House will see clearly and exactly the trend of the wave of immigration since 1898.

IMMIGRATION TO CANADA FROM JANUARY 1, 1898, TO DECEMBER 31, 1907.

—	British.	Continental, &c.	From the United States.	Totals.
Calendar year 1898	11,173	11,608	9,119	31,900
" 1899	10,660	21,938	11,945	44,543
First 6 months of 1900	5,141	10,211	8,543	23,895
Fiscal year 1900-1901	11,810	19,352	17,987	49,149
" 1901-1902	17,259	23,732	26,388	67,379
" 1902-1903	41,792	37,099	49,473	128,364
" 1903-1904	50,374	34,728	45,229	130,331
" 1904-1905	65,359	37,255	43,652	146,266
" 1905-1906	86,796	44,349	57,919	189,064
Fractional fiscal year (9 months) 1906-1907	55,791	34,217	34,659	124,667
9 months of fiscal year 1907-1908	111,238	77,165	46,925	235,328
Totals	467,393	351,654	351,839	1,170,886

Let us now see what we have expended in bonusing and what our immediate prospect of expenditure is:

STATEMENT SHOWING THE AMOUNT OF BONUSES PAID ON IMMIGRANTS TO CANADA FROM JULY 1, 1897, TO DECEMBER 31, 1907.

Fiscal Year.	British. Total payment.	Continental, &c. Total payment.	United States. Total payment.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1897-98	4,268 17	14,880 52	3,615 19
1898-99	873 82	24,259 29	3,017 12
1899-1900	2,300 44	46,987 26	6,410 82
1900-01	1,610 61	26,525 60	11,863 20
1901-02	887 23	34,132 36	7,903 14
1902-03	7,156 43	36,925 83	14,917 00
1903-04	43,666 63	41,826 14	14,428 25
1904-05	12,600 21	80,224 03	5,860 75
1905-06	34,360 59	81,477 59	5,850 25
1906-07 (9 mos.)	60,010 94	24,952 75	4,743 00
1907-08 (9 mos.)	84,495 82	34,619 73	3,963 25
	252,230 89	446,811 10	82,571 97

Total bonus paid to date	$ 781,613 96
Total amount voted for immigration	950,000 00
12 months to July 1, 1907—On estimates so far for next year—	
Main estimates, $920,000; (supp. $125,000); total	1,045,000 00

I may say that a large proportion of the bonuses for continental immigrants went to the North Atlantic Trading Company.

One word now to make clear what the present regime as to bonusing is under the regulations or orders in council at this moment in force. The bonuses paid at the present time are as follows:

United States.—Since 1897 a bonus has been paid to sub-agents of $3 on each man, $2 on each woman and $1 on each child, of the farming class from the United States. In a few cases the commission is $2, $1 and 50 cents on men, women and children of specified classes.

British.—£1 sterling on adults, 10 shillings on those between 1 and 18 years of age who come to Canada to engage in farm work, railway work or, in the case of females, domestic service, who are British

subjects by birth or naturalization and who have had at least one year's experience as farmers, farm labourers, gardeners, stablemen, carters, railway surfacemen, navvies or miners.

Iceland.—A bonus of £1 on full tickets and 10 shillings on half tickets is allowed to steamship companies on immigrants from Iceland, through an arrangement with the steamship companies that the rate or passage to immigrants is decreased by that amount.

Continental.—A bonus of £1 on adults and 10 shillings on those between 1 and 18 years of age is paid to certain selected booking agents in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Germany, Finland, France and Belgium on immigrants from those countries who come to Canada to engage in farm work and who, before coming to Canada, had at least one year's experience in one of the prescribed occupations. These are the same as in the case of the British immigrants.

In fact, after the description I have given to the House as to how the immigration is started on the other side by the agent, and how the immigrant is received here, I think it is evident that almost anybody can get in under these regulations, because we have no way of verifying the statement made by the immigrant to the inspector here. The immigrant is not required to produce any proof of any statement he may make, and he is allowed to pass into the country on his assertion that he is a farm hand, a railway navvy, a gardener or a stableman. And, to those who have witnessed large numbers of immigrants on their arrival here passing before the inspector it is impossible not to say that a great number of these immigrants have it written on their faces that they have never been farmers or railway navvies. The agent can do nothing to prevent them under the circumstances I have narrated; he has to take their statements. Under the order in council of January last (1908) the bonus was doubled from that which it was under the order in council of February, 1907, and that was done without any reason that I can see, the pretext given that there was a falling off in the immigration being absolutely unfounded as shown by the statistics I have given to the House. It is not out of place to remark that according to the answer given by the Minister of the Interior and reported in 'Hansard' of the 16th of March last, we have spent to date on immigrant hospitals a total sum of $208,420.63. I quote this in connection with the statement which is sometimes made that immigration to this country is not assisted. I will refer to that later on, but in the meantime I will point out that we have spent over $200,000 in providing hospitals which are simply for immigrants only.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

Mr. MONK.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, I had no idea when I began that the observations I had to make would take up so much time. Perhaps my right hon. friend the Prime Minister is not wholly free from a responsibility for this, as when I first gave notice of this motion I expected to bring it up at an early date and since that notice was given, a great many people in my own province particularly, who take a deep interest in this question have sent me much of the information I am now giving to the House. I had determined to sift and prune that information as much as possible, but I found when proceeding with the expurgatorial work that it was more difficult than I had at first imagined. Most of these data I think are important in the examination of this or any other question connected with immigration.

When you left the chair at six o'clock I was stating that it was a question of very great interest whether or not we in Canada got the benefit of this bounty or bonus expenditure. Do we not pay for immigrants who come to Canada and within a year or after a year proceed to the United States? I expressed very serious doubts as to that and these doubts will be confirmed by what I am about to say to the House. Bonuses, as I understand, are paid monthly and once paid I doubt if we ever get them back. Is there any instance of a bonus, after once being paid, having been recovered because the immigrant, either within the year or after the year left for the United States or because he was deported after a certain time by reason of becoming a public charge? I do not think the minister can give any example of a refund having been made by the bonused agent of the bonus he has received. I do not think we would have any right to that refund. Once the immigrant has entered Canada and been accepted by the inspecting authorities, the bonus appears to me, by what I have seen of the regulations, to have been earned. The agent is entitled to it and it is impossible to recover it from him, whatever circumstances may afterwards supervene.

I find in one of our Quebec papers, the Richmond 'Guardian,' an article which I feel bound to give to the House, which affords ground for seriously doubting whether all this vast mass of immigration comes to Canada, whether they really go to people the Northwest or to improve our own population in the older provinces. This article appears in the Richmond 'Guardian' of February 21, 1908, and reads as follows:

The Interior Department gives out glowing reports of increased immigration. These statements are clearly false. About half the settlers reported can never be found after-

ward. This is proved by the Northwest census of 1906, which shows the population of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta to be as follows:

1906..	808,863
1901..	419,512
Increase..	389,351

Returns of births and deaths make the natural increase of the population of 1901 41,951, leaving 347,400 to be supplied from outside, and by the natural increase of these immigrants. Now the number of homestead settlers in the Northwest from other provinces in the five years is represented by the department to be 27,625. The department counts two and a half persons for each homesteader, making 69,312 inhabitants from this source.

A much larger number from the older provinces settled on lands which they purchased, or in towns and villages, or were employed in the various works and industries of the country. This would leave less than 200,000 to be supplied by immigrants and their children.

Note now the number of immigrant settlers reported by the department as having located in Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan in the five years preceding the June, 1906:

1901-2.. ..	61,129	see Interior report, page 99.
1902-3.. ..	109,986	see Interior report, page 95.
1903-4.. ..	75,308	'Hansard,' 1906-7, page 1053.
1904-5.. ..	74,676	'Hansard,' 1906-7, page 1053.
1905-6.. ..	90,652	'Hansard,' 1906-7, page 1053.
Total..	411,652	

Here are more than twice as many immigrants reported to have settled in the west as could be found there by the census enumerators. The number of immigrant settlers reported from 1901 to 1906 is 22,301 more than the total increase of population from all sources.

What has become of the 200,000 or 250,000 lost people? This includes the 22,301 mentioned above, also the total natural increase of the oldest settlers, and of the immigrants, themselves, together with all that arrived from the older provinces and their descendants. Either these 200,000 never came or they came and went away. On how many of these imaginary immigrants did the country pay a bonus of $4 and $5 per head? On how many did the mysterious North Atlantic Trading Company draw $5 for each imaginary head? How many of them were travellers coming into the country and going out by another or the same gate? How many were Canadian travellers coming home? How many were picnickers from across the borders? How many were mere dead figures stuffed into the books to make glory for the Immigration Department, gain for the immigration contractors, and excuse for an annual immigration expenditure which has jumped from $120,000 to $950,000 since the change of government?

But, Sir, there are other figures that go to show that our Northwest lands, which we are so desirous of seeing settled by real bona fide farmers are not being settled in the way the immigration returns would lead us to expect. Let me give briefly a statement showing what proportion of our immigrants go upon the free lands of the Northwest, the increase in the number of homestead entries, the total immigration and the percentage of the homestead increase to the total immigration for each year from 1896 until the present.

STATEMENT SHOWING WHAT PROPORTION OF OUR IMMIGRANTS GO UPON THE FREE LANDS OF THE NORTHWEST.

Year.	Homestead entries.	Total immigration.	Percentage.
1896	1,857	16,835	11
1897	2,384	21,716	11
1898	4,848	31,900	15
1899	6,689	44,543	15
1900	7,426	23,895	31
1901	8,167	49,149	16
1902	14,673	67,379	22
1903	31,383	128,364	25
1904	26,073	130,331	20
1905	30,819	146,266	20
1906	41,869	189,064	21
1907 (9 mos. to Mar. 31, 1907).	21,647 (9 mos.)	124,667	16
1907-08 (9 mos. to Jan. 1, 1908)..	25,281 (9 mos.)	235,328	11

There is therefore grave reason to doubt that we are really getting in our Northwest Territories the benefit of all this bonus expenditure.

One word as to the incompleteness of the immigration report. There is nothing in it to show the movement through Canada into the United States of the immigrants either on arrival or within the year or after the year. The reason given for that omission by the Minister of the Interior on the 16th of March last was that this exodus was emigration and not immigration. Nevertheless although the United States do not bonus immigrants or aid immigration in any way, they give information in their report which shows the exodus of people from the United States, so that in this connection our report, as compared with the American report, is scanty to a degree.

I find that the reports from seaports in the British isles are no fuller, since the tide of immigration has increased, than they were before. The report from our Belgium agent is always couched in the same terms. It is almost identically the same every year. And from the continent we get no report at all. We get, of course, from the Superintendent General of Immigration some very general observations, but no details. That is a serious fault which the minister ought to try and remedy. In the United States we maintain agencies which cost us from $2,000 to $6,000 a year and even more. How is it that we do not find in the last report of the Department of the Interior any state-

ment whatever from these agents? Surely when we pay them so much money, we ought to be informed in detail what each of these immigration agents is doing and what bonuses are paid them so that we may know that they are earning their money.

Before you left the Chair, Sir, I was pointing out that this immigration business is an extremely profitable one for the transportation companies, the booking agents, and those individuals and companies who are interested in large tracts of land in the Northwest. The transportation companies not only make a large profit out of the fares, not only do they afterwards draw profit from the immigrant when he lands, but they undergo no expense in putting the immigrant on board or in landing him. An immigrant is not like ordinary freight. He goes on board of his own accord, there is no machinery or labour required to put him on board, and when he reaches his destination there is no expense in putting him ashore, and he is then taken charge of by the government. Although it is said that we do not assist immigration, we have gone to great expense in building sheds and hospitals, in taking charge of the quarantine, in paying all the expenses of inspection, and in providing every description of necessaries for the immigrant when he lands. We feed him, we see to his safe transference in his destination, and incur considerable expense in that work. Moreever, we do the advertising for these transportation companies. We spend immense sums every year to advertise this country and to induce immigrants to come here. In fact, the transportation companies have no expense in connection with this branch of their business, though in every other they must incur large expenses.

One word as to the bonused agent himself. This agent receives a commission from the transportation company on the ticket he sells to the immigrant. That commission varies. As the immigrant must practically always go to some inland place away from the port of debarkation, the agent receives a further commission for his transportation. He probably gets a commission from parties who employ the immigrant on his coming to this country. I take it that the amount he makes on each immigrant, including the $5 of bonus which we give him, must amount to $10 or $12 at the very least. If he handles any considerable number of immigrants, his profits must be even abnormally large. Even if he were deprived of the bonus given by the Dominion government, the commissions to which I have referred and the salary he gets as booking agent would show a considerable profit for each immigrant he handles. As a rule the booking agents in the British islands and even elsewhere, are engaged in some general business, as dealing in coal or some other occupation. The agent, as a rule, is not well versed in the country to which he is sending immigrants. That explains why so many immigrants have been left to public support during last winter. The agent will tell the immigrant, for instance, that he knows that farm-hands in Canada earn from $45 to $60 a month. That is not absolutely untrue, for I am told that in the west, during harvest time—and even in other provinces—large salaries are paid to good farm hands. But their employment at these rates lasts for only a short time. The immigrants, however, are not informed of that; and, frequently, when they arrive in Montreal, where many of them are stranded, they will not work except for a considerable salary, for they have been told not to accept work unless paid at about the rate I have stated.

In regard to the class of immigrants who arrive here, let me give to the House what Lord Strathcona says in this year's report of the Department of the Interior:

> Another serious matter to which I have drawn the attention of the imperial authorities is that magistrates and others have repeatedly deferred passing judgment on transgressors against the law, on the condition of their being sent to Canada.
>
> I have, from time to time, had direct correspondence with recorders, chairmen of sessions, and others, whenever a particular case of the kind came under my notice, formally and emphatically condemning such action. Attention has also been widely drawn to the views of your department on the matter in the press of this country, and I hoped, as a consequence, no further causes of complaint would arise.
>
> In view, however, of the two further cases which you recently brought to my attention, I felt compelled to make official representations to His Majesty's government on the subject. These negotiations are still pending, but I hope they may lead to steps being taken which will put a stop altogether to countenance being given by magistrates and others concerned to the sending of persons convicted of crime to Canada.

I think that abuse has not ceased. And, to be perfectly frank, the general impression which exists in the British islands is that the people there do us a favour by sending out the unemployed and those who cannot get on in the old country. I do not speak against immigrants as a whole, for some are excellent and are a great acquisition. But the impression that I have spoken of exists in the British islands and they do not hesitate to state it. There is an impression that this is a country of enormous resources, immense areas of fertile lands that are given away, and that it is an advantage to pour out population into this country and that there will always be found something for newcomers to do; even though they may have been found incapable of getting on in the older countries. I am told that an eminent writer, recently in Canada, Mr. Rudyard Kipling, has written that we

must pump the Britishers into this country. We are glad to receive Britishers in Canada, for many of them make excellent immigrants. But we ought to accept only the best class, and there are undesirable classes in England as elsewhere. As a matter of fact, I think the magistrates of Montreal will bear me out when I say that, during the past seven or eight months, most of those who have been brought before our courts of justice for serious offences are not men of this country, but immigrants who have slipped in in one way or other. Judges who preside at our assizes, I think, would report to the government, if questioned, and the magistrates have repeatedly told me, that this is the condition of affairs in Montreal. As a matter of fact, to-day, it is almost impossible for our country people without danger to follow the custom which, for all time, has existed among them, of coming to the Montreal market during the night. Up to within two years ago, farmers—and not farmers only but their wives and even their children—would come on their carts during the night to Montreal to be on the market early in the morning, without any thought of danger on the public highway leading into the city. In Montreal we preserve the peace with a very small proportion of police protection, but this has become impossible because of outrages committed on the public roads leading to Montreal. People have been held up, assaulted, wounded and left to die on the public highway. And there is no doubt in the mind of anybody that these outrages have not been committed by our own people; they are committed by immigrants who are stranded in Montreal. Cases of that kind have been discovered and the perpetrators belong to the foreign criminal classes undoubtedly. Let me read a paragraph from the last report of the inspector of hospitals for the province of Ontario:

There is marked evidence that public attention should be called to the large number of undesirable and unsuitable immigrants that are being induced to seek a shelter in Ontario. This has been found nowhere more noticeable than in the city of Toronto, where more than half of the indigent casuals, who have had to be provided for, belong to the immigrant class. In many instances, however, they prove quite incapable and, when winter comes on, they drift into the cities and are not slow to find the location of the charitable institutions. The whole fault for this condition must be placed where it belongs, namely, in the system that permits and encourages immigration without a proper discrimination. The present policy of Canadian emigration agents in Europe would seem to be to secure the number and pay no heed to the quality of persons urged to seek a haven in this country. The system of the Dominion government of bonusing agents to send out in an apparently indiscriminate maner a class of people totally unfit to provide a livelihood for themselves is deplorable. During the past year it has cost the hospitals and public charities of Ontario thousands of dollars to provide for these people, who are homeless and friendless and quite incapable of earning a living in this country. More precautions are needed. 'Quality, not quantity,' should be a rule from which there should be no deviation. More than ever before Ontario has been made, during the past year, the dumping ground of a most undesirable class. Charity may suffer long and be kind, but this province cannot afford to permit the bonused and designing agent abroad to continue as he has been doing during the past year, and the manner in which some of our charities have been imposed upon fully justifies this protest.

This is true also of my own province. Then I find that on March 18, before the Irish Protestant Benevolent Society's banquet at Toronto, Lieutenant Governor Clark said this:

Our province is in a crucial stage at present. Influx of new population, of people who have had strange ideas about liberty and religion, is endangering our state. These people come here believing that liberty means license and as such are a menace to our institutions.

A class of people come here who call themselves English or Irish or Scotch. True, they are British born, but they are not British at heart. They are children of foreign parents, who came to the British Islands years before. The babies were born in the British Islands, but they were partakers of foreign dispositions. They are not bred to principles we know of and might at the ballot-box seriously injure us.

It is a most serious question with which we must grapple. The United States, our neighbours to the south, have had, no doubt, the same troubles, and have to some extent assimilated this objectionable element in their population. But you must have noticed how crime is on the increase in Canada—crime of an abominable character. Evil deeds are rife in this land which we never knew before. Our nation was a better one before these people came. I am glad, and we should all be glad, that our questions of state and our institutions have been so largely settled before these people came.

I find here a resolution which is rather long, and I will not trouble the House with reading it, exactly in the same sense, passed by the Associated Charities of Toronto. This condition of affairs in Toronto is exactly repeated in the province of Quebec. I see that the eminent authority I have just quoted speaks of the possibility of assimilation. Now in this connection let me say this: The population of the United States numbered 50,000,000 souls before immigration into that country reached 300,000 per annum. We have in this country about 6,000,000, and we received last year over 250,000 immigrants. Now to meet the proportion between the number of immigrants that came this year into the United States and its present population of 80,000,000, we would have to have 20,000,000. Those who visit the United States, men of the very highest authority in sociology, like Mr. H. J. Wels, Viscount D'Avenel

who has a European reputation, and Mr. Doumer, a French publicist, all agree that this immigration constitutes a grave peril to the United States. President Roosevelt himself said that this immigration is leading the nation to disaster. This year he has named, as I have already said, a commission of nine of the ablest experts to visit Europe and see what can be done to check the outflow of immigration to the United States. Other writers I have quoted say, and have made calculations to show, that in twenty-five years, at the present rate of immigration, we will have a population of 30,000,000, not 10,000,000 of which will be Canadian born. Now under these circumstances how can one explain the indifference that has existed in Canada up to at least the last six months, with regard to the immigration policy of this government? I think it is difficult to explain. If these figures are correct, we will find ourselves in a few years in this position, that the destinies of this country, its march towards the future, will be decided, not by ourselves who are the descendants of those who have settled the country and have built it up, but it will be settled by an alien population who have invaded the country.

One word now in connection with the care we must take respecting immigrants. During the past year we have had a large influx of Italian immigrants, many of whom have settled down in our cities. The question of the influence of this tide upon labour I will leave to others to treat, because the labour element is well represented in this House. As a matter of fact, in my own constituency, I know a large industry which has during the last year dismissed a great many Canadian employees and replaced them by Italians, because they work cheaper, and can live on wages that Canadians cannot live on. We all know how these Italian labourers live. They live in masses, they are able to work at much lower wages than our own people can live on, and consequently they become very dangerous competitors to our own labouring men. I find that during the year ending June 30, 1907, we had 12,771 Italian immigrants admitted into Canada. Were any of them bonused? I do not know. Certain it is that under our present system it is possible they were bonused. I do not see any difficulty in Italians reaching certain European countries which are under the bonus system, and getting tickets from the agent to come to Canada, and in one way or another the agent gets the bonus. I see no obstacle to that, and I would be glad to hear the Minister of the Interior declare that it is impossible, or tell us how they get here. But that class is not a dangerous class. I have lived in Montreal, and I know the Italians. There are excellent Italians, and there are some that are not so desirable. Let me quote to the House a high Italian authority who is thus reported in the Montreal 'Star' of February 28, with regard to Italian immigration:

I know for a fact that over sixty per cent of the Italians that come to this country are convicted criminals. When a man gets into trouble in Italy and is convicted, he generally leaves the country after having served his sentence, as he finds that he is not wanted at home. For years Canada has been the dumping ground of these criminals. It used to be the United States, but owing to the enforcement of stricter laws the United States are not so popular with my countrymen as they used to be. Canada is now their goal because it is so easy of access. No questions are asked, no certificates are necessary. If you are in good health you can land in Canada without any money, regardless of the fact that you may be a hardened criminal.

And believe me, the majority of the Italians do not come out here without good reason. Their own country has grown too warm for them and Canada offers ample shelter. If the Canadian government knew its business it would have immigration agents in Italy whose duty it would be to inquire into the characters of intending emigrants.

The American authorities have done that.

Until some action of this kind is taken, the trouble that the respectable citizens of the city and the Dominion are now suffering from will never be eradicated. Almost without exception the men Italians found carrying arms are criminals and ex-convicts, who don't feel safe without a gun or stiletto. They come out here because they are too well known in their own country. Their actions here cast discredit upon the land of their birth.

I have no doubt that everybody here labours under the impression that in Italy every man goes about armed and that murders and stabbing cases are of hourly occurrence. Let me tell you that this is far from being the case. When a man is found carrying concealed weapons in Italy he does not get the chance of paying a fine. Instead he gets a long term of imprisonment. They don't believe in fines for that sort of thing over there. But as a matter of fact the people there are not in the habit of going about armed with revolvers and razors and such like things. They are for the most part respectable, law-abiding citizens, who are particularly fortunate in that their criminals leave them in peace and emigrate to Canada, or some other country.

Murders are no more frequent in Italy than in any other country. There is more crime committed in Montreal in a week——

I presume he is speaking of last winter:

——than there is in a month in an Italian city. The Italians here—I mean the most of them—are desperate men and the law will require to be strengthened in order to deal with them.

I just wish to revert, in connection with the wholesale manner in which we are getting immigrants out here, to the kind of contract that is made with the prospective emigrant to Canada. I will quote an agreement that has been invariably used

by the James A. Smart Company Limited and from this agreement and the conclusion which I draw from it the House will be able to see how it is that we have been obliged, in our large cities, to do very much, during the past winter particularly, for the immigrant classes who have been left on our hands for support and help. The James A. Smart Company is a company that was founded, I presume,—in fact I have no doubt,—by Mr. Smart who was formerly deputy Minister of the Interior, who was subsequently connected with the North Atlantic Trading Company and finally became the agent of that company. When that company disappeared I suppose he founded this company. The agreement is as follows:

Received on account:

Agreement.

In consideration of the promise of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, hereinafter called the company, to give or procure for me employment on the construction of its railway line, and for which I shall be paid at the rate of at least $2 per day (eight shillings and four pence) and to furnish board at a rate not to exceed $4.50 per week (eighteen shillings and nine pence) I hereby agree as follows:

I will work as a labourer for the company, or for any contractor or sub-contractor with whom the company secure work for me for a period of at least six months, or for such period as the company or the contractors or the sub-contractors may require my services or until I am discharged by the company or contractors or sub-contractors, in which latter case I shall simply be entitled to wages earned up to the time of my discharge. My service shall be as a labourer or in any other capacity my employers may desire at the same rate of wages as is paid to other persons similarly employed.

My employment, and the relation of master and servant between the company and me, is to commence immediately upon my signing this agreement and I am to be subject to the orders and commands of the company from time to time thereafter but wages are to be paid me from the time only when I begin work on the construction of the railway and not during transportation.

The company reserve the right to discharge me at any time without notice in case I shall fail to perform my duties to the satisfaction of the company or the foreman in charge of the work.

In further consideration of the advance to me of transportation from the seaport from which I embark, or other place, to the point in Canada where I am to be employed, or to the railway station from which men are transported for work, for medical examination, premium for insurance, and advance made under this agreement, and for incidental expenses connected with this agreement amounting in all to $, I solemnly acknowledge as a just and legal debt for which I have received full value and for the repayment of which I regard myself as legally and in honour bound to repay, I hereby assign and transfer to James Smart the whole of the balance which may become due to me or wages from time to time, from the said company or other contractor or sub-contractor for whom I may be working on their contract, after deducting the charge for board as above, and the medical fee usually charged workmen in such cases, as security for the repayment of the said. (. . . . .); and I hereby irrevocably appoint the said James Allan Smart my true and lawful attorney to receive all my said wages which may from time to time be earned by me in respect of the said employment, and I hereby authorize the said Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and every contractor or sub-contractor or other person by whom I may be employed upon the said work or other work, to deduct the said amount from my first earnings on the said work, less board and medical fee as above and to pay over such amounts as may become due me from time to time to the said James Allan Smart, until the said sum of $ ( ) has been completely repaid.

I further agree to pay the charge of not exceeding $4.50 per week for board and also medical attendance or any other reasonable charge which the company, contractors or sub-contractors may be put to while I am in his or their employ, and such amount to be deducted from any wage due me.

My real name is .. ..
My age is .. ..
My present address is .. ..
I am (married or single) .. ..

This agreement has been signed on the .. .. day of .. .. 190.. In the presence of .. .. .. Witness .. ..

tering the field of immigration than I would have in the booking agents to whom I have already referred, from all the information I have regarding the natural and easily understood inclination and interest of the booking agents. The Salvation Army, in particular, does excellent work. I am speaking generally and outside of that phase of its work which has to do with immigration. It has done an immense amount of good in England and it is doing a great deal of good in this country. I am always happy if I can assist this work, because, as was very properly said by Cardinal Manning, speaking in London, the Salvation Army reaches a class of unfortunates that no other organized religion can possibly reach. That is true and it is doing a great deal of good, but still, when you consider it as entering the field of immigration and receiving a bonus you are obliged to consider the classes among which it works. Many of this class are reclaimed, are redeemed and many, I have no doubt, make good immigrants. We are dealing with conscientious men when we are dealing with the soldiers of the Salvation Army, the Church Army, the East End Church Army and these religious organizations. But let us be perfectly frank and say that the immigrants they recruit—not all, but a good many—are recruited among people who are dependent in England upon public charity. They are men who have not succeeded in life, who have been assistant painters or assistant plumbers, who have not been able to succeed in their trades, who have large families, who are on the poor rates and it has been the habit of the guardians of the poor to confide a large number of these people to the Salvation Army, giving them a certain amount to take charge of these poor people, and they have all the necessary machinery to ship them to Canada. These are not in all cases the immigrants who are desired and I think it would be necessary for us, before paying bonuses in such cases, if we are to continue the bonusing system at all, to exercise the very greatest surveillance and to see that the unfortunate classes among whom these organizations work are not the classes that are sent out here.

There is an impression in England that all these undesirable people may be safely sent out here because they believe this to be a land flowing with milk and honey where there is always something to do even for the least qualified. It is the same in Calabria and the Neapolitan districts whence the most dangerous class of immigrants come, they find it cheaper to pay for the transportation of these dangerous and criminal classes from Naples to America than to keep them in jail, and that is why so many of these sinister malefactors from Italy land in Canada. Therefore, with regard to the immigration by religious societies we cannot be too careful. Many of these undesirable people, as was stated by the Italian whom I have quoted come from the United States. Indeed we should be very careful in granting bonuses on immigrants who come from the United States and who are not of that excellent farming class in the western states who settle on our cheaper and better land. The immigrants who come from the New England States, particularly the aliens, are dangerous. In support of that view I quote a letter received in Montreal by a friend of mine, from a very reliable authority, who says:

An estimate based on information from several sources places the number of unemployed men in this city (New York) at 40 per cent of the total; the wages of many still employed are being reduced. The employment bureaus are crowded as they have not been for years. The savings banks are being drawn upon heavily. The beneficial and insurance societies are feeling the effects of the times by lapsed membership and heavy borrowings on policies. Public charities are besieged for help. Our city magistrates states that their courts and prisons are crowded with men who have committeed no crime, but who have come to the extremity of their resources.

In view of such conditions in the United States I would warn the government that next summer we may expect a large influx of such people to Canada, and we cannot be too careful. I stated this afternoon that such had been the prosperity attendant on the operation of that mysterious Northern Atlantic Trading Company, the names of whose directors the Prime Minister was careful not to divulge on account of the danger of their committing suicide—that company made a great deal of money, and following their example, a great many other such combinations have been formed for the purpose of reaping profit out of this bonus system. In the city of Montreal we have a society called 'La Societé de placement et d'immigration,' which is composed, if I am well informed, of many influential members of the Liberal party who expect to get a bonus on immigrants from France. They have received a bonus of $2,000 from the provincial government, and the Minister of the Interior will correct me if I am wrong when I say, they have received or are going to receive, $5,000 from the Dominion government. I was told in reply to a question put by me in the House the other day, that they had not yet received any money, but my information is that they are to receive $5,000 from the Dominion government. Judging by their advertisement they have made arrangements to bring out farm hands and domestic servants. They will get a bonus from those with whom they make arrangements to bring out these people, and furthermore they are entitled to the large bonus which is paid on English immigrants. I think there is a danger in this. Societies of this kind are started

without any capital and they rely on the bonus for their income and for their profit, and I think there is a danger in that. The truth is that we can obtain excellent immigrants from France, but in regard to France as well as in regard to every other country we should apply the rule that we must select the immigrants and be careful in the selection. Last year 17,000 French emigration from the Basque provinces went to the Argentine Republic. They are excellent settlers, and they left France from Bordeaux, Acachon and surrounding ports. But when immigrants get to the Argentine Republic they want to know who they are and they exact a certificate from each one of them, and in France every man carries a livret which gives his full record and which states whether he is really a farm hand, what has been his business, what reputation he enjoyed in his own country, what is his record. We should impose a condition on all immigrants coming to Canada that they should have their livret which would show us their record.

Now, there is another matter to which I wish to call the attention of the government. Sometimes on these steamers from continental European ports there are as many as 2,000 immigrants and taking into account the crew and other passengers there sometimes are 2,400 persons on one of these steamers which will carry only perhaps 30 boats. That of course, would be impossible from a British port, but in the case of a vessel sailing from a continental European port the number of life boats is inadequate to save the passengers should the vessel meet with an accident which would necessitate those on board taking to the boats. I would suggest to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that he should take this matter into his consideration, for should any frightful loss of life occur under such circumstances the government would be held responsible because of its failure to provide safeguarding legislation.

Now, Sir, as a practical conclusion I would say this: We should first and foremost have the examination of immigrants conducted on the other side before they leave for Canada. This is done largely by the United States authorities and we should follow the example. When a man and his family arrive here it is very difficult to deport the mother or the father or some of the children and let the others remain here. Very often a family of immigrants has sold all their belongings in the country whence they came, and it might be cruel to deport them except in very extreme cases indeed. We are the masters as to whom we shall admit to Canada, and it ought be possible for us to provide on the other side for an examination into the physical, mental, and moral condition of the immigrants, and to admit nobody into the Canadian family who is not thought fit to form part of it. The bonus system should be abolished altogther. I think I have stated enough with regard to the bonus to show that it is time there should be an end put to that antiquated form of encouraging immigration. I venture to predict that if it is abolished we will receive the same number of immigrants, and we will most assuredly get a better class. But if we must have a bonus system I submit to the consideration of the House and the government that we should give the bonus to the immigrants themselves. Once we have found a man courageous enough to come with his family to this country, to give up his home in the old country, to settle down here and become a respectable and a valuable citizen, why not give the bonus to that man so that it may help him on his new career in this country. Under these circumstances, if we are to give some encouragement we could not give it in any better shape than a payment to the immigrant himself. I know my own opinions on the question of immigration are advanced. My own belief is that before long we will be obliged to adopt sterner measures, we will have to adopt the head tax. We know that in the United States they began with a head tax of $1, then they raised that by degrees to $4, and unquestionably they will still further increase the head tax in the United States. If we had a reasonable head tax we would immediately cover all this vast expense of over $1,000,000, we would secure better immigrants and we would receive as many as we are now receiving. Strange as it may appear, I am sure that if we had a head tax we would not diminish the number of immigrants. It has not diminished it in the United States. We would cover the whole $1,000,000 by means of the head tax and would provide a perfect system of inspection so that the immigrants would be in better shape than they are at present, and the $1,000,000 which is absolutely lost to us under the present conditions, could be devoted to more useful purposes.

I feel that in talking to the Minister of the Interior, who is charged more particularly with the Department of Immigration, I am, in a sense, speaking to a convert. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior when he was an ordinary member of this House, gave to the House the benefit of his experience as a long resident in the North west. He has expressed to this House in far stronger and more eloquent words than I could, exactly the opinions which I expressed this afternoon. Time and again I have heard my hon. friend before he reached the high position which he occupies today, explain and uphold the views I have expressed. I shall not quote at length, because he never varied in his opinions until the change which took him from the seat he occupied then, which was the seat of sincerity and truthfulness, to the ministerial position in which his views underwent, I

regret to say, a very serious change. In 1899 the minister among other things said at page 8523 of 'Hansard':

It is said: Look at the example of the United States. There is a country which has grown great by reason of opening its doors wide to the world. Well, let us see. The United States had a population of over 30,000,000 before the general influx of European population began. We, in Canada, have a population of possibly 5,000,000. There was no possibility of the original population of the United States being overwhelmed by the influx of foreigners from Europe. But there is every possibility of the population of northwestern Canada being overwhelmed. We must not forget the difference in out situations; and we must not forget that, after an experience of many years of the open door to the world-wide immigration, the United States years ago saw their mistake, and to a very great extent, shut the door. Now, if the example of the United States was good at one time, why is it not good now? Surely, the more mature judgment of the United States is as valuable to us as the less mature. If a nation of sixty or seventy millions finds it necessary to shut the door to indiscriminate immigration, is it not more necessary for a country of five millions, especially when the part of the country affected, in which these people will have almost sovereign powers, numbers only half a million, or scarcely that.

Elsewhere my hon. friend said:

I give you the actual facts which speak for themselves. People have left their places because the Galicians came in and settled near them. These other people are the pioneers and not the Galicians. The latter came in and had the advantage of the experience of the others, and they settled in places which would be considered desirable for settlement by other people were it not for the fact that these Galicians came there. It is not necessary that they should occupy every quarter-section in order to keep other people out, because they have taken up a tract of country about 25 miles in length and there no other settlers will go, although the Galicians have not occupied every other quarter-section. On the face of it, it is plain that this is a very serious question. While we have not suffered any very serious loss so far, I would not be doing justice to the district I represent were I not to place before this House and government the fact that there is danger, very serious, to the settlement of the Northwest, and particularly that part of the country, from the influence of these Galicians.

Further on he said:

You ask where are we to get people to fill up the Northwest? I looked over the United States census a few minutes ago and I found that in 1896 there were in the United States 980,938 natives born Canadians. Of these 678,442 were English and 302,496 French. There were of Canadian descent in the United States at that time 1,700,943 people. If it is true that there were in 1890 about 1,000,000 native born Canadians in the United States, if my calculation is good for anything, it means that there has been an overflow of population from Canada to the United States of not less than 30,000 people a year for 30 years. Where, then, can we find a better field for immigration to the Northwest than right in Canada itself, right in the older provinces? I know that that was contrary to the policy of the late government, as it is the policy of the present government, but is it not worth trying to get some of that 30,000 a year to go to the Northwest?

I cordially endorse, Mr. Speaker, these and many other statements made at that time by my hon. friend when he was completely independent. Let us reflect for a moment that the Doukhobors about whom we have heard a great deal lately, cost us to bring out here according to an answer given to a question in this House about $7.07 each. We expended over $40,000 at that time and they have cost us a great deal since then by reason of their being undesirable. Would not this House agree that the sum of $100,000 almost that we have spent on this class of people, clearly not the best, clearly not what we want in this country, could have been far better spent in the repatriation of this million and more of our fellow citizens in the United States, many of whom are anxious to get back to Canada, many of whom have never taken the oath of allegiance to the United States? There is a valuable asset lying ready to return to this country and could we not better have spent all our money on these people, than on adding an undesirable element to our population? The Minister of the Interior expressed these and far stronger views at the time. I have only given the House a sample of them. How changed he is today. What is it that has brought about this change? The contact with the gentlemen whom he met when he entered the cabinet? When he was a private member of this House the Minister of the Interior was the knight errant of what I would call the noble and proper principle for Canadian immigration; but bold knights yanish very quickly under such influences as seem to have been brought to bear on him since he entered the cabinet.

I feel confident that the time has arrived when we must not only look most carefully into this subject but must study the whole subject of immigration, and I venture to say that our whole system will have to be completely remodelled. We are a young country, we are at present the cynosure of the eyes of all Europe and the world generally. Canada is an immense country, a young country, full of resources, and the trend of the tide of immigration from all over the world is towards these shores. This is the hour for us to bring to bear all necessary precautions, a certain pride, a certain prudence, which should be our characteristic as a young nation; we should see that only the very best elements enter this country and we, the older men, the descendants of those who were the pioneers of this country, who settled it, should make it our principal solicitude to have in Canada only those who are fit to be associated

with us in the grand work of building up here a great commonwealth.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). With a great deal of what my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has placed before the House I can most cordially and heartily agree. He has not said one word too much with regard to the importance of immigration and its character. But I am sorry that he has moved a resolution in amendment to the motion to go into Supply in the terms he did and that in supporting that motion he took the ground and made the speech he did. He declares in his resolution that an aggressive immigration policy is desirable, but in his speech declares that the methods by which our immigration policy has been made successful are undesirable. My hon. friend is in the position of a successful business man who has achieved success by following certain methods and who then having achieved success decides to discard the methods which brought about that success. He admits that we have been successful in our immigration efforts, but regarding one very important part of that effort the bonusing of booking agents he has said everything he could to disparage it. While admitting that our immigration policy has been successful he has said everything he could to disparage every effort put forth by the government to encourage immigration and has been particularly desirous of discrediting this particular form of effort. I cannot follow him—and I do not think that that would be desirable or in the interests of debate—in all the positions he has taken.

In the beginning of his remarks he spoke of Canada as a country of five and a half million people with a very large territory to develop and very great opportunities and responsibilities. He then spoke of the United States a country of 80,0000 people, and of the splendid development which has there taken place. And he undertook to draw a parallel with regard to immigration policies between the two countries. He undertook to show that because a certain line of action was particularly desirable in the United States, a country of 80,000,000, that same line of action was equally desirable in Canada, a country of five and a half million people, but with an area equal to that of the United States. I have only to state the position to show how absurd his contention is. My hon. friend did not remind the House that 125 years ago, at the time the United States became an independent country, it had about the population which the Dominion of Canada has to-day. The United States has been 125 years from that date arriving at the position it now occupies. Yet my hon. friend undertakes to say that the policy of Canada should be the same as that of the United States after 125 years successful effort. That is sufficient to show how unwarranted were my hon. friend's comparisons. I do not wish to make any reflections upon his remarks; but I notice that although no one in this House has greater ability in expressing himself correctly and concisely and in transferring his thoughts to the pages of 'Hansard' without special assistance, he was careful to-day not to trust to his memory or the inspiration of the moment, but to read carefully his matured conclusions with regard to this important subject. I assume that the importance of the question was part of the warrant for this unnecessary and unusual caution on his part. I assume that another reason was the importance of the position he occupies on this subject. I take it for granted that he voices the opinion of his party on this question, that his leader left this charge upon him when he left the House, and I have every confidence that he discharged his duty as well as his leader could have done or perhaps better. But it seemed to me that there was something more than all this in the necessity for the special care he took in the expressions that were to be used. It seemed to me that my hon. friend had one eye on the effect of his remarks upon those who are particularly interested against an overplus of labour in this country, while he had another eye just as wide open to the possible effect of his remarks on the financial manufacturing and transportation interests of this country. He was evidently travelling on a very narrow road and it was necessary he should not step off it on either side. Every one will admit that if immigration is a good thing, if it is a necessity for this country in its present condition—and I have my hon. friend's word that it is—it must be upheld by methods of business of one kind or another. Something must be done if the good result aimed at is to be achieved; and when my hon. friend had been at such pains, as he was to-day, to discredit this important feature of the government's immigration policy and as far as he could, discredit all its methods, he must be satisfied to rank himself and his party against the principle of immigration to this country or against the principle of active effort on behalf of immigration. If that is the position of my hon. friend and his policy, we are very glad to take issue with him. We believe that in a country of the limited population and the vast area of Canada to-day, immigration is necessary to its progress, prosperity and general well-being. We believe that a great part of the prosperity and success which Canada enjoys to-day is due to the success of its immigration policy. My hon. friend read a great many figures which have more or less bearing on the question at issue, but he did not make what I think would have been a very illuminating statement. That would be a parallel between the flow of immigration and the increase of trade and general prosperity in Canada. He will find that the flow of immigration and the increase in the

volume of trade and general prosperity of the country absolutely march together from year to year.

My hon. friend has heard, or knows, that there are people out of employment in Canada—they were out of employment during the past winter. Did he ever hear, or does he remember, whether there were people out of employment in 1896 or the years preceding? He has heard of crime in Canada within the last few months. Was Canada free from crime previous to 1896? Is it a fact that there are fewer people out of employment than there were in 1896? It is a fact and my hon. friend knows that it is a fact. Notwithstanding the vast flow of immigration in the years between, notwithstanding the sudden change in financial conditions, only a few months ago, it is a fact to-day, that there are a less number of people out of employment in this Dominion of Canada than there were eleven years ago. That means, and can only mean, that Canada needed the people who came in the intervening years—that Canada needed these people, that these people have found a place in the well-being of Canada and that we have had the benefit of their coming. My hon. friend was eloquent on the desirability of keeping Canada for the Canadians, for those of us who were born here. Well, we want Canada for ourselves. But we cannot have something and at the same time give it away; we cannot keep Canada for ourselves without keeping it to work in for ourselves. If we are going to have other people in this country to help to develop the country and make money for us, we have to give them their share in the country. We could keep Canada for ourselves—our hon. friends opposite kept Canada for us very well, they were most successful in that policy. But I do not believe that even they themselves were satisfied with it; at any rate, the country was not. If we are to have that success in the development of the country that we look forward to, that we expect, that we plan for and work for, we can only have it by an increase in the number of workers in the country; and we can get that increase in the number of workers by bringing people from other countries to help us develop this country.

In regard to this particular question of bonus, I think it is just as well that we should deal with that matter at some length. I am glad my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) dealt with it, because I believe there is a very widespread wrong impression in regard to it. And, just in passing, I must thank my hon. friend for having read to this House the remarks which I made some years ago. I would like to say to him that what I said then seemed to me just as good as it seemed to him, and it seems to me just as good to-day as it did then, and expresses my opinion and my policy—so far as I may speak of my policy—to-day, as it did then. I will not remind the House, however, that when I gave expression to these views, I had not a solitary endorser on that side of the House.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Pardon me——

Mr. OLIVER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give me the name of one.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. These gentlemen had not votes at that time—possibly that is the reason.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) is alluding to, and I do not know whether he knows himself or not. I repeat that the views I expressed in regard to indiscriminate immigration I hold to-day as strongly as I held then. The policy of the government to-day is to carry out these views—let there be no mistake on that point. And the system of bonuses, as it is at present administered, is distinctly a system of selected immigration —so intended, so carried out, and successful in being carried out. Because bonuses are given, it does not follow that they are an inducement to indiscriminate immigration. Advertising may be necessary in carrying on a certain business, but the advertising may be one kind or it may be of another kind. Your canvasser may put forward one kind of argument or he may put forward another. So the system of offering bonuses may be put forward in one way or it may be put forward in another way. And to-day the matter does not admit of question that the system of bonuses as now administered is distinctly and specially a system looking toward selected, not toward indiscriminate, immigration.

My hon. friend was very much perturbed about the possibility of our paying bonuses on people, who, having come to Canada, pass on to the United States. He did not know how we avoid paying these bonuses, or how, if we paid them, we could possibly get the money back. I am afraid he did not study his own remarks before he made them as well as he should have done. He told the House that the United States keeps a most careful check upon all immigrants passing from Canada into the United States. He told the House what this check at the hands of the United States government rereveal to him, He had every faith that it was a complete check, that it was absolute and correct. He must know that, if this information was abialable to him, it is just as available to the officers of the Canadian Immigration Department, and that, by co-operation with the officials of the United States immigration service, it is possible for us to have the same advantage of an absolute check upon the immigrants passing through Canada to the United States—check in which the hon. gentleman reposes the most implicit confidence. Therefore, we do know, as a matter of fact, from the returns of the United States government, exactly how many, and exactly

who, of the immigrants who have come to Canada have passed to the United States ; and if, upon any of these, bonus has been paid, that amount is deducted from the next amount due that booking agent on bonus account. Nothing could be simpler, nothing could be easier, and nothing could be more satisfactory it seems to me.

Mr. MONK. Why have we no report of that?

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend will agree with me that there are more things in heaven and earth than are covered by the reports made to this House. It seems to me that the reports made to the House, not excluding the numerous returns asked for from time to time, receive very little attention from the House or country, judging from the discussions that take place on this floor. However, if this has not been reported before, I hope the hon. gentleman will consider that it has been reported now, and that he is aware how this payment of bonus is checked by the Canadian Immigration Department.

My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) enlarged greatly upon the enormous amount that had been paid in bonuses, and the stupendous danger of paying money upon undesirables. He spoke of our receiving 100,000 immigrants from European countries and suggested to the House, so that it might be reported to the country, that there was a probability, a reasonable probability, that bonus had been paid on every one of these immigrants. Now, he knew perfectly well that there was no foundation for that statement—pardon me, I should not say that; but the figures in his hand which he read to the House showed that there was no foundation for the statement. Just to recall some of those figures, he gave the House something like this: From the United States there was an immigration in a certain year of 30,000 or 40,000 people, and on that immigration there was some $3,000 paid in bonuses. In regard to general immigration there was in 1904-5, 146,266 immigrants arriving, and bonuses were paid on 28,836, or a little less than one in five of all those that arrived in that year. In 1905-6, 189,000 arrived, and a bonus was paid on 33,608. In 1906-7, nine months, 124,667 arrived, and a bonus was paid on 14,094; that is about one in nine. In 1907-8, nine months, 235,328 immigrants arrived and a bonus was paid on 20,492, that is about one in twelve.

Mr. MONK. There are still unsettled accounts.

Mr. OLIVER. I have given my hon. friend four years ; so while it is quite true that some accounts are yet unsettled, I think they will balance each other. At any rate, we are not paying on a greater proportion of the total arrivals than I have just indicated. Now what do these figures show ? They show first that we are not paying a bonus on all immigrants who arrive ; they show that the number on which we are paying is from one in five to one in twelve of all those who arrive. That shows that our officers are exercising due diligence in carrying out our regulations and that they are exercising proper care in the payment of bonuses that my hon. friend was very careful not to give them credit for in his remarks. He gave the idea to the House that there was collusion between the officers of the department and these immigration companies. If there was collusion, certainly the moderation of these people is wonderful. If there is an improper agreement between these companies and the officers of the government, and if having that free hand my hon. friend has suggested, they only paid bonuses on one in five or one in twelve that came over, certainly they are a very moderate minded people. But in point of fact, the hon. gentleman's figures disprove his contention ; they prove absolutely that the regulations regarding the payment of bonuses are effective, and that they are honestly administered. Now, if they are effective and honestly administered, and if the bonus figures are as I have just stated them, the conclusion is irresistible that the bonuses are paid with discrimination, and are not paid indiscriminately. If we pay on only one in five, or one in ten, or one in twelve, we must pay on that small percentage for some reason, there must be some basis on which we make the payment. Now why did we pay on that small number ? Because they are the classes of people that are satisfactory to us, the kind of people that my hon. friend himself will not dare to say should not be admitted to this country, or should not even be encouraged to come here. The figures I repeat are proof absolute that the policy of the government is a policy of discrimination in regard to immigration, and that the payment of bonuses made in pursuance of that policy is effective in carrying out the policy.

My hon. friend was worried about the North Atlantic Trading Company, and he thought the North Atlantic Trading Company had numerous successors who, I suppose, he wished us to understand were even worse than the North Atlantic Trading Company, more secretive and more ravenous. He knows that the agreement with the North Atlantic Trading Company was terminated on the 30th of November, 1906. From that time forward no bonuses were paid on continental immigrants until the order in council that was passed in 1907, and then a bonus of ten shillings was paid on adults to selected booking agents in certain European countries. Under that system, during the months from March, 1907, to February, 1908, bonus was paid to these selected booking agents for immi-

grants of the classes described coming from certain countries of Europe, to the number of 1,211 men, 390 women, 555 children, or £930 in all. That is all the bonuses paid on continental immigrants under the system which the hon. gentleman has been pleased to term a system of indiscriminate bonusing of immigrants coming from the continent of Europe. He has been good enough to say that in all probability the bonus has been paid on Italians, and he seems to have a very strong objection to such a thing. Now for good or bad reasons the government has not paid any bonuses on people coming from Italy since some time I think in 1902. Italy was one of the countries where a bonus was paid on immigrants to the North Atlantic Trading Company, I think in the first year of its operation. But the bonus was withdrawn as regards Italy and several other southern European countries, and since then no bonus has been paid on immigrants from Italy. The total number of immigrants coming from Italy on whom bonuses were paid, were I think in all 72, and that was five or six years ago. So that whatever may be charged against the bonus system, certainly the objections which my hon. friend has expressed to the Italian residents of this country are not chargeable to that system. In order to make it perfectly plain that the policy of the government is one of discrimination, it is only necessary to read the provisions of the immigration law, to which my hon. friend gave his assent in the session of 1906. Let me remind him and others of my hon. friends on the other side that their assent was not by any means a cordial assent to the provisions of the Act. They had a great deal of fault to find with a good many of its provisions, nearly as much fault as they have to find with the provisions of the regulations regarding bonuses. But, remember that Act was passed and it is in force and it is being enforced. Nothing can be plainer than the intent of the government and of parliament at that time was that while there should be an active and energetic effort made to secure a good and desirable class of immigrants for this country it should be a part of that policy, a very necessary part of it, that there should be accompanying these aggressive measures to bring immigrants, parallel energetic and effective measures to exclude undesirable immigrants. That was the mandate of parliament expressed in the session of 1906, embodied in the provisions of the Immigration Act and has been the policy that the government has carried out ever since. My hon. friend has been pathetic as to the woes of the municipalities, especially in Ontario and Quebec brought about by reason of the presence of undesirable immigrants. The city of Montreal, it seems, has been plagued with them, and the city of Toronto has been plagued with them. I do not know but that a great many other places may have been plagued with them. I notice that the city of Montreal is very glad to publish from time to time the statement, blazoned as largely as possible, that the population of Montreal has increased over a previous period and that the city of Toronto is doing likewise. These municipalities are glad to announce that their population has increased, but you cannot have an increase of population without having an increase of people and if you have an increase of people you can hardly have it without having an increase of the disabilities and disadvantages that go with ordinary people in this country. If the city of Montreal, or the city of Toronto, or any other municipality has suffered in the way my hon. friend has said then it is the fault of Montreal, the fault of Toronto, the fault of the other municipality and not the fault of this government or of its Act or its administration. Section 32 of the Immigration law says :

All railway or transportation companies or other persons bringing immigrants from any country into Canada shall, on the demand of the Superintendent of Immigration, deport to the country whence he was brought, any immigrant prohibited by this Act, or by any order in council or regulation made thereunder, from being landed in Canada, who was brought by such railway, transportation company or other person into Canada within a period of two years prior to the date of such demand.

Section 33 says :

Whenever in Canada an immigrant has, within two years of his landing in Canada, committed a crime involving moral turpitude, or become an inmate of a gaol or hospital or other charitable institution, it shall be the duty of the clerk or secretary of the municipality to forthwith notify the minister thereof, giving full particulars.

2. On receipt of such information the minister may, on investigating the facts, order the deportation of such immigrant at the cost and charges of such immigrant if he is able to pay, and if not then at the cost of the municipality wherein he has last been regularly resident, if so ordered by the minister, and if he is a vagrant or tramp, or there is no such municipality, then at the cost of the Department of the Interior.

That is the law. That was the law passed by parliament. That is the law under which the government is working and I say that under the provisions of that law, if any municipality complains as my hon. friend says they complain, it has no ground to complain of the Immigration Department or of this Liberal government, because in every case, where representations were made by a municipality deportation has been carried out.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Do I understand that deportation can take place at the cost of the municipality ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, but it can also be made at the cost of the government, but the point I wish to emphasise is that if a municipality wants an immigrant deported the provisions of the law are there and under these provisions he can be deported. If he is not deported it is not the flault of the law and it is not the fault of this government. I agree with what my hon. friend has said that it is a tremendous hardship to deport people. It is a most unfortunate thing when deportation has to be carried out. I quite appreciate the consideration of the municipalities in not asking for deportation of unfortunates who are within their limits. It is to the credit of the municipalities that they should have such a large feeling of charity, but there is the law and if they do not want to take advantage of its provisions I submit that they have no right to complain of the government which does not carry out the law except upon their demand, and especially there is no cause of complaint from our hon. friends opposite who are a party as much as we are to the provisions of this law. My. hon. friend also found fault with us because we allowed the people to get into the country that should be kept out. He said that the hurry and rush of landing passengers made it impossible to preserve an absolute check upon them on their arrival. Admitting the truth of that there is still the provision for the deportation of any undesirable who comes in. If he is discovered within two years he may be sent out. But in regard to the actual conduct of the examination at the port of landing, it is not the mere formal affair that the hon. gentleman suggests. It is true that a large number of people have to be landed in a very short time, but it is also true that on the slightest suspicion that anything is wrong with any of these people they may be taken aside from the general rush and held for examination. That is done and there is a very large number checked at the port of landing and returned from that port. He says that the provisions of the United States at these ports of landing are more efficient than ours. Possibly they are, but I would call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that to-day in the House and in the papers of this country there was blazoned abroad a complaint that the medical officer of the Immigration Department at the port of Halifax had delayed unduly a steamship load of immigrants. The same gentlemen who are demanding greater delay in the landing of immigrants, who are demanding that there shall be more particular examination, which means certainly either a very much greater expense to this country or a much greater delay to passengers, are complaining because they say that a load of passengers was unduly delayed.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Was not the complaint that the officer at Halifax was not at his business, that he was up town canvassing and that he allowed the passengers to remain on the ship ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, the complaint as stated on the floor of the House is as my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) has stated it, but the complaint as read from the newspaper was distinctly not as my hon. friend has stated it. The newspapers did not say that the doctor was canvassing when he should be attending to his duties.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He did not come until three o(clock in the afternoon.

Mr. OLIVER. The newspaper was careful not to say that he was not attending to his duties as he should, but it said there was a delay of the passengers and I submit that the hours mentioned did not show there was an undue delay, but quite the contrary. It shows that this statement was sent broadcast through the country just as a thousand other slanders have been sent broadcast through the country, and with just as little justification. The United States is at present pursuing a policy of exclusion of immigrants; it has no policy of bringing in immigrants. If we are to take the policy of the United States then we know exactly what to do and we can do as they are doing. I hope that if we ever have to undertake such a policy we will be more successful than they are, because, with their efforts at exclusion they received last year over one million immigrants and of that one million from 45 per cent to 50 per cent were of the very class which our friends on the other side of the House consider as being undesirable for Canada. The immigration situation in the United States differs materially from our situation. Their climatic and other conditions are attractive to a certain class of people that our country is not attractive to. Certain phases of the immigration question loom large to them where they loom small to us because of different conditions. Their attitude is one specially of exclusion but ours is not an attitude of exclusion. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) did not dare—I use the word without offence—did not dare to put upon the records of parliament a motion declaring for an exclusion policy; he did not dare to say that he was against a policy of active immigration. And as long as this country is to have a policy of attraction for immigrants it cannot handle its immigrants as they come at the ports of landing as would a country which has a distinctly exclusion policy. We must give facilities for our immigrants to land with the least possible discomfort. We must so conduct our business at the ports that we shall not exclude those whom we desire to

come here. In the United States they can exclude everybody, that is their law, that is their policy, that is their business. But it is not ours, and we cannot carry on our business at our ports as they carry on their business at theirs. I am bound to say that after all, although we do not have nearly as large a staff at our ports as they have at theirs, although we do not take up nearly as much time as they do, in the last result we have just about as effective inspection of immigrants as they have. They have, by agreement with the Canadian government, an inspection of immigrants bound for the United States, at Halifax, Montreal, Quebec and St. John, where they handle their immigrants just the same as if they were landing at United States ports. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) was terribly worried about what became of immigrants excluded at Canadian ports by United States officials. I can tell him what becomes of them. If a passenger ticketed for the United States is excluded by a United States official at a Canadian port he goes back on the steamship he came on. The same rule prevails at New York; if an immigrant arrives at New York ticketed for Canada and if our officer there says he is to be excluded the United States authorities see that he goes back on the steamer he came on.

Mr. MONK. Have we an examining officer at Ellis Island?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. MONK. Who is he?

Mr. OLIVER. Doctor Elliot.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister said that the newspaper did not state that this doctor at Halifax was not charged with being absent from his post.

Mr. OLIVER. I said that the newspaper did not charge he was canvassing when he should be at his post.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I don't care whether he was canvassing or anything else, he was not attending to his business, and I will read what the newspaper says if the minister will permit me.

Mr. OLIVER. I don't think that has anything to do with the question I am dealing with now.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The newspaper says the doctor did not come there from early morning till three o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. OLIVER. We are inquiring into the matter, and I hope to be able to lay before the House a statement with regard to it. I can assure the House that if the doctor at Halifax was not attending to his duties when he should have been, we will probably be able to get along without his valuable services. This question of dealing with immigrants on their arrival is a serious question, it is a difficult question, it is an important question. I beg to assure my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) that the government appreciates just as highly as he does the importance of excluding undesirables from this country and has taken all active measures that can be taken to achieve that end. But it is one thing to take the position that we are there simply for the purpose of excluding, and another thing to take the position that we are there principally for the purpose of bringing into our country those whom we desire to assist us in building our country up. That is the difficulty that confronts the Dominion government in dealing with this question of immigration, and we certainly think we are entitled to a fair consideration from our friends on the other side of the House in our efforts to deal with that question, rather than that we should be met by what I consider to be unfair criticism of details of the policy in regard to difficulties which cannot be avoided and which are inseparable from the carrying out of the dual policy of aggressive immigration effort on the one hand and exclusion of undesirables on the other. That I take it is the policy of this government. Let there be no mistake about it. And, one part of it is just as important as the other. It is just as important that we should use our efforts and spend our money to bring desirable immigrants to Canada as it is that we should keep out undesirable immigrants. Our friends opposite have during several sessions assumed, and their press throughout the country has assumed, that the government's policy was a policy of indiscriminate immigration, and yet there was a law on the statute-book and there was enforcement of the law at every port. My hon. friends opposite have no warrant for the position they took, and if they had ever a warrant for that position they have no warrant from this time onward. It is not long ago since in an effort to make it possible to carry out our understanding and to compel the fulfilment of our obligations, there was before the House a little amendment to the Immigration Act; a trifling little matter of some four or five lines. It was an absolute necessity to the intelligent and effective enforcement of certain provisions of the law. We have to face an immigration question on the Pacific as well as on the Atlantic. It is different on the Pacific from what it is on the Atlantic. The immigration differs at every point of the compass. It was necessary to adopt a restrictive policy on the Pacific coast. Different measures were suggested in regard to that restrictive policy but it was thought well in the interest of the country, in the interest of the empire, that a conciliatory rather than an aggressive policy should be adopted in connection with the immigration from one country at any rate. In pursuance of that idea an amicable arrangement was arrived at with that country, and it is hoped that a

similar arrangement can be arrived at with another country that is in a somewhat similar position in regard to immigration. But an agreement with Japan as to the restriction of immigrants from Japan to Canada, or an agreement with the government of India as to the restriction of immigrants from India to Canada was of no value without the provision we asked this House to pass the other night. It was absolutely of no effect.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE.. Did the minister say that the regulations passed by the House were above the treaty ?

Mr. OLIVER. No I did not say anything about the treaty. The gentleman who should be my hon. friend's leader took occasion to state his opinion to the House on that subject, but I do not think he maintained it, I think he was very glad to drop it before he got very far. However, my hon. friend will have an opportunity to maintain that same position at a later stage of this debate. My statement was that the agreement we arrived at with Japan and the agreement we hoped to arrive at with the government of India, agreements which are absolutely necessary in pursuance of our immigration policy and our trade policy on the Pacific coast, did not receive enthusiastic endorsation from our friends on the other side. I was surprised to see that. After the question had been threshed out for an hour, and the amendment had been twisted in every direction, when it was explained to our hon. friends that it was a matter of urgency to have this little amendment to the immigration law passed that evening, the Prime Minister was refused that courtesy, he was told it could not be passed, although our friends opposite had been informed that the date of its going into effect might be deferred for three or four weeks, and that as a consequence very serious complications might have arisen. I was glad to see when the House met the next day that our friends had experienced a change of heart; there was nothing wrong with the little amendment to the Immigration Act and it went through without change.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the minister should be fair enough to admit that it was the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) that prevented it going through the first night. He was not here the next night and in his absence it went through; that was the only cause of delay the first night.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Hughes) has a great deal to answer for on that side of the House, but I do not think he was entirely responsible in this case.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes, I was wholly and entirely responsible for holding back the Bill, and if it had been held back for ten minutes longer the next evening it would have been delayed still more.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not here to argue. I merely state the facts. I instance this to show that the government's policy is well defined, that it is a continuous policy, and that it does not receive that support from our friends on the other side that their remarks from time to time would indicate it should receive at their hands. We have not only the provisions of this Immigration Act which I have already mentioned to the House, but have found it necessary on account of the changed conditions in this country during the last few months to make certain changes in the administration of the law such as we are empowered to make by the provisions of the Act; because my friends will notice that while the Immigration Act contains certain very definite provisions, it also recognizes that new conditions may arise at any time and that it is necessary that the government should have the power to meet these new conditions as they arise. Provision is made in the Act for the passing of regulations by order in council to meet such conditions as may arise from time to time. Taking advantage of that provision in the Act, last fall when there was a change in the condition of the country that seemed to make it very desirable, we provided that there should be a money qualification in certain circumstances on the part of immigrants arriving in this country. That I hope my hon. friends will consider is not an indication of a policy of unrestricted immigration. On representations made by our agent in Great Britain, Mr. Bruce Walker who was then assistant superintendent of Immigration in London, in regard to the work of the charitable associations in Great Britain and its effect upon the immigration situation in Canada, we passed on the 25th of February another regulation which provided that persons coming to Canada by assisted passage could be excluded unless they were approved before they left their homes by our agent in that country. This is surely not an indication of a policy of unrestricted immigration. Surely these regulations bear out my statement that the avowed policy of this government is a policy of selected immigration, is a policy of restricted immigration if you like, while at the same time, it is a policy of aggressive immigration.

In order that there may be no mistake about the attitude the government assumes the government aware of its responsibilities, aware of the requirements of the country and carrying out its policy of selected immigration makes announcement in large type on the first page of its latest publications, the following :

IMPORTANT.

Farmers, farm labourers, railway construction men and female domestic servants are

the only people the Canadian Immigration Department advise to emigrate to Canada. All others should get definite assurance of employment in Canada before leaving home and have money enough to support them for a time in case of disappointment.

That is an expression of the immigration policy of the government of Canada to-day as set out in the printed representations they make to the people whom they desire to come to the country. How, in the face of that, can my hon. friend suggest that our policy is a policy of unrestricted or indiscriminate immigration ? We cannot be held responsible for the efforts of charitable associations. We cannot be held responsible for the movement of free citizens of other countries who choose to come to this country. We can only be held responsible for the efforts we make, and we make those efforts only to secure the classes of people that I mention. No one in this House, even at this time, will suggest that this is not desirable, that it is not in the best interests of the Dominion of Canada that reasonable efforts should be made to induce these classes of people to come to this country.

What was the condition a year ago in Canada? At that time, from one end of Canada to the other, there was a demand for unskilled labour. The demand was loud and insistent from every part of the country. It was proclaimed in the newspapers that railway construction was being held back because there were not sufficient people to work on the railway; that the factories could not fill their orders because they could not get operatives; that the farmers could not work their land because they could not get the farm help they required. And at the same time the broad fields in the Northwest were waiting settlement. What policy, in such circumstances, could be suggested for a progressive government but a policy of aggressive immigration? It is not so very long since we had a session of parliament here. The intervals between sessions seem to be getting shorter as the country gets older. It is just about a year ago to-day, or a little over, that we had a discussion in this House on the question of immigration, and some of our friends opposite then relieved their minds on this question. At that time there seemed to have been a rather strong sentiment in favour of immigration. My hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne) had some thing to say. I fancy he will follow the lead of my hon. friends on the other side and declare against immigration to-day. A year ago my hon. friend from Montmagny said:

> There is another feature of the immigration policy of this government which I desire to call to the attention of this House and the country in general. It is the most unjust way in which French immigration and the province of Quebec has been treated.

Mr. OLIVER

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I did not say that. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. OLIVER. He did not say it ?

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I did not mean it either.

Mr. OLIVER. He did not say anything in the whole course of his remarks.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Why then this reference?

Mr. OLIVER. In my opinion he did not say anything, but this is as near as he came to saying anything, and what I gather from it was that he was dissatisfied because the government had not used greater endeavours in order to secure more people for the province of Quebec.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. The hon. gentleman is again mistaken, but no doubt that is as near as he can come to understanding what I said.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is absolutely correct. That is as near as I can claim to an understanding of his remarks. I submit them, as they appear in 'Hansard' to the House for special consideration. He said further :

> I could also give figures to show that the French immigrant has cost less to this country than the British, and I only mention this to show that if the Department of the Interior were not so savagely opposed to it, it would be easy to bring French emigrants to this country.

We had an hon. member in this House at that time, who, we are pleased to see, is not among us now. I refer to the hon. member for Labelle.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER. He discussed the question of immigration. He said:

> My views are these. Because the fathers of confederation decided, and decided wisely, that this should be a dual country—French in its origin, British by assimilation, taking from both races and both civilizations its best moral, social and political characteristics—I maintain that the equilibrium between the two should be maintained, and it is in the interests of all British citizens in Canada that French-speaking population should be developed.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend to-day is in favour of more immigration.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Hear, hear. The hon. gentleman ought to remember too that we favoured interior immigration from one province to another which the government opposed then and opposes still.

Mr. OLIVER. I shall have something to say on that later on. Our friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa)—after a considerable amount of remarks which I think were as difficult to bring to a conclusion as the re-

marks of my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne)—also said:

But I claim that you can get from Scotland from Ireland, from England, from Belgium, from the north end of France, from Brittany, from Auvergne, from Franche Comté a most desirable class of immigrants. You can get from these mountains a hardy race of men who would come to our eastern provinces and take up small farms because any of them have a small capital at their disposal of $1,000, $2,000, $5,000 and as much as $10,000, who will go into the older provinces as some of them have done without any inducement whatever from the government without any literature being distributed amongst them, having come of their own will because they happened to learn something about Canada. . . . I claim that we have room for a large number—perhaps not for hundreds of thousands.

I think the House will admit that the then hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) was advocating an increase of French immigration to Quebec, and my hon. friend from Montmagny will not say that that occasion was the only one, in the course of his parliamentary experience, on which, when my hon. friend from Labelle said 'yes' that my hon. friend from Montmagny did not say: 'Me too.'

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Does the hon. gentleman want an answer ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, I am satisfied. But my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) also had something to say on that occasion. He was rather strongly in favour of immigration at that time. He did not have so many faults to find with the policy of the government. He said:

Let us look at the present situation in France, and let us ask what the Canadian government has done to induce French settlers to come to Canada. . . . Nothing has been done by the government to induce such people to settle in Canada. . .

There are at present in France perhaps, ten millions of people who would be prepared if, in the proper way, the advantages of this country were shown to them, to consider emigration to Canada, large numbers of whom would come to this country—eligible people who would make excellent settlers and would quickly become accustomed not only to our political institutions but to our national life in every sense.

To-night he has found serious fault with this government because it has spread its efforts in regard to immigration to the extent of paying a bonus to booking agents on settlers coming from France, and because having offered that bonus and continued it for the year at ten shillings, they increased it to $5 per head at the beginning of this year. He has experienced a change of heart or else he would not have found fault with the government for using reasonable endeavours to secure a desirable class of immigrants from France to Canada.

Mr. MONK. Because you are not taking the proper means.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend said that we should not give bonuses to booking agents, but that we ought possibly to pay bonuses to the immigrants themselves. Well, that policy was adopted by his friends when they were in power and it was a failure. It was found not desirable and was abandoned by them. This government has not seen fit to revive it. Such a policy would be the policy of assisted immigration, and assisted immigration is distinctly contrary to the immigration policy of this government. Let that be distinctly understood.

Mr. MONK. You assisted a great deal too much I think.

Mr. OLIVER. Except in the case of the Icelanders, in which a bonus is paid the shipping company, thus reducing the fare to that extent—and no one will question the propriety of using reasonable endeavours to get Icelandic immigration—with that exception this government has not spent any money in assisting immigration or with regard to assisted immigration. And I want to impress on the House that we have taken the position that assisted immigration is not desirable as a rule. We have taken power to absolutely exclude it unless it is first approved by our own officers in the country from which it starts. That makes our position on the subject of assisted immigration perfectly and absolutely clear.

Mr. MONK. You assisted the Doukhobor —paid $50,000 for that purpose.

Mr. OLIVER. We did assist the Doukhobors. I think that what was done in regard to these people was that some concession was made, the same that was made in the case of the Icelanders—the bonus was used as a part payment on the transportation. There was some exception made—I am not now clear exactly what it was—to the rule in the case of the Doukhobors. But, as I had occasion to say to the House a little while ago, when this question was up before, what was done in regard to the Doukhobors was not done in the dark, but in the full light of day, and, with one or two exceptions, on which I need not dwell, the action of the government received the absolute assent of this House and of the press and the people of Canada. I say it is too late in the day to call in question the policy of the government in regard to the Doukhobors.

Mr. MONK. I do not like to interrupt the hon. gentleman; but what does he say regarding a trachomatous immigrant who is kept for six months in the hospital?

Mr. OLIVER. A trachoma patient is required to pay his own expenses in the hospital, and, if he does not pay, the steamship company must pay or he goes back—that is

all there is in regard to that. I want to make it perfectly clear that the hospital treatment of trachoma is at the cost of the immigrant or of the shipping company. The immigrant arrives suffering from a disease which renders him undersirable. But it is a curable disease. Under our law, he is liable to exclusion and to be sent back on the steamship, and unless the steamship company is willing to pay the charges necessary to bring about his cure, back he goes and that is all there is about it.

Mr. MONK. That is not the law.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, it is the practice. And if there is no law for it, I hope he will not be one to raise a question as to the system under which we are acting. It seems a reasonable and proper system and one that exactly meets the views he expresses. So far as the Pacific coast is concerned we have there, in view of our present attitude in regard to immigration, ceased to give treatment in these hospitals; so, when a trachoma patient arrives on the Pacific coast, he is sent back on the ship on which he came. Another hon. member of the House had something to say on the occasion of that debate :

This shows that the policy of the Immigration Department is to direct these immigrants to the western lands——

That was the ground of complaint.

—and if, perchance, the agent of any farmer would like to offer one of these immigrants employment—and we have farms in the vicinity of the city of Quebec where the immigrants would find a welcome and an opportunity to work for an honest wage—the making of such an offer specially forbidden.

Another gentleman on that side of the House on that occasion said:

But I have also another complaint to make with regard to our immigration methods. It appears that the whole effort of the government is directed toward procuring settlers for the northwest. But there are other parts of Canada beside Saskatchewan, Alberta and the territories.

And my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) said :

I am not so much complaining that our people go to the northwest as I am that our farmers cannot get the help they require.

And the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) who, I regret, is not now in his place, said :

So far as Ontario is concerned, it is short of help.

Another hon. member who is not now in his place, the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Marshall) said :

A good deal has been said about farm labourers, but nothing about women. Would it not be well to encourage to come into Canada, good strong women and girls? Manufacturers in this country are handicapped very much by shortness of female help, particularly the canners. I would like the minister to consider whether it would not be well to encourage women to come over, and give a bonus on bringing them as well as the men.

And another hon. gentleman on that side, whom I see in his place, said :

I will ask the government to make a more intelligent and more active propaganda in France where we have but two agencies. I should think that our efforts should be directed especially towards securing emigrants in provinces.

And so on. A year ago, our friends on the other side were just as anxious for immigration as we were. This year, because there has been a change in the conditions, they are prepared to take a stand against immigration, while, saving themselves by the terms of the resolution they put before the House.

There is a feature of this immigration question that I think should be discussed and considered very carefully. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) did me the honour to read to the House some remarks I made some years ago in which I spoke of the number of Canadians then in the United States. According to the theories I have heard advanced in the House this session in regard to this immigration question, Canada should have been in a very much more prosperous condition, or, at any rate, the working people of Canada should have been in a very much more prosperous condition, because of that large movement of Canadians to the United States. If our working people are at a disadvantage because we bring in people from other countries, or because people come in from other countries, surely there must have been an advantage because our own people went out of our own country. Was Canada prosperous and were our working people advantaged because of the fact that one million Canadians found their homes in the United States previous to 1890? Were the conditions in any part of Canada better because of that movement of our people away from our country? Is it not a fact that the loss of that population to Canada was the greatest loss she ever suffered? Was it not that loss of population more than any other cause that prevented the progress of Canada during these years? And what class in Canada benefited by that exodus which was deplored at that time, but which, I supopse our friends opposite should congratule themselves upon now? It is not the fact that increased population decreases employment, nor is it the fact that decrease of population increases employment. The contrary is the fact. It is a fact that never in Canada were wages so high or so much work available as there has been during the past two or three years when we have been getting more people in one year than we got in twenty years before; when, I say,—very much better than

that—our own people, instead of going to the United States have been remaining in Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) say that they are not going to the United States yet?

Mr. OLIVER. I say there is not one of our native Canadian population going to the United States for ten that went fifteen years ago.

Mr. SPROULE. The United States report of last year says that in 1907, there were 19,918 Canadians went to the United States.

Mr. MONK. It is the same as ever—there is no change.

Mr. OLIVER. I can only say that my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) has more faith in the United States returns than I have. I think I can produce evidence that is better than any return. Previous to 1896, there was in some of the New England cities an absolute preponderance of French Canadians. At the same time there was not in the Canadian Northwest any appreciable increase of Canadian population. These facts are within the knowledge of every man in this House, and they do not need to be supported by reports of immigration officers or by census returns. That there are a million and more of Canadians in the States, any person who travels in the States will know. Go to any of the large cities in the United States and you will find a Canadian club ; go into any legislature of the western States and you will find Canadians occupying positions of more or less prominence. In every part of the United States are our people to be found. They went there instead of going to populate our own country, but to-day our country is being populated by our own people. We are getting people from other countries, it is true, but the most satisfactory feature about it is that our own people are going to our own Canadian Northwest, so that notwithstanding the inrush of people from Europe and the United States, to-day Canadians are the dominating influence through the four western provinces. That result has been achieved under the present immigration policy that my hon. friend deplores as one likely to de-Canadianize this country. It was the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite that de-Canadianized Canada, and that Canadianized every one of the northern States. This country cannot stand still, it must either go forward or backward. The immigration policy of this government is a policy of going forward ; the policy of my hon. friends when they were in office was a policy of going backward. To-day the hon. gentleman, seeing a little change in the financial condition of the country, thinks he sees an opportunity to secure a party advantage at the expense of the country, and he proceeds to take it, and no doubt will have able assistance from hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. We have confidence in the intelligence of the Canadian people and their ability to understand the situation. We deny absolutely the accusation that the policy of this country is one of indiscriminate immigration. It is a policy of discriminating immigration, a policy that only looks to getting the best and excluding those that are not the best, so far as that is possible. On that line we are working and on the results achieved we desire to be judged.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny). I think I can congratulate the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) in having deserved the compliments of the Minister of the Interior. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier has been able to speak of French immigration without being accused by the Minister of the Interior of raising racial prejudices, and creed questions in this House. Last year when the debate on immigration took place, to which the minister referred, my hon. friend stated that I had the honour of occupying a unique position in this House. I am sure he has found out to-night that I do not occupy a unique position in this House, and if he goes out into the country he will find that I do not occupy a unique position. Evidently the hon. gentleman has kept in his mind the debate of last year, but he has not answered the arguments made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier to-day, or the arguments made last year by Mr. Bourassa and myself. For instance, we stated last year that although the government had cancelled its agreement with the North Atlantic Trading Company, they were still paying bonuses to booking agents ; the minister has not contradicted that. We stated last year that the policy of the North Atlantic Trading Company had been a failure, and the minister has not contradicted that to-night, nor did he last year. We stated last year that the system of paying bonuses to bring immigrants into this country had the effect of bringing people into this country of an undesirable character, and the minister has not contradicted that. We stated last year that the system of bonuses was still in existence ; the minister contradicted that last year, but he did not contradict it to-night. We stated last year that they were bringing all kinds of people to this country under the present system ; the hon. member for Jacques Cartier stated that to-night, and the minister has not dared to contradict it.

Mr. OLIVER. If I did not deny it before, I certainly take the opportunity of denying it now. But with my limited knowledge of English, I am under the impression that I did deny it.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I am glad the hon. gentleman denies it now. I will

prove that the present immigration policy of the government is a dangerous one, and will have the result of breaking up confederation ; I will prove it by the words of the minister himself when he had no portfolio to safeguard. Take the commonsense point of view. Is there an hon. member in this House, including the minister himself, who will say that the paying of bonuses to booking agents who have nothing in common with this country, who do not know any thing about this country, has not the result of bringing to Canada a mass of immigrants without any regard to quality ? As the hon. member for Jacques Cartier stated this afternoon, there is no man in this country who would adopt the same policy for a herd of animals ; there is no man who would pay a bonus to an agent in Europe to send him a number of animals without paying any regard to their quality. But let us see what the minister said himself when he was plain Frank Oliver. In 1902 he used these words :

Let me say further that it appears to me to have been a mistake in the past to have spent so much money as we have in paying bonuses to steamship companies for the conveyance of immigrants, and for this reason: We made the steamship companies by that means our immigration agencies——

Where is the difference this year ? If we are not making the steamship companies our immigration agents, we are making the men who sell tickets on those ships our booking agents.

—and it did not make any difference to the steamship companies what the character of the immigrant was, or where he was from so long as they got the bonus. It seems to me, from my point of view, that this is a most undesirable system and a most undesirable expense, and I would ask that it be not continued. . . . To depend on the steamship companies is to put a premium upon the worst rather than upon the better.

That is what I said a year ago, and what the hon. member for Jacques Cartier said to-night. The minister spoke thus also:

I would like to say still further and to urge upon the House at large, upon hon. members who come from all parts of this Dominion, that the immigrant who is of the most benefit to this country in every way is the man of our own blood, namely, the native born Canadian, who, finding it necessary to shift his ground, must go either to the United States or to the Canadian Northwest.

I will prove that this government has been directing immigration from other countries, and opposing the movement from our own east to the west. But the minister, when he was still plain Frank Oliver, in 1903, said this :

Something has been said, I understand, about the paying of bounties or commissions to induce immigration. To my mind, if ever there was need for that system, that need has passed.

The payment of bounties and commissions has a tendency to bring the less desirable rather than the more desirable class of people. The work of introducing immigration is carried on in many different ways. Some are better than others; and I would take the liberty of suggesting to the House that there is a certain system being carried on to day which is in every way desirable, a system which is producing the best possible results and which may very well be enlarged so as to continue these results.

But the hon. minister, before he accepted a portfolio, said that the payment of bounties had the result of bringing a less desirable class of immigrants into the country. I could go on and quote statements of the minister extending over a series of years. Even since he has been a minister he has expressed himself on this subject and notably when the North Atlantic Trading Company contract was announced. The reason given by the minister for the contract was because the government did not want to pay bounties and bonuses to individual booking agents. This is what the minister said in scoring a point against the Conservatives:

Now, to whom did our hon. friends on the other side pay the bonuses? They paid them to individual booking agents—so their letters show. To whom did this government pay in the years preceding the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company? They paid to individual booking agents.

To whom do they pay now? Not to any individual booking agents but to the North Atlantic Trading Company, a collective interest of booking agents. And do they get value for their payments? Judged by the standard laid down in the letter of Sir Charles Tupper they do. And any man of common sense, not wrapped by political bias, will agree that that is the main question.

Since the contract has been denounced I want to ask the minister if the government pay bonuses to individual booking agents. The reason given for entering into the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company was a false reason, or, if it were not false, how is it that the government has denounced this contract and has gone back to the system of paying bounties and bonuses to individual booking agents? The minister has been meditating on this question for twelve years and he has not given us an answer yet.

We heard this afternoon from the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that, with the class of people we are getting, assimilation would not be possible. The minister says that in the Northwest there is everywhere the stamp of Canadian civilization. Let us open the report of the Department of the Interior and read a list of the immigrants arriving for one month. It is as follows:

African, south; Australian, Austrian, N.E. S.; Bohemian, Buckowinian, Croatian, Galician, Hungarian, N.E.S.; Slovak, Belgian, Bulgarian, Chinese, Dutch, French, German, N.

E.S.; Alsace-Lorraine, Prussian, English, Welsh, Scotch, Irish, West Indian, Jamaican, Greek, Hebrew, N.E.S.; Hebrew, Russian; Hebrew, Polish; Hebrew, Austrian; Hebrew, German; Italian, Japanese, Newfoundland, New Zealand, Portuguese, Poles, N.E.S.; Poles, Austrian; Poles, German; Poles Russian; Persian, Roumanian, Russian, N.E.S.; Finns, Spanish, Swiss, Servian, Danish, Icelandic, Swedish, Norwegian, Turks, Armenians, Egyptians, Syrians, Arabians, U.S.A. Citizens, India.

This is the stamp of Canadian civilization that is being put upon the Northwest. We find in a total of 109,000 immigrants, no less than 9,000 returned Canadians. Let us go a little further. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier pointed out this afternoon that there had been a movement started in the United States against immigration, but let us see the proportion of immigrants who come into this country and the proportion of immigrants who go to the United States. Let me point out to this House, that a man who knows something about immigration, an economist of world-wide celebrity, P. Leroy-Beaulieu, says that the immigration is greater than the natural increase of the Canadian born population. What was the population of the United States when they were receiving about the same proportion of immigrants that we are now receiving? As my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier says then they had fifty million of a population. To-day the Americans, with a population of eighty-seven million cannot assimilate one million immigrants a year; that is 115 immigrants for every 10,000 of the population. Canada, with a population of only six million received 215,000 immigrants in 1905-6. Last year we received about 300,000, or 360 to every 10,000 of the population and next year it will probably increase to 400,000 or 500,000. We have received in six years 736,000 immigrants. I see by 'Hansard' that the unit of representation was, in 1903, 25,736. We have received enough people to supply 29 new counties in Canada. In four years at that rate we will have received enough to make 60 new counties, or 5 less than there are in Quebec, and still we are giving to the Northwest the stamp of Canadian civilization and we are assimilating this new population. The immigration which comes from the British isles has been proved to be the least desirable class in the Northwest, and this is attributable to the bonus system because it has prevented us from getting the best immigration which we could receive and that is immigration from the British isles. I am reluctant to weary the House with figures, but I desire to make a comparison between the position of the United States and that of Canada with respect to immigration. The following table will show the proportion of immigration to population of the United States from 1790 onward:

Year.	Population.	Periods.	Total immigration.
			$
1790.....	3,929,214	1790-1800	about 75,000
1800.....	5,308,423	1800-1810	75,000
1810.....	7,239,881	1810-1820	75,000
1820.....	9,638,453	1820-1830	151,824
1830.....	12,866.020	1830-1840	599,125
1840.....	17,069,453	1840-1850	1,713,251
1850.....	23,191,876	1850-1860	2,598,210
1860.....	31,443,321	1860-1870	2,491,451
1870.....	38,558,371	1870-1880	2,812,191
1880.....	50,155,783	1880-1899	5,246,613
1890.....	62,622,250	1890-1900	3,687,564

The United States never received immigration exceeding 11 per cent of the population, while according to the figures of the Department of the Interior in Canada, from 1901 to 1911, Canada will receive foreign-born immigrants to the extent of 37 per cent of the population. When the United States had fifty million of a population they did not receive more than 300,000 immigrants per year. President Roosevelt and the scientists and economists of that country are alarmed and are doing what they can to exclude immigrants. I could quote more figures to show the House that since 1850 in the United States the foreign-born population was never more than 15 per cent of the total population. In Canada the foreign-born population is 12·7 per cent of the total population. The total population of Canada was at the last census, I believe, 5,371,315, and the foreign-born population is a little more than 684,000. In four years, according to the estimate of the Department of the Interior, the total population of Canada will probably be about eight million and the foreign-born population will be about two and a half million; that is 30 per cent of foreign-born population. But, as to this assimilation, let us hear a voice from the west; let us hear a man who ought to know something about assimilation of population in the Northwest, and here is what was said by Mr. Roblin, Premier of Manitoba, speaking at Pictou on June the 10th, 1907:

To show that I am not mistaken in my conclusions upon this point, allow me to point out this fact—that in the last ten years, according to the figures compiled by the Immigration Department of the Dominion, there have come into Canada, in round figures, 900,000 souls. Of these, only 350,000 were British born, the balance (550,000) are either Americans—citizens of the United States to the South of us—or people from continental Europe. I may say that, according to the same authority, a larger proportion of those who came to us who were not British born, covering this period, came from the United States, than came from Europe.

Now, it is only a logical conclusion to say that the same ratio at least will be maintained in the future as has obtained in the

past. It is a reasonable statement, therefore, to say that a country of eighty millions of people immediately adjoining, who have no more free lands to offer to their people, will naturally, by virtue of the natural increase of population, continue in much larger percentage to emigrate to our 'last west,' as it is called. The same with continental Europe. They have 400,000,000 of people to draw from, and they are coming from every nation, while we have only about 40,000,000 to draw from in so far as the United Kingdom is concerned.

Foreigners will control.

Without any doubt whatever, it is only a matter of five, certainly not more than ten, years with the same ratio of immigration that has characterized the last five years, when the foreign-born citizens of western Canada can, if they choose, take all matters of government absolutely into their own hands.

That speech was published in the press all over the Dominion; it was read by the people of the west and I am told that the popularity of the Premier of Manitoba has not suffered thereby. Even the Minister of the Interior himself speaking of the North Atlantic Trading Company said that this system of paying bonuses to individual booking agents cannot be checked. More than that, we have in the old country, hypnotized immigrants to come to Canada and I do not want any better proof of that than the statement of Mr. Bruce Walker contained at page 66 of the report of the Department of the Interior for 1907, where he says:

Since I have been in charge of the propaganda here, under your Lordship, I have sought to impose a higher standard upon those classes of emigrants over which we have control particularly, and over all emigrants generally. I disapprove strongly of efforts to paint Canada as a 'land flowing with milk and honey,' or a place providing an easy existence for those who readily tired of work. The greatest attraction of our country is the ready results that follow energy, ambition and determination.

Here, according to the report of an officer of the department, Canada has been represented as a land flowing with milk and honey. We have been told by the Minister of the Interior that we do not pay bonuses for immigrants to come to this country, and that the bonus to the booking agent is simply for advertising Canada. Does the minister pretend that the advertising of Canada in the old country is read only by farm labourers or railway navvies and those of the classes we desire to bring here? Does he not know that the advertising of Canada reaches every class of the population there and that it brings to our country the disabled and degenerate. Such representation have even a more decided effect on a population of destitutes. I say that the immigration agents have brought immigrants to this country under false pretenses and I further say that when the government paid these bonuses they had no proof that they were paid on account of farm labourers or navvies, or those whom the regulations prescribed it should be paid on. I want no better evidence of that than that which is given by Mr. Scott, superintendent of immigration, before the Committee on Colonization and Agriculture, and which I quote:

By Dr. Sproule:

Q. As I understand it you merely ask immigrants whether they contemplate following agricultural pursuits when they come here?—A. We do at the ocean ports.

Q. That is all the information you have as to the classes to which they belong?—A. Yes, they are questioned as to their age and occupation.

Q. What occupation they have been following?—A. What occupation they have been following in the old country and the manifest is prepared by the purser of the ship who is not a government officer and certified to by the master of the vessel.

Therefore, the certificate of the occupation of the man who comes to this country is prepared by the very people who have an interest in bringing him here and receiving the bonus, as is proven by the evidence of an officer of the department. I quote further from the evidence of Mr. Scott:

I should have thought a government officer would look after that work and see that nobody but certain classes were sent out?—A. Anybody who has the money can buy a ticket.

Q. But if he has the money will he get the bonus?—A. No, but I say any one can buy a ticket in the old country.

Q. The reason I ask is because I know of several men who came out here; I was told they were farm labourers and had come out to follow farming and I took the trouble to inquire and in the case of six or seven there was not a single man who was on a farm in his life?—A. That might be quite true.

Here is the superintendent of immigration saying that bonuses might be paid on men who were brought out as farm labourers and who never had worked on a farm in their lives. The examination of Mr. Scott continued:

Q. And yet they were sent out and called farm hands?—A. No, not called farm hands. They were sent out here to follow agricultural pursuits and on an English farm the labourer receives as good money as he receives here and in addition he gets work all the year round instead of only seven or eight months.

Q. It seems to me that is not the question; it is whether we were misled or not in reference to the class of people coming out?—A. I do not think so. The manifest shows the evidence.

Q. What manifest?—A. The manifest signed by the purser of the ship.

Q. Do you not pay the booking agent?—A. Only if they are agriculturists or intend to follow that occupation in this country.

Therefore a man can buy his ticket from a booking agent and the booking agent does not care about Canada, he cares only about

the bonus he is going to get and the commission on the ticket and he says to the man: Just say that you are a farm labourer or that you want to work on a railway and you will get into Canada. The examination of Mr. Scott continued:

By Mr. Wilson:
Q. If they say they intend it ?—A. Yes.
By Mr. Ross:
Q. Do I understand they make a declaration to that effect?—A. They answer questions at the port.
Q. With reference to the Salvation Army do you insist upon the same class that you pay the bonus on?—A. The same class.
Q. Or do you pay the bonus on all they bring?—A. No, on the same class.
Q. What was the percentage they bring?—A. I think possibly their percentage has been a little higher than some of the others.

I want the House to remember well what has been said about the Salvation Army because when we come to consider the ports of Canada we will see the acts of the Salvation Army.

Q. Has the arrangement been completed with reference to the land they get in the Northwest?—A. I know nothing about the land.
Q. Will that not come under your office to some extent?—A. No, we have nothing to do with the land in the west.
Q. You have nothing to do with where they shall be sent?—A. No.
Q. Who does that?—A. The land branch, I suppose.

Here is the Superintendent of Immigration who does not know where the immigrant goes in this country.

Mr. SPROULE. Hear, hear.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. But we are told by the Minister of the Interior that the bonus is paid on the immigrant, not to the immigrant. As I have said we have been advertising Canada as a patent medicine is advertised and what has been the result ? The result has been, as with any patent medicine, that the diseased have been coming to this country. I care not what kind of disease they are suffering from, mental, physical or moral, it is certain that they have been coming to Canada. As the minister himself said when he was a plain member of this House, the best advertisement we can have for this country is a contented settler and as the minister has proven to-night by trying to show that we do not pay a bonus on the greater part of the immigrants we receive. Stopping the bonus will not stop immigration coming to this country but we will have the quality instead of having the quantity sent to us by different booking agents to secure the bonus paid by our country. To-night, as last year when the immigration question was threshed out in this House, the minister tried to prove that we were not paying bonuses on many of these immigrants sent out by organizations but later when the subsidies came down it was seen that the immigration agents of the government, such as the Church Army, were asking in England for such immigrants as these, tramps, loafers, ex-convicts, drunkards hooligans. That is the kind of immigration we have been receiving in this country, and these immigrants have been canvassed by the very agents of this government. Has this government disallowed the Church Army? I have searched in every record of the government, in every record of the Department of the Interior, and I have not seen that the Church Army has been disallowed, except that this year a certain number of their immigrants were sent back. Why? Because last year we denounced this policy of the government and were called little Canadians by that broad, that immense Canadian, the present Minister of the Interior.

The Salvation Army is still an immigration agent of this department and what have we seen in Quebec? I have no hesitation in saying and I dare the minister to contradict me, that nine-tenths of the immigration which has been sent out by the Salvation Army is bad, and I want no other evidence than that of the doctors who receive the immigrants at the port of Quebec. And I say this too, that there has been some collusion between the Salvation Army and the officers at Quebec.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend has asked me to deny a statement he has made and I do not want his statement to go on record without my denial.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Then I defy the minister to have an inquiry into the Salvation Army and the immigrants it has brought into Quebec, and to ask the doctors at Quebec to give their evidence; but I hope this time the government will not stop the mouths of the witnesses who give evidence. There has been collusion between the officers at Quebec and the Salvation Army, and I have it from the very officers who receive the immigrants at Quebec that before they pass the medical examination of the officers of his department the immigrants of the Salvation Army go to the barracks and get the password of the Salvation Army at Quebec and then go back and answer the doctor. The minister cannot contradict that if he looks at the correspondence produced.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member is making a great many statements which he puts forward as statements of fact. The statement he has made just now that members of the Salvation Army or immigrants coming out under the auspices of the Salvation Army are treated any differently from any other immigrants who come out, so far as my knowledge goes, is absolutely incorrect; and if I can by any means demonstrate that it is the fact we will have a change in the immigration service at Quebec immediately.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I accept the personal denial of the minister but you will notice that it is not an official denial and I repeat it officially——

Mr. OLIVER. We will make this as official as we can. If my hon. friend will give me name, place and date, I will make it official inside of twenty-four hours.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. All last summer, the immigrants brought out by the Salvation Army were sent to the barracks and there they got the password from the Salvation Army officers to answer the doctors of the Immigration Department. Not only that but a report was made to the Interior Department here and after that report was made, it was understood by Mr. Doyle and the immigration doctors at Quebec, I think Dr. Nadeau and Dr. Potvin, that if there were one hundred Salvation Army immigrants they would pass before the doctor first but if less they would go to the barracks first. That is the statement I have to make and on it I would like the department to throw more light.

Mr. OLIVER. I will guarantee all the light that is possible and if the statement is true I will consider myself under very serious obligations to my hon. friend for making it.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I knew the minister would be under obligations. Last year we made statements and he made changes, and this year he will make more. If he will have an investigation of the methods at Quebec he will learn many things that will enlighten him and he will be still more grateful to me.

But the minister has told us that if the immigrant was not satisfactory he would be deported. If he came here in transit through Canada to the United States he would be deported, and was generally deported, and no immigrant who was brought into this country and was found undesirable was not deported. Let us look at the statement. First of all we see no report of the immigrants refused by the United States who have been deported by this government and more than that we see that the very immigrants coming to this country who should have been deported have not always been deported. We have had to-night the first declaration of the minister on this subject. We see certainly that some have been deported at the port of entry for certain reasons, but there are some in Montreal who come under section 33 of the Immigration Act who have not been deported. The minister says that no complaint has been made. I understand that quite well. Suppose a city like Montreal or Toronto would make a complaint, do you know what the minister would answer? Yes, they will be deported, but you pay the cost. That is the regulation of the Immigration Department. I say that with the number of immigrants coming to this country it would be impossible for a city to do this, it would ruin the budget of any city to have to deport the immigrants received who are not desirable.

Mr. OLIVER. It may be that my hon. friend is not anxious to adhere strictly to the facts but he should get a little closer to them. The Act says that the immigrant is to be deported at the cost of the transportation company bringing him.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Or those making the complaint.

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I asked the minister and he said yes.

Mr. OLIVER. If the transportation company is not known then at the cost of the person making the complaint.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Have we not seen that the transportation company is not known? We have seen from the evidence of Mr. Scott that they do not know the immigrants or where they are, and how would it be possible to know what transportation company brought them? Therefore, you would fall back on a city like Montreal or Toronto. And what do we see in those cities in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario which have received those immigrants? We see that criminality there has increased to such an extent that the public press of this country deem it advisable to publish articles on its alarming increase. Let the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) ask any judge of the assizes in Montreal or any other city, or any police magistrate, if nine-tenths of those who are convicted before them are not foreigners brought to this country at so much per head, or, if no bonus was paid on them, brought by the false pretenses of immigration agents who paint Canada as a land of promise with a view of getting the bonus on a certain number. And because of these glowing descriptions, you will always find that a good many of the abandoned and destitute in the old world will be tempted to seek better fortune in the new. There is something else. In Montreal already we have had to face the social question which until to-day was there practically unknown. Last year we had a socialistic parade and we are to have another this year. I knew the Minister of the Interior was a Liberal, but I could not know, he was a Liberal to such an extent that he wanted the red flag raised in the city of Montreal.

Mr. MEDRIC MARTIN (St. Mary, Montreal). My hon. friend states that last year there was an anarchists parade ; I may say that three-fourths of those people were from New York, and were visiting in Montreal for the occasion. One or two women were among the paraders. The demonstration was stopped by the civic authorities and it will be stopped again this year.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. My hon. friend (Mr. Mederic Martin) says that last year the parade was stopped and will be stopped again this year and that most of those who took part in it came from the United States. But if the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are true Liberals, it seems to me that, having brought out those immigrants under false pretenses, the least they could do, if they have brought out socialists, is to let them parade. You must respect the opinion of the immigrants who enter this country. And I must say also—even if I have to contradict my hon. friend from St. Marys (Mr. Mederic Martin) for whom I have the greatest respect—that while the parade may have been composed to a certain extent of a certain foreign element, it was composed mainly of a foreign population brought to this country through the immigration policy of the government. Is it not true that in Toronto last winter there were about 15,000 people without work and that 500 poor little children of immigrants died of starvation in that city? If that be the result of the bonus which the government pays, are we not justified in denouncing it? And if the Minister of the Interior will go to Vancouver, he will find there racial riots, which though they may not be the result of bonused immigration, are the result of throwing the door open to all kinds of immigrants. There is this exception, namely, the government put a head tax on the Chinese. But they do not put it on the Japanese. I would like the Minister of the Interior to explain the difference, from a racial or national point of view, between the Chinese and the Japanese. If there is a yellow peril, it is just as yellow with the Japanese as with the Chinese. There is this difference between the two that you will not find the Chinese despising every other nation as do the Japanese and the immigration regulations passed by the department are not above the Japanese treaty.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Would you keep a man out of this country because he declares himself a socialist ?

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Certainly not, but what I say is that the socialistic movement is found among the destitute of the old world and previous to these destitutes coming out here we had not any socialists in this country.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Perfect nonsense.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. That is very easy to say, but if you go to the old country you will find two classes of people fighting against organized society and these are the socialists and one degree further down the anarchists.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. You will find socialists in the House of Commons in England.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I am sure of one thing and that is that if my hon. friend were in the House of Commons in England, where his talents ought to bring him, he would not be sitting on the socialist side.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I would not exclude a man because he declared himself a socialist.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I never said I would either; but what I say is that the propaganda of the government has had the result of penetrating to the socialistic centres and bringing out the destitute to this country. If socialism means anything, it means an appeal to the destitute and the poor on the ground that they should have their share in the wealth of those who are rich.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Good doctrine.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. But there is one doctrine superior to socialism, and my hon. friend has heard about it, I am sure, and that is the Christian doctrine. If you look into the report of the Department of the Interior—and here I crave your indulgence because I am going to start on dangerous ground, I am going to speak of the Belgian and French immigration. And I tell the minister of the Interior that I am going to raise all the racial appeal and appeals to prejudice that I raised last year, and will add another argument to which he may find an answer. If we look at the report of the Interior Department, we find that his immigration agents, the Church Army, were eager to bring to this country hooligans, scamps, ex-convicts, loafers and drunkards, but were not very eager to bring in Belgians or Frenchmen.

Mr. OLIVER. Would the hon. gentleman define hooligans?

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Let the hon. minister look for the definition in his own department because it is his department that are bringing them out. As the old French proverb says:

> Dis—moi qui tu hantes,
> Je te dirai qui tu es.

Tell me whom you go with and I will tell you who you are.

Mr. OLIVER. Does the hon. gentleman say that the Department of the Interior directly or indirectly suggested the immigration of people such as he described?

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Certainly, and I am going to prove it. Is the Church Army or is it not an immigration agent of the government.

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly not.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. My hon. friend has not looked into his own report, because he will find in it a whole page about the Church Army.

Mr. OLIVER. That does not prove that the Church Army is an agent of the government or that the government is in any way responsible.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Is the Church Army not carrying on a propaganda ? Has it ever been disallowed by the government ? Is there a fine against such propaganda? Every police magistrate in England is an immigration agent for this country.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not responsible.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Certainly, and in this way. The government has opened the door to that kind of immigration, and I am not quite sure that their agents have not said to the Salvation Army to send out more. More than that, the Salvation Army is paid a special bonus by this government. Is that true or is it not.

Mr. OLIVER. It is.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Therefore there is no use in the hon. minister contradicting it. Take what Mr. Speers says, in the report of the Department of the Interior, about the Belgian immigration:

The great majority of the French and Belgian immigrants are farmers and have taken up land. Most of the Belgians and French Canadian immigrants and settlers have gone to Lake Monroe, Jack Fish, Moosejaw, Trampink lake, and southwest of Moosejaw in Saskatchewan and in Manitoba some have gone east of Lake Manitoba, to Toulon and to Makinak. In Alberta these settlers have gone to the districts east of Stetler Daysland and on the Battle river, and a number have settled east and west of Red Deer and north of Morimbille. Indications will show that possibly 150 families will be located north and east of Wood Mountain on the Canadian Pacific railway during this season.

And he says that these settlers are very successful and thrifty. And that, no doubt, is why we have just one immigration agent in Belgium. But there is more than that: when the famous North Atlantic Trading Company were in operation, when its members not known and were not in danger of being sent to prison or of being driven to suicide, why was it that this company did not operate in France or Belgium ? We were told then that the French government had the greatest objection to canvassing for emigrants and the French laws forbade it, and also that the Belgian government was very much opposed to canvassing for emigrants within that kingdom. We were told that, I think, by the minister himself.

Mr. OLIVER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, my memory is, that the reasons given were the direct opposite.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Oh, no, no——

Mr. OLIVER. Well, I have expressed the opinion and I may explain. The North Atlantic Trading Company did not cover France and Belgium in its operations, because it was considered that in those countries it was possible to carry on an open propaganda for emigration, and so it was being carried on by a resident and duly accredited country agent in both countries. It was in other European countries that the North Atlantic Company operated because in those countries it was not possible to carry on an open propaganda.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I expected that answer from the Minister of the Interior, but he is caught there. Why is it that the North Atlantic Trading Company was operating in all the rest of continental Europe while there was no immigration agency or propaganda going on in France or Belguim ?

Mr. OLIVER. The only reason is that there was a propaganda going on in France and Belgium.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. There was one man who used to be a professor of elocution in this country, M. Wiallard, and another man who was lame, M. Foursin Escandre. That was the propaganda. And we were told by the minister—I remember it well—that the French government would not permit any more active propaganda, Well, perhaps he would say that as the propaganda went on, some men would be driven to suicide or would be sent to prison because the French laws would not permit an active propaganda.

Mr. OLIVER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armand Lavergne) deny that the laws of France do not permit an active propaganda ?

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I do deny it.

Mr. OLIVER. Then I am afraid the hon. gentleman is not well acquainted with the laws of France.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I have the law of France here and I will read it.

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN. From a newspaper.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Yes. I do not believe in newspapers very much, perhaps, but I believe that this is a correct reprint of the law of France. Here is the title: 'Loi Francaise sur l'emigration.'

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN. What date ?

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. '18 juillet, 1860.' It has not been changed since.

Mr. BUREAU. What paper ?

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. The best paper in Canada—'Le Nationaliste. Here is what the law says.

Article 1. Nul ne peut entreprendre les operations d'engagement ou de transport des émigrants sans l'autorisation du ministre de

l'agriculture, du commerce et des travaux publics.

That is the whole and sole prohibition in the French law of an emigration propaganda. I will translate it for the benefit of the Minister of the Interior.

No person shall undertake the operation of engaging or transporting emigrants without the authorization of the Minister of Agriculture, Commerce and Public Works.

And why is this ? It is explained in the rest of the statute—it is to safeguard the emigrants from suffering during transportation. And that is the whole and sole law in France prohibiting a propaganda in favour of emigration. I suppose the minister will be satisfied with this. Now, let us turn to the case of Belgium. In Belgium, not only does the government not prohibit canvassing for emigrants, but there is no emigration that the government of that country favours so much as emigration to Canada. Belgium is a very prosperous country. But it has too large a population for its superfices, and, as it has no colonies, it likes to send its surplus population to Canada. Thus, there was not only no prohibition, but there is actually encouragement in Belgium for emigration to Canada. But there was no active propaganda to encourage emigration. More than that, there was only one emigration agent, M. Treau de Coeli, who might do much better work if he had better help. And, at the same time, this emigration, as shown by this very report of the Department of the Interior, is the best that can come to this country, as these people are farmers and succeed very well. And not only that, but, as I stated last year, when the Belgian exposition was held at Liege all the propaganda that was made for the older provinces amongst the Belgians in the form of pamphlets to encourage the Belgians to come to this country and these pamplets, by order of the commissioner of this government, were put in the cellar of the Canadian pavilion and ordered to be left there until the exposition should be over.

Mr. OLIVER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armand Lavergne) object to the payment of a bonus to Belgian booking agents?

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I object to paying a bonus to booking agents in any country. My position is clear, if the minister did not understand it last year, I hope he will understand it this year. He has put enough questions to ascertain it, but he may put as many as he likes and I shall be glad to answer them. I object to bonuses to booking agents in any country—France, Belgium, Germany, England, Scotland, Ireland or even the Russian countries that are the greatest friends of the Department of the Interior. As I have said before,—I cannot give it in the eloquent language of the hon. minister, though it is practically the same idea—the result of the bonus system is quantity not quality and it tends to bring the undesirable instead of the desirable. This is the opinion that was expressed by the minister himself.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He was not minister then.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. No,—he was a Little Canadian. We are told that the French do not emigrate—we have been told that many times. Certainly the French do not emigrate to this country as the British people do or as those of other continental countries do. But there is good reason for that. In France and Belgium the same propaganda is not carried on as is carried on in other countries. But I want to contradict the general statement. The French do emigrate. One proof is that there are 100,000 Frenchmen in the Argentine Republic. There are 50,000 French people in the United States.

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN. What is the population of the United States ?

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. My recollection is that it is about 80,000,000.

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN. The French immigration is not a large proportion.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Perhaps not, but it is enough to prove that the French do emigrate. If you look up the report of the Department of the Interior of France, for the year before last, you will find that 92,000 people left France in that year. I may be contradicted by some figures published in this country but the figures given by the French government are good enough evidence for me. I say that this bonusing of immigration can have two excuses—I will not say that it can have any justification. The excuse is either that the government wants to see the land speculators in the Northwest sell their lands or, as Mr. Smart, one of the government agents, said in Liverpool—and the Minister of the Interior cannot contradict me—to prevent this country from being Frenchified. The Minister of the Interior knows that Mr. Smart said that in Liverpool.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that, he may have said it.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I will read it to him again, I read it last year.

The 'Northern Express,' Liverpool,, February 10, 1902.—British blood is needed.

The Hon. J. A. Smart, Deputy Minister of the Interior of Canada, and Mr. W. T. R. Preston, immigration agent general for the Dominion, arrived in Liverpool to-day from London and Glasgow to arrange a gigantic system of British immigration to Canada.

Mr. Smart said this :

More British blood is also needed to be infused if the views of the Dominion of Canada

is not to be Frenchified by the rapid growth of the French population.

Is that the reason of the present immigration policy of this government, to prevent this country from being Frenchified? I thought the spirit of this country was that we should cease talking about these questions. I am glad to take the same view that the member for Strathcona (Mr. McIntyre) did last year. I do not think I am raising any racial question, or any creed question, when I say that I see no reason why the deputy minister of this country should go to England and tell the people that they must prevent Canada from being Frenchified.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that Mr. Smart said that.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I have just read what he said.

Mr. OLIVER. I know what the hon. gentleman has read, but I do not believe that Mr. Smart ever said it.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Well, I believe that Mr. Smart did say it, not only do I believe it, but I am sure of it. I read it last year, and I asked the Minister of the Interior to contradict it. If he could have contradicted it he would have done so, but he has not contradicted it. The Minister of the Interior knows that the province of Quebec counts for something in the majority of this House, and that these words of Mr. Smart will not help the government in the next election; therefore he would have contradicted these words if he could. Mr. Smart has not contradicted them, and he cannot contradict them. The minister said that the best immigration we could have into this country was not people from foreign countries, but our own Canadians, and that the best immigration policy was to prevent Canadians going to the United States, and send them to the Northwest. But what do we see? We see that it costs less to bring an immigrant from the continent of Europe to the Northwest, than it does to take a man from the province of Quebec to the Northwest. This cannot be contradicted. If the government wants an immigration policy, why dont they adopt the policy of sending people from the older provinces to settle in the Northwest? That is not what is being done, that is not what this government is encouraging, but that is what this government is opposing.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say, or to intimate, a short time ago that too many foreigners were being infused into the population of Montreal and the province of Quebec. Now he puts forward the idea that the government is making no effort whatever to settle the older provinces.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I did not say that, I said that the bonus system of immigration adopted by this government had the result of bringing to this country, not farm labourers, but men who are criminals in their own country, according to the declaration of the Italian consul in Montreal, men who come to this country under false pretenses, and who are swarming into our cities because they do not know how to work. If you abandon the bonus system you will improve the quality of immigrants a hundred per cent, because they will not be attracted to this country by the false representations of booking agents, but by the contented settlers who have preceded them in this country. The new comers will settle in the older provinces instead of going to the Northwest. I have asked this government why it was that under the present system, a young man of the older provinces had to pay more for a transportation ticket to go to the Northwest than the foreign born European or the citizen of the British Isles. That is what I complain of.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he thinks it should form any part of our immigration policy to move population from one part of Canada to the other.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I do think so, because that is the way that western Canada has been settled. If the hon. gentleman will study the history of our country he will see that the people of the old provinces have been gradually spreading out west, and the settlers that go from eastern Canada are no worse than those who come from foreign countries; I think they are much better, because they are Canadians. That is my policy; but the policy of this government seems to be to bring in masses of people without regard to quality, to fill up the western country and help speculators sell their lands in the west. They are trying to get every kind of immigration except French speaking immigration. Every right is denied to the French speaking element except the right of paying. But the Doukhobors can run around naked from place to place. Sir, I think the policy of this government will lead to the political murder of our country. As has been well said by many economists, we are laying the foundation for a mongrel nation in Canada. According to the report of the Department of the Interior itself, we are laying the foundations of a mongrel nation. I say that is political murder, and I say that from a French Canadian point of view it is not only political murder but it is suicide, as it has been well pointed out by one of the greatest economists in the world, Mr. Louis Arnould, in 'La Revue des Deux Mondes.' Some hon. members of this House may have no objection to committing suicide, but I have, and I will never be an ac-

complice to a policy which will have only the result of diminishing the influence of the French speaking element in this country. Not that I think this country should be more French than English, or more British than French, but because I think the French Canadians have a right to live and to exist in this country. A policy which has for its object, according to Mr. Smart, to prevent this country from being Frenchified, will never have my support, neither in this House or in this country. I know well that the majority of the English speaking members of this House as well as the English population of this country, will not share the views of Mr. Smart. I had the proof of that not more than two weeks ago, when I went into the province of Ontario, and before an English speaking audience I expressed the views I am expressing in this House to-night. I think that the majority of this assembly share my views, and I know that the French Canadians have no other idea or desire than to work in harmony with their English speaking fellow Canadians.

From the broader point of view, from the broadest Canadian point of view, what is the result? You secure the immigrant in the old country, you bring him to this country, you embark him on a train at Quebec or Halifax, he goes through the province of Quebec or through the province of Ontario, he sees the old provinces from the windows of his train and then he goes to the Northwest where the foreign population will be almost, if it is not to-day, as numerous as the Canadian-born population, and you will try to assimilate him. Is that not a good reason for placing the immigrant in the older provinces, let him there become assimilated and send the young men from the older provinces to settle in the Northwest. If we go on with this policy, in ten or twenty years—and this is not my opinion only—there will be a majority of foreign-born people in the Northwest, they will think that they can sell their products better in Chicago and a feeling will grow up in favour of annexation. You must remember that there is only an imaginary line separating the Northwest from the United States, that the commercial interests of the Northwest are more closely allied with the Northwest than with Canada, and that the east and west of Canada are separated by greater geographical obstacles than separate the Canadian Northwest from the United States. Therefore, Sir, you will have a foreign-born population separated from the older provinces which will have a natural tendency towards the south and towards the market of the United States, and with the American population which is coming into the Northwest very rapidly the history of Texas will repeat itself. You remember well that Americans settled in Texas, saying that they would be good Mexicans, and that not very long after they wanted to be annexed to the United States. What happened? A war ensued and the United States took Texas from Mexico.

I am sorry that I have taken up so much of the time of the House, but I thought, Mr. Speaker, that it was my duty to protest against a policy of this kind. I thought it was my duty to protest against a policy which can have no other result than to make of our country a universal lunatic asylum, or to make of our country a penitentiary colony, or to make of our country a world-wide general hospital. That is the result that will inevitably follow the continuance of the present policy. If you go to the penitentiaries of this country you will find that we not only have to pay a bonus to bring these people here, but will find that we have to pay to keep them in prison so that they will not stab or kill or rob the Canadian-born population. If you go through our lunatic asylums—and this is not my statement, but it is the report of every grand jury—you will see that we have not only paid bonuses to bring these people to our country but that we are paying immense sums all over the country to keep them in lunatic asylums so that they will not run amuck in our streets and shoot people as one of them, the other day in Montreal did shoot three policemen, one of whom has since died. If you go to the immigration hospital at Quebec you will see that we are paying to maintain people who are suffering from trachoma, if they are not suffering from other diseases that I would not like to name in this House. I also desire to say to a broad, large Canadian like the Minister of the Interior that, while I may be a Little Canadian on this question, I believe that in our country there is room for every man who wants to be a true Canadian, but there is no room for the hooligans, exconvicts and immigrants brought out by the church army. There is but one Canada, and that is for the Canadian. I will tell him also that it may be well to think of the prosperity of our country, and I would remind him of what I said not long ago in the province of Ontario that there are three kinds of prosperity, moral, mental and intellectual, and that we are sacrificing the moral and intellectual prosperity of the country, and not only that, but we are endangering the material prosperity of our country as well. Let us compare the prosperity of our country with that of another British colony—the colony of Australia, a colony which has no bonused immigration policy, which has a narrow immigration policy and yet, we see that the imports into Australia were, in round figures, about £52,000,000, and that the exports were £72,000,000. In this country, with our strenuous immigration policy, which, according to the Minister of the Interior has so much to do with our prosperity, the exports are not so much

above the imports. I think, as a matter of fact, they are a little below—far below. The prosperity they bring is that of crime, disease and idiocy. Therefore, if this is all the prosperity that these immigrants bring in to our country we have no need for prosperity of that kind, and the minister ought to remember that prosperity does not mean the bringing about of a greater amount of criminality or an increase in the number of lunatics in our country. If we compare our prosperity with that of the United States we must come to the conclusion that the United States has to-day the worst immigration problem of any country in the world to face. To-day they have a restrictive policy. They have to face the whole question, and it will be remembered that one president of the United States has been assassinated by anarchists. If that is the future prosperity that immigrants are going to bring to our country, we may well expect in the very near future that the Canadian-born population will be at the mercy of the foreign-born population and will become an insignificant minority. Therefore, for these considerations, if I have to take a stand against my political party on this question, it is because I place above party the future of my country and if, on this question as on many others, I have to choose between my party and the future happiness of my country, I choose my country.

On motion of Mr. Verville, the debate was adjourned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Does this debate go on to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This debate will go on.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, April 14, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

TREATY WITH UNITED STATES RE BOUNDARY AND FISHERIES.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to read the following newspaper item :—

Washington, D.C., April 13.—President Roosevelt to-day transmitted to the Senate

treaties with Great Britain in relation to the fisheries on the great lakes as between the United States and Canada.

And I would ask, in view of these treaties having been presented to the United States whether the Prime Minister is prepared to bring down information to the parliament of Canada the representatives of the other side interested, which, I should think, would be the natural and constitutional course.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). We have not yet received the ratification. As soon as we receive them, they will be communicated to the House. I should think that, as they have been communicated to the United States Senate, we ought to have them here.

ENGLISH AND FRENCH ORDER PAPERS.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I wish to direct your attention to something that I have noticed several times of late and that, it seems to me, ought to be made right. Comparing the English version of the orders of the day with the French version, I find that the items are not the same on the two papers. For instance, take the items under the headings 'Public Bills, and Orders' in the Order Paper of to-day, I find, in the English version, item 21 as follows :—

No. 21.

February 12—House again in Committee on Bill No. 2, An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act.—Mr. Lancaster.

But, in the French version, item 21 is Bill (No. 18). But Bill (No. 18) is item No. 22 in the English Order Paper, being the second item under the heading 'Public Bills and Orders.' Then in the French version, I find that the fourth order under 'Public Bills and Orders,' being item No. 24, is Bill (No. 43). But, in the English version, this is the third order under this head or item 23. I find that item No. 30 of the English orders appears as item No. 22 in the French orders. It seems to me, as well as I can judge, that the French version is correct. Rule 28 provides :—

Bills reported after second reading from any standing or select committee, shall be placed on the orders of the day following the reception of the report, for reference to a Committee of the Whole House, in their proper order next after Bills reported from Committees of the Whole House.

According to that the second order under 'Public Bills and Orders' in the English Order Paper ought to be the first, for it is 'House in committee on Bill (No. 18) to amend the Railway Act (reported as amended).' As I understand it, Bills reported from committee as amended must

come first on the Order Paper and the Bills reported without amendment second. But they are reversed here. I have noticed these differences several times and have wondered how they arise. It seems to me that both versions ought to be the same, for, in that way, you avoid any danger of doing injustice.

Mr. SPEAKER. The matter will be looked into.

DREDGING CONTRACTS.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) was to lay two documents on the table to-day. Might I ask if they are ready ?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I thought it better to have copies made. Of course, I will produce the originals if the hon. gentleman desires it, but if copies are presented they can be used——

Mr. BENNETT. Well, may I have one now ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have given directions to have the copies made. But there are quite a number of dredging contracts in the order in council and a separate report of the chief engineer as to each one. They are being copied, but I cannot promise them before to-morrow. I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) if it would not be convenient for him to discuss the matter in committee, as each item will be in the estimates. I will have the copies desired by to-morrow.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I move for leave to discuss a question of urgent importance, the question of dredging contracts at Midland, Tiffin and Victoria harbour.

Leave being granted.

Mr. BENNETT. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) stated yesterday, in answer to a question from myself that he was proceeding, during the coming season, to expend moneys for dredging at Midland. Tiffin—which is a point adjoining Midland —and Victoria harbour, without asking for tenders for the work for which the money is to be expended, but proceeding upon the prices that prevailed last year. Therefore I know, having seen the tenders of last year, what prices are to be paid for that work, without the report of the minister being brought down, which I expected to see to-day. Now, Mr. Speaker, in that somewhat well known document called the report of the Civil Service Commission, upon page 42, will be found a very pertinent and very strong reference to the millions upon millions of dollars that are being expended in different parts of the Dominion on dredging ; and I will call the attention of the House to the reference in that respect.

In certain cases there may be over-payments of wages such as the notorious instance which was brought to light about a year ago, when a clerk of works appointed by political influence was found to have sublet his work to another person at a much lower rate. Your commissioners consider that some steps should be taken to organize the large army of employees in connection with this department, many of whom have served their entire lifetime in its employ, and bring them under definite regulations so that their employment may be considered fixed and stable.

And furthermore, in volume II of the evidence of the Civil Service Commission, the following appears upon page 1100 :

The Chairman:

Q. You have a chief superintendent at St. John?—A. Yes, for the maritime provinces.

Q. And you have also dredging done by contract?—A. Yes.

Q. In connection with the dredging done by contract you have inspectors?—A. Yes.

Q. There was a statement made in the House of Commons during the last session, I think, by Mr. Bennett, that one of these inspectors of dredging to whom you paid so much a day, farmed it out to another man at half price?—A. Less than half. He was getting $3 a day, and he paid out $1.25.

Q. How are these inspectors of dredging appointed?—A. This year, when we ask for a recommendation for local men we state that they must be men of good standing and reputation, and furthermore they are invited to make a declaration to the effect that they are not in any way connected with companies or individuals who are performing dredging. We are trying to avoid the fact of relatives of contractors being employed to superintend them, and we are going to exercise the closest possible supervision so as to see that every inspector is on his work all the time that the work lasts.

By Mr. Fyshe :

Q. Why not hold the local government engineers responsible for that?—A. The local government engineer has perhaps forty works to look after. He cannot be at one work the whole time.

Q. He can get one of his subordinates to be there?—A. He cannot do it for all the works; he would require an immense staff. One man has to have charge of half a dozen works. The Toronto engineer, for instance, runs as far as Manitoulin islands, and he has to go around the shores of Lake Ontario, and he has perforce to trust somebody for some of the works.

Q. Could not the government so manage that a government official connected with the department could exercise an oversight?—A. We do. Our engineer or the superintendent of dredging visits the places at times, but they are not there all the time, and while they are not there, it is like when the cat is away.

By the Chairman:

Q. It would be in the interest of the contractor to connive at irregularities in inspection?—A. Very few would do anything of that kind, according to my experience, but it

could be done. The remedy I have always favoured for a state of things of that kind is a permanent staff of inspectors, appointed by the government as the engineers are appointed. I would have the inspectors entirely under the control of the department and with no local interests. They would act without fear or favour, while the local man who owes his position to local influence, is more or less influenced by that local power.

Now, Mr. Speaker, consider that within the past few years the firm of Bowman & Company have been paid the enormous sum of $2,000,000 in round figures for dredging —$2,000,000, let there be no mistake in the figures, because they are according to the returns brought down in this House; and that the firm known as the Great Lakes Dredging Company, which is composed of Mr. James Bowman, member of provincial parliament for North Bruce in the Ontario Legislature, A. F. Bowman, his brother, and Mr. James Whelan, of Port Arthur, son-in-law of the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee), have been paid $1,350,000 within a few years; that a concern known as the Owen Sound Dredging Company, which is composed of the Hon. A. G. Mackay, leader of the Liberal opposition in the Ontario legislature, who is half owner of the whole concern, the other half being owned by a Mrs. E. H. Horsey, have been paid upwards of $350,000 to $400,000. Now I will confine my remarks to these three firms, because these three particular firms have had their dealings exposed before the Public Accounts Committee of this Dominion—and there will be more of that in the future. Now what is the position of affairs with regard to these dredging companies? We are blandly told to-day by the Minister of Public Works that despite the fact that there are appropriations which will run, I assume, over half a million dollars, that the Minister of Public Works has gone to his colleagues and his colleagues have said: There is no necessity for calling for tenders for this large amount of work, whatever it may amount to; and I think the figures will show that at the points indicated by the hon. gentleman, the dredging will cost half a million dollars. The hon. gentleman told the House yesterday that with the consent and concurrence of his colleagues he had obtained an order in council by which no tenders are to be called for this year for the expenditure of that vast sum of money, that very considerable sum of money, at all events. Now we have to-day lying in this House, in the custody of the proper officer in that behalf, the chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, the original tenders which the hon. gentleman is going to accept, the figures that have not been discussed yet before the Public Accounts Committee, but will be discussed in the next few months. And what do those figures show? I would ask, and I think it is within the rights of this House, that these contracts should now be laid on the table, because they particularly refer to this work where the large amount of from $100,000 to $150,000 will be spent the coming season. Those are tenders for the work to be done at Midland and at Tiffin, and the production of those documents will show this fact, that there are, or supposed to be, two rival companies competing for the work. Two tenders have been put in, one by what is known as the Midland Dredging Company, of which Mr. F. W. Grant is the secretary treasurer, and the other by what is known as the Penetanguishene Company, of which Dr. Spohn is the secretary treasurer. Now, both these tenders are in the handwriting of F. W. Grant; and I challenge the Minister of Public Works now to send to the office of the clerk of the Public Accounts Committee and produce those tenders and lay them on the table, because they will prove to the hilt, what I have stated. Is not this an odd state of affairs? The criminal law of this country says that you can send to the penitentiary a man who interferes and causes the withdrawal of a tender; yet though I brought this matter specially to the notice of the Prime Minister ten days ago in the House, and made the same allegation, I have never yet heard the matter mooted by the department. On the contrary, I have heard the Minister of Public Works stand up here yesterday and say that an order in council has been passed to give these very people who have been tendering and have defrauded the people of Canada, a contract without a tender being called for. Now I think it is high time that these tenders should be brought down, and I will ask the Premier if he will have a messenger sent for those tenders so that they may be laid on the table and may be inspected by members. I do not think I am asking any thing beyond what is in the interest of the government of this country, when exposure has been made along those lines. Now, what did these tenders show? These tenders showed that the Midland Company, called the Great Lakes Construction Company—that is the corporate name—tendered on the Midland work at 53 cents a yard and that the Penetanguishene Company tendered on the Midland work at 57 cents a yard, that on another work at Waubaushene, the Midland Company tendered at 18 cents a yard and the Spohn Company, or the Penetanguishene Company, tendered at 16 cents a yard.

Mr. SPROULE. What kind of material?

Mr. BENNETT. All kinds of material except rock which is especially provided for. Under these figures the Penetanguishene Company would have received the Waubaushene work and the Midland company would have received the Midland work. But, these gentlemen evidently were not

aware of the fact that a third party was going to tender and although the tender of the Midland company, or the Grant Company, was 53 cents a yard for the work at Midland and the tender of the Penetanguishene company was 57 cents a yard a third tender came in from the Stewart Company of Ottawa and the Stewart Company tendered at 30 cents a yard.

Mr. PUGSLEY. For which work was that ?

Mr. BENNETT. For the work at Midland. The hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) was acting at that time as Minister of Public Works. I would ask the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) to direct that these tenders be brought down from the committee room. It only requires a direction on the part of any Minister to have them brought here so that hon. gentlemen may pass them from hand to hand to see them in all their nakedness and their fraud because there is fraud on the face of them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, there is fraud on the face of them.

Mr. JOHNSTON. On whose face ?

Mr. BENNETT. If I said on the face of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Johnston) I think every one would assent to it. I say it is a serious matter and, what is more, these tenders have been seen by many hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There has never been any attempt to keep them secret at all. They were produced openly before the Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. BENNETT. However, they are there now and if they were to be removed a number of gentlemen have seen them as a matter of proof and if it were not so it would be a most unfortunate thing perhaps for all parties concerned. But, they are there now and I challenge any minister to lay these papers on the table because they will prove that the tenders of the two companies are written in one and the same handwriting, that of F. W. Grant.

Mr. BERGERON. Who is Mr. Grant ?

Mr. BENNETT. Brother of the hon. member for North Ontario. What next happened ? There were tenders called for at a number of different points and this so-called Dominion Dredging Company of which Mr. Gordon Stewart is the secretary treasurer, put in a tender for a number of works. Some hon. gentleman asks : Who is Mr. Stewart ? He is the son of the hon. the senior member for Ottawa. The Stewart Company tendered for a large number of works and the Stewart Company, not having the plant to perform the work did, as I am informed and believe, go to other dredging concerns and offer to sub-let. But, there was so much clamour made over the matter that the Minister of Justice, then acting as Minister of Public Works, did what ?—did not, as I am informed, call for public tenders and ask publicly for competition, but permitted these tenderers to put in new tenders among themselves. If there was no fraud in the case of these two companies that I have mentioned there is proof positive and conclusive that the so-called Grant Company tendered on the Midland work, that their tender was 53 cents per yard for all material outside of rock and that when the second arrangement was made, they only got 26 cents a yard for that work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Do you blame the department for that ? Do you find fault with the minister for letting it at 26 cents ?

Mr. BENNETT. No, but what I do find fault with the minister for is dealing with people who are attempting to put up a fraud on the government. That is the reason that my complaint is made now. I say that the minister should go into the open market and ask for tenders. When the Spohn Company and the Grant Company thought there were no other parties who would intervene their tenders were respectively : Grant, 53 cents, and the Penetanguishene Company, 57 cents, but when the Stewart Company could not undertake the work by reason of the insufficiency of their plant, the acting minister made a new arrangement, not by calling for public tenders. I regret that the Minister of Justice cannot hear what I am saying in this respect so that he might be in a position to acquiesce in my statement or deny it. When the matter came up again the Grant Company got the contract at 26 cents a yard. There was some work to be done at a point called Tiffin below Midland and that work, without any competition at all, as I am informed, was handed over to the McKay Company at 27 cents a yard. Now, I am going to ask the hon. gentleman what can be thought of this transaction in the face of the statement that one of these supposedly rival companies, through its secretary, writes out the tenders of both companies ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the hon. gentleman excuse me for a moment ? Did I understand him to say that there were no tenders called for the work at Tiffin and that the work was let without any call for public tenders ?

Mr. BENNETT. That is what I am informed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. By whom ?

Mr. BENNETT. Well, I have private information on that score. In support of that I will prove something by the records which lie up in the office of the Public Ac-

counts Committee and which the minister, so far, has not brought down. I am surprised that the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) does not ask that these records should be brought down here in the face of an accusation of this kind. It can be rebutted if it is not true.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that these records are in the hands of the Public Accounts Committee ?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no control over them.

Mr. BENNETT. They are lying in the closet of the Public Accounts Committee, and, as was done with the timber leases, they can be brought down here, handed to the clerk of the House and the clerk of the House can hand them back to the committee.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The timber leases were brought from the Department of the Interior. If these records are in the possession of the Public Accounts Committee the Public Accounts Committee has control over them and not the members of the government.

Mr. BENNETT. They are in the custody of the clerk of the committee and surely parliament is big enough and strong enough to direct the clerk of the committee to come to the door of parliament, hand them to the clerk of the House and order that they shall be laid on the table so that they may be inspected and returned.

Mr. TAYLOR. Any member of the committee can go up and examine them.

Mr. BENNETT. Any member of the committee can go up and see them and if any member of the committee can see them there surely parliament can order that they be brought down.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Any member of this House would have just as much authority to order them from the custody of the Public Accounts Committee as I would have or as the Prime Minister would have.

Mr. BENNETT. If the Prime Minister wishes it, I will ask if I have the concurrence of the House in sending a page to the clerk of the committee to bring them down and lay them on the table and if there will be any objection to that being done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a matter for the Public Accounts Committee entirely.

Mr. BENNETT. What position is this matter in? There was a tenderer bold enough to write not only the tender of his own company but the tender of a supposedly rival company. There is no question about it. The handwriting is as a like as two peas, and to show there was connivance and fraud between these two tenderers when the so-called Grant Company tendered in supposed competition their figure on the work is 53 cents a yard, but when the government found that Stewart could not take the work at 30 cents they were afraid to give the contract to the Grant Company at 53 cents, and for some reason or other the work is allotted to them at 26 cents a yard. The Minister of Public Works asked me where I got my information and I will tell him where I got part of my information. Attached to these tenders and in the committee room at this moment is to be found a schedule showing the names of the different contractors with the figures at which they had tendered opposite their names and a circle is placed around the name of the lowest tenderer. Underwritten on that schedule is, the McKay Company for the work at Tiffin, and no tenders are asked for the work at Tiffin at all, and the minister cannot find in all that file a single tender for the work at Tiffin, and there under the signature of Mr. Aylesworth, the acting minister, not in his handwriting but in the writing of some person, on that file appears 'Tiffin, Owen Sound Dredging Company, at 27 cents a yard.' Will the Minister of Public Works say there were tenders called ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would say to the hon. gentleman that the report of the chief engineer in my department is, that in respect to all the works with regard to which he has recommended the fixing of the time during the present season for the completion of the work, in every one of these he reports to me that public tenders were called by public advertisement. And I may say further that I would not think of extending the time except in cases where tenders have been publicly called for.

Mr. BENNETT. Let the general public understand what this dredging operation is. Everything hinges on the one question whether or not these scows are filled, and I say that the country is paying for scows which are presumably filled and which are never filled. I say that the country is paying inspectors to inspect the work who are never there. The evidence of Mr. Gobeil which I have quoted proves conclusively that the inspector on the Spohn dredge was not there at all. Has that man been prosecuted for the fraud he practised on the government ? Not at all. Has the other inspector who connived at the theft been prosecuted ? Not at all. What do these dredging operations mean to the people of this country ? Let me take the case of the Grant Company. You can see from the papers before the Public Accounts Committee that in one month alone that dredge was paid over $11,000, and when it is considered that these dredges work over eight months in the year that means that the dredges would aggregate about $90,000 in the season. And it was sworn in the committee the other day by the owner and the representative of the McKay dredge that

the inspector was not there to inspect the work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought you were speaking of the Grant Company. You go from one to the other. Which are you speaking of: the Grant Company or the McKay Company?

Mr. BENNETT. I should have said that the McKay Company had the Grant dredge under lease last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is certainly very inconvenient, and if I know anything about the rules of parliament it is very objectionable for a member from his place in the House to refer to what is occurring before a committee of the House.

Mr. BENNETT. There is no inquiry at all about it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The House cannot know what is taking place before a committee until that committee reports to the House. This matter is still under investigation before the Public Accounts Committee, and I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) will see that it would be very much better that these matters should be threshed out in the Public Accounts Committee, and then when the committee reports to the House it will be properly before the House for discussion. I take that point, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPROULE. You cannot get a report from this committee.

Mr. BENNETT. The Minister of Public Works is mistaken. The inquiry in the Public Accounts Committee is about dredging at Fesserton in connection with the Spohn Company, and there is no question at all about the McKay Company at Midland. The papers have been moved for and brought down and in due course it will be investigated, but so far I am simply speaking from documents that have been laid on the table.

Mr. PARDEE. Is it not a fact that Mr. Wilkinson was here but a very little while ago in connection with the McKay Company dredging and that the matter was gone into by the Public Accounts Committee?

Mr. BENNETT. Since my hon. friend does not recollect the circumstances I do not want to detail them all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the matter is before the committee under investigation and has not been reported upon to the House, the rule is explicit and plain that no reference to it can be made in the House until the report is received by the House.

Mr. HAGGART. But there is a denial that the matter is before the committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is another point.

Mr. BENNETT. It is the question of the Fesserton dredging which is before the committee.

Mr. EMMERSON. What are the papers before the committee for?

Mr. BENNETT. To be dealt with in due course of time.

Mr. EMMERSON. Then it is before the committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is: Has this matter been before the Public Accounts Committee under investigation and has a report been made to the House? If it has been before the committee for investigation and if no report has yet been made the rule is plain that no reference can be made to it in the House until there is a report from the committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My information is that the matter is before the committee. All these documents are still before the committee, the tenders, the contracts and all the papers, and no report has yet been made to the House.

Mr. BENNETT. I have in my desk a copy of the evidence as printed so far, and that document states that the inquiry before the committee is in reference to the dredging at Matchedash bay. There is no reference in the printed evidence to the dredging at Midland and there is no inquiry into it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. gentleman deny that at the request of the Public Accounts Committee these papers have been produced from my department and submitted to the committee and are now in the custody of the committee and have been there for weeks, and that the matter has not yet been disposed of?

Mr. BENNETT. It is quite right to say that the papers have been brought to the committee and they will be dealt with in due course, but there has as yet been no inquiry at all into the Midland business.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, that is a point to be cleared up. I have not been in the committee and I have not had an opportunity of ascertaining what the committee has been doing. The whole question is: Has this matter been before the committee under investigation, and if so, and if it has not been reported upon of course it is improper to discuss it in the House. I would like to be clear on that point before making a definite ruling.

Mr. LENNOX. Your ruling is quite clear, Sir, that if there is an inquiry in the committee, until the report is made a discussion cannot take place in this House. But, I presume, that the information which an hon. gentleman gets otherwise than from what has taken place in the committee he can use. What I understand the hon. membr to state is that he has obtained this information from the examination of docu-

ments which lie in the Public Accounts Committee, but that no investigation has been had as to the matter to which he refers. Surely ,Mr. Speaker, in that case any hon. member can use the records of parliament or the records of the department for the purpose of obtaining information and can bring that information before this House. You have said, Mr. Speaker, that there has been some discussion as to what the facts are on which this matter is based, but in that regard we have the statement of the hon. member, who is the only person who actually knows the facts in that regard, and surely we may take his statement that he is not stating what has been elicited by any examination before the Public Accounts Committee, but what he has obtained from records which are accessible not only to the members of the Public Accounts Committee, but to every hon. member of this House who likes to go and examine them. If the investigation had commenced, then I think it would be clear that the hon. member could not discuss it; but no investigation, as the hon. member has said, has taken place, and, therefore, he having ascertained the facts which he proposes to deal with by an investigation of his own and from public documents which are of record, I submit that he has a right to discuss them.

Mr. BENNETT. In confirmation, let me give what is stated in the printed proof which I hold in my hand. After stating that the committee met on February 28, it says 'further consideration of the payment to the Penetanguishene Dredging Company. That is a matter that is not under discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER. There seems to be a difference of opinion as to what has taken place before the committee. I think I must assume that the documents which are before the Public Accounts Committee have been taken there for some purpose. They are now in the possession of the committee, and the proper and usual course if an investigation as to same is pending would be to have them transferred here for the purposes of discussion otherwise as they have not been reported to the House. I shall have to rule that the discussion is out of order.

Mr. TAYLOR. I moved for some papers early in the session. The papers were brought down ; I got the information I required from those papers and sent them back to the Auditor General's Department. Do you rule that I cannot make use of the information I got from those papers because they are before the Public Accounts Committee?

Mr. SPEAKER. Not at all. In that case the documents were sent back to the department, and no further action would be taken on those documents until they were returned to the Public Accounts Committee. I assume that if the documents are in the possession of the Public Accounts Committee they are there for some purpose of the committee. Where an investigation allowed them is pending until the committee disposes of them by returning them to the place from which they came or by reporting them to the House, I do not see how I can rule otherwise than I have ruled, that the discussion upon them is out of order.

Mr. LAKE. Mr. Speaker, I would ask whether your ruling means that no member can discuss any payment made by the Auditor General because the papers regarding it are before the Public Accounts Committee, because in that case all inquiry on any subject could be blocked by members on the government side of the House having the papers brought before that committee.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to avoid any matter of a controversial nature by simply referring to what is to be seen in the papers and not at all to the question of what the evidence has been. The very certificates that give this company this colossal sum in one month, or thousands and thousands of dollars in a season——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think I should do the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) the courtesy of answering his question. I would not at all press the ruling so far as the hon. member suggests. This matter comes before the House in this shape. An hon. member rises to discuss it and states that the documents show that so-and-so has occurred. After some discussion another hon. member rises and takes the point that this matter is still before the Committee on Public Accounts under investigation and that the documents are still before that committe. On that state of facts I am bound to assume, and I do assume, that the committee is still seized of the documents, and until the committee reports either in the shape of forwarding the documents or reporting to the House with reference to the investigation that has been made, discussion is out of order. That is as far as I go as to the proceedings before the committee.

Mr. HAGGART. The reference to the Public Accounts Committee is the reference of all the public accounts of the year and of the Auditor General's Report. Do you rule, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot discuss any account that is in the public accounts or in the Auditor General's Report because they have been referred to the Public Accounts Committee? Our argument is that an order from the Public Accounts Committee to produce the documents before that committee or a reference to the House does not in the slightest degree preclude any hon. member of this House from discussing any paper on any item that has been discussed

before the committee. The Public Accounts Committee is not a special committee to which this House has referred any particular item on which to report. It is one of the ordinary committees of the House, and the fact that it takes cognizance of a matter does not remove it from the jurisdiction of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am in this position, that on the one side reference is made to documents which are before the Public Accounts Committee, and on the other side the point is taken that the matter is still pending before the committee. It is quite impossible for the Speaker to decide as between two adverse views based upon two different statements of the facts, and under these circumstances the only position and the proper position for the Speaker to take, it seems to me, is the well known one, both in England and here, that 'until a committee report it is irregular to refer to its proceedings in debate in the House.' In view of the assertion that these documents are still before the Public Accounts Committee and under investigation, I cannot decide otherwise than I am doing.

Mr. HAGGART. Do you hold, Mr. Speaker, that the Public Accounts Committee is a special committee, or a committee of the House that comes under the rule to which a matter has been referred for the purpose of reporting?

Mr. SPEAKER. The statement is made that the Public Accounts Committee is seized of the documents for investigation, and that the investigation is pending. Then the term 'proceeding' which is laid down in the practice applies, and until a report upon the matter has been made to the House or the documents have been ordered to be laid before the House, it will be impossible to have a discussion upon them here.

Mr. BENNETT. I think on the question of order——

Mr. SPEAKER. I am quite prepared now to allow discussion on that question and after that discussion I shall rule one way or the other; but I cannot make a ruling and have discussion later on about it. The point of order is now open for discussion and after it has been discussed I shall rule finally on the question.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Would not a consideration of the actual practice in the Public Accounts Committee enable us to determine whether or not certain documents are under consideration in that committee? At the beginning of the session and throughout the session the members of the opposition find in the Auditor General's Report items such as in their opinion call for inquiry. Very seldom does the opposition member when moving for papers, know that the papers will produce tangible result; but from information that he may have received from private sources he moves for papers that he may investigate them and, as a matter of fact, no one but himself investigates them. In fact the papers are not laid before the committee; they are brought over from the department to the clerk of the committee and are by him put in the proper pigeon holes and are never seen, in all probability, except by the member who moved for them. When papers are brought down there are probably a hundred different matters on which the papers are before the committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Are not the papers brought before the committee by order of the committee?

Mr. NORTHRUP. The papers are brought from the department by the order of the committee, there is no question of that; but as a matter of fact they are not laid before the committee until some one moves to examine witnesses and when he examines the witnesses the papers are brought before the committee. Let me show to my hon. friend the absurdity of his position. Of the papers brought before the committee probably not one-twentieth are investigated by the hearing of evidence. If the rule is to be that the moment papers are brought down before the Public Accounts Committee, then the subjects with which they are concerned are excluded from discussion in this House until the committee reports, there will be on an average eighty cases each session that never come before the committee, and the committee cannot make a report because there is no subject before them.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it is quite unnecessary to discuss a ruling which has not been made or suggested, that is that every paper before the committee is to be ruled out of discussion here.

Mr. NORTHRUP. The Minister of Public Works takes that view.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I beg your pardon, I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Then what does it come to? It has been contended that the moment papers are brought down to the Public Accounts Committee the House is debarred from discussion upon them until the committee reports. I point out that there cannot be a report until something further has been done in the committee than the mere examination of papers by a member. The hon. member for Simcoe says that this matter was never before the committee. His word must be sufficient for the committee in that respect.

Mr. BENNETT. The printed records show that.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Apart from the proof he brings, the hon. member's word is sufficient for this House, but when he brings the

record and shows that it is another dredging matter altogether, it practically comes to this that the Minister of Public Works wishes to prevent discussion on dredging contract 'A' because dredging contract 'B' is being investigated before the committee.

Mr. F. F. PARDEE (West Lambton). In so far as the dredging goes, the question of dredging stands by itself. Ever since the Public Accounts Committee commenced the hon. member for Simcoe has been examining witnesses in regard to dredging. His first motion was in regard to one certain payment and several times, whilst the committee has been in session, he has branched off from that payment altogether and gone on to other matters not pertinent to it at all. His attention was called to it——

Mr. SPEAKER. That will be entering upon a discussion of what occurred before the committee, which I could not permit.

Mr. PARDEE. This has gone on and I wish to say further that I asked the hon. gentleman only on Friday last, to close the inquiry and bring a report to the House regarding dredging. He refused saying that he had other witnesses to examine.

Mr. BENNETT. Certainly, and I am going to examine witnesses about this matter. Do not go away with the idea that this will not be further investigated before the committee.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). If the ruling just given is correct it is a rule that has been more honoured in the breach than in the observance, because every session there are questions before the Public Accounts Committee, some of which will be investigated and some will not; during the time these papers are before the Public Accounts Committee, we go into a Committee of Supply here and we proceed to vote money for similar items, we take up the Auditor General's Report with these items that are before the Public Accounts Committee for consideration and we ask all kinds of questions about them. I think, if my memory is correct, we have sometimes brought down the original papers from that committee for the convenience of the House when we were inquiring into the expenditure of public money in connection with some of these items. At the present time there are several items regarding timber limits that are before the committee. I moved for some papers there as well in reference to some timber limits. I looked into those papers, I got all the information I required, and therefore it was unnecessary either to call witnesses or to bring the departmental officers before the committee. I obtained the information and I left the papers there. Would it be said that I had no right to use the information or to discuss those items in this House because the papers were before the Public Accounts Committee, when the Public Accounts Committee will not deal with them during the whole session, will make no report whatever? If I understand, it is only questions with which the Puplic Accounts Committee deal and upon which they report, according to the terms of the order of reference, 'their findings, suggestions or observations,' that we may not discuss. Take the case with which the hon. member has dealt. It is true that one item of dredging that has been before the Public Accounts Committee has been inquired into.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is that?

Mr. BENNETT. The Fesserton case.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That cannot be so because the hon. member said that the Penetanguishene matter is before the committee.

Mr. BENNETT. It is the Fesserton case of the Penetanguishene Dredging Company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And Owen Sound?

Mr. BENNETT. Nothing about Owen Sound.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the minister confuses the two names, the dredging company in Penetanguishene and the dredging company at Fesserton. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) is discussing an item that the Public Accounts Committee have not considered at all and that item may not be considered by the Public Accounts Committee. Would it be held that because these papers are before the committee for examination by any private member of this House, but have never been brought up and examined and investigated by calling as witnesses under oath, we had no right to speak of them in this House? We have always dealt with these questions when in Committee of Supply, we would discuss items belonging to the same locality or to the same public work, for which we were voting money. We discussed them ad libitum, and there is no objection notwithstanding that they are before the Public Accounts Committee. I hold, if I understand the rule, that we have a perfect right to discuss any matter unless it is a question being examined by the Public Accounts Committee as a Public Accounts Committee and not by a private member, a matter on which evidence is being taken either from the departmental officers or some one interested in the contract or some one who can give additional information that the committee desires to have before making its report, with its observations, conclusions or suggestions to this House. It is only with regard to these things, I think, that we are debarred from speaking in this House, and not the others.

Mr. SPEAKER. The ruling which the Chair makes in the matter is this: If the

matter is really before the Public Accounts Committee, after the papers have been sent from one of the departments, and has not been dealt with by the committee, reference can be made to it in this House. The question comes down to one of fact—whether there are proceedings in connection with this matter pending before the committee or not. The statement is made on one side that there are such proceedings; the statement is made on the other side that there are no such proceedings. The hon. member (Mr. Bennett) who initiated the discussion was certainly quoting from proceedings before the Public Accounts Committee which had not been reported to the House, and so was clearly out of order. Of course, I did not wish to interfere unnecessarily, but when the point was taken, it was clear to my mind that the hon. gentleman was quoting proceedings before the Public Accounts Committee not yet reported to the House. So, my ruling would be, if there are proceedings pending before the Public Accounts Committee on this matter, until the matter is reported to the House, it would be out of order to discuss those here. If the hon. member will conduct his discussion on the line of not referring to or quoting proceedings that are still before the committee, he will have a perfect right to proceed.

Mr. BENNETT. I take it, Mr. Speaker, that your ruling is that I must not make a reference to any evidence that has been given before the committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. Or to any documents which are the subject of a pending reference.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not wish to transgress your ruling. Then, I understand that, having moved for certain documents——

Mr. SPEAKER. If the documents are there and are not being investigated, you have a perfect right to discuss them.

Mr. BENNETT. Very well. Now, early in the session I moved that certain documents should be laid before the Public Accounts Committee referring to the dredging at Midland. I have seen those documents, together with the tenders for the work, and I will quote from these. I repeat that the tenders for the work at Midland are of the Penetanguishene Company and the Grant Company and both are written in the handwriting of Mr. F. W. Grant, the brother of the hon. member for North Ontario—there is not the slightest doubt about that.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member says he is referring to documents before the committee. The whole point is, have these documents been before the committee for investigation.

Mr. PARDEE. Yes, certainly.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. No evidence was taken.

Mr. BENNETT. I am astounded that——

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) has announced within the last twenty minutes that he intends to do so and so before the committee proceeds 'further' with the investigation; and he says that he intends to call 'other' witnesses.

Mr. BENNETT. I intend to bring these matters up before the committee at some future day. Surely no hon. gentleman on the other side who is a member of the committee will make the statement that the authenticity of these two tenders has been brought up or evidence adduced. Mr. Grant has not been a witness before the committee. Hon. gentlemen opposite are mistaken. Now, in the first instance, the Grant tender for the work at Midland was for 53 cents a yard. I believe I am right in the assertion that tenders were not publicly advertised for, but the work was subsequently given to that company at 26 cents a yard. That is surely an astounding thing—that a company, within a short space of time, probably a few weeks, would offer to do work at 26 cents which so short a time before they had asked 53 cents for. But that is on the record. I said there were no tenders for the work at Tiffin. There can be no question that, in the original asking for tenders, none were asked for the work at that point, —or, if they were, they are not filed on record in the department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of course, I will look into it. Tiffin is part of Midland, is it not?

Mr. BENNETT. It adjoins.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Are not they the same?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It may be there were no separate tenders for Tiffin as distinguished from Midland.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. minister (Mr. Pugsley) cannot understand this matter thoroughly because he was not in charge of the department at the time, and, as he has not recently looked at the schedule, it will not be fresh in his memory. There is a schedule prepared by the department showing where all these different works have been performed, with figures placed opposite the name of the respective tenderers, and by the acting Minister of Public Works—the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth)—a circle around the name of the contractor who has secured the job. There is also a lead pencil memo. which shows that the Tiffin work goes to the Owen Sound Dredging Company at 27 cents a yard.

Now, let us take these records and see what they mean to the country. In one month this company draws $11,089. It must be remembered that this work is certified to in these returns as paid for at the rate of $2 a yard. The scows are large scows carrying perhaps not 200 yards at a load

but certainly over 100 yards. Therefore, if this material is not rock but clay, though paid for at the rate of rock, it means that they receive at least $200 for a load instead of $34, the amount they ought to receive. Another question that presents itself is whether or not the inspector inspects in this case. There are certificates lying there—more than one and more than several—on which this company has been paid large amounts which bear no signature to show that the inspector had anything to do with it. That is a serious statement, but the minister can verify it by bringing down the documents from the Public Accounts Committee.

Now, let us follow these figures a little. This company is paid $11,089 for one month. Working eight months, they would receive about $90,000 for the season. Now, these dredges are not expensive concerns to work; —probably $25 to $40 would pay for the wages of the men and the coal. That being so, you can see that there is colossal profit. It is no wonder that the stockholders in these dredging companies—there are scores of such stockholders—make their boast in the streets of Midland that they are receiving from 75 per cent to 100 per cent dividend. Why, it is the easiest thing in the world to do this when you have an inspector who cheerfully certifies that these dredges are working fifteen hours a day even on into the month of December when it is utterly impossible for them to work for that length of time, and when you have a manager of a dredge, who, with equal cheerfulness, will certify to the same thing.

Let us take another case, the case of the MacKay Company, the owners of dredge No. 9. I asked a question as to the amount per day this dredge was making and I find that it is earning $210 a day, if she is working twelve hours a day. Now, contrast that with the figure at which this same dredge was previously hired by the department, which was $80 per day. Is that not enough to put the government and the Minister of Public Works on his guard with the people he is dealing with? Look at the Auditor General's Report of a few years ago, and you will find this dredge of MacKay, Horsey & Company, working at $8 an hour, and there are figures that prove conclusively that she is earning $200 a day—not earning it but she is paid that much.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman know whether the company that got paid for the dredging, paid for the coal and all that ?

Mr. BENNETT. In both cases the company paid for operating.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Paid the coal bills themselves ?

Mr. BENNETT. No question about that. There are facilities afforded for fraud in these matters, owing to the fact pointed out by the commissioners, the appointment of these local inspectors. Take the case dealt with a year or two ago in the committee. A man named Eastwood was appointed, and he cherfully tells the committee that he drew $3 a day and never went near the work ; as Mr. Gobeil says, he retained $1.75 a day out of the season's wages, and gave the other man $1.25. But the dishonesty of that man was nothing compared to the dishonesty of other government inspectors, because the other government inspectors had been in the employ of the country for some years. Now the figures prove what I have stated, that these dredges which cost about $100,000, or are given out to cost that much, are paid $80,000 to $100,000 in a season, less the wages, which are not a large item. Is it not a suspicious circumstance that the secretary treasurer of one company is actually writing out tenders for both companies ? And yet the minister says that these are the people to deal with. How ? By not allowing them to be subjected to competition. Why ? Because he thinks the prices are fair and reasonable. The minister in that respect is going directly contrary to law. What right has the government to spend an amount running in all probability —I cannot tell the amount, because the minister promised to bring down that schedule to show where the work is to be done. May I ask the minister now : Is the large work at Port Arthur to be done under a similar arrangement, and that at Fort William ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, that does not come under this, that is a different contract.

Mr. BENNETT. Is that a contract that has been let by tender this year ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. The hon. gentleman must be aware that the contract for the work at Port Arthur, upon the Mission and Kamanistiqua rivers, was let some time ago, and this work, extending over several years, was provided for in the original contract.

Mr. BENNETT. Then may I ask the minister this question : Will the Collingwood work come under this order in council ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not sure whether the Collingwood work is included in this order.

Mr. BENNETT. And Little Current ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, Little Current is not in this order.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I have shown the government that this is a case where they should be on suspicion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that we are always on suspicion, and always watchful.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, I compliment the Minister of Public Works on this fact, that he has done for the first time during the past ten or twelve years, what must be done for the future, and what the public will insist upon, namely, that every one of these inspectors shall make himself amenable to the criminal law by making sworn declarations as to the returns. These matters attract public attention, as they must necessarily do. Take the case of MacKay & Company. It is only a few years ago since Dr. Walsh and Mr. MacKay started in this dredging business, with an old dredge named No. 9 that they were anxious to rent to the government at $8 an hour. To-day they are owners of two dredges that are openly discussed by people who know their cost, and are stated by these gentlemen themselves, to have cost with their scows, over $100,000 each. Talk about where the money comes from !

Mr. PUGSLEY. Dredges cost $100,000 to $200,000. Dredging plants are very expensive.

Mr. BENNETT. I have been informed by the manager of this concern that these dredges cost over $100,000 a piece, with the scows. These gentlemen had no extrinsic business.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You can hardly be sure of that. I know many a dredge that is not paid for yet.

Mr. BENNETT. These gentlemen had no extrinsic business out of which they could make money to become the owners of these dredges. I say now that as these facts are disclosed in the Public Accounts Committee by documents that are lying there, the fraud perpetrated by the Grant and Spohn companies, or by Spohn's company, in the face of the fact that their original tender was for 53 cents a yard, and that afterwards they accepted the work at 26 cents a yard, in the face of the fact that the certificates of the inspector up there show that he has not in certain cases certified to them——

Mr. PUGSLEY. In how many cases ?

Mr. BENNETT. I did not charge my memory with them, but I think, in looking them over, I say more than three. In face of the evidence, which the hon. gentleman can read when it is printed, given by the man representing these dredges, as to whether or not the inspector was there when the work was done, and having regard to the enormous amount of money that is being expended———

Mr. PUGSLEY. If it would be right to refer to the evidence, I might ask the hon. gentleman if the inspector was not dismissed the moment it came to the knowledge of the department ?

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman is confounding this case with another. This is a case where a huge expenditure is to be made. The minister cannot tell me what works will come under the purview of this order in council, but the Victoria harbour work, the Tiffin work, the Midland work, and perhaps the Collingwood work will come within it, and I assume the expenditure will be upwards of half a million dollars. The government knows all this, the government knows what this dredging is costing. I say the public will not be satisfied, and is not satisfied. Irrespective of politics, the public do not believe, from Owen Sound to Collingwood and Midland, that the government has ever got value for the money that is being disbursed. I submit that instead of allowing this order in council to be acted on, tenders should be called forthwith for this work. Let it be put up to public competition, and let there be no more of these suspicious circumtances allowed to exist.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not at all sorry that the hon. gentleman has brought this question before the House. I recognize that the matter of dredging, and the question of having the work honestly, efficiently and satisfactorily done, is one of great importance. It is becoming yearly of more importance, because there is a rapidly increasing demand in all sections of the country, both upon the Atlantic and the Pacific, upon the rivers and the great lakes, for dredging to be performed for the purpose of giving accommodation to steamships which are every year becoming larger, therefore, the cost of dredging must increase year after year. I am sorry to have to say that the Dominion is not properly equipped, in my judgment, with dredging plant. We have no adequate dredging plant upon the great lakes. We have, in the maritime provinces, for use there and in the Baie des Chaleurs, only a comparatively few dredges—I think some nine or ten altogether. The dredging plant owned by the government is not at all in my judgment, what it ought to be for a maritime country such as Canada is. There is an enormous demand for dredging on the Pacific coast, on the Atlantic coast, on the St. Lawrence, and other rivers, the Baie des Chaleurs and the great lakes. Therefore, the department has felt obliged to ask for tenders for a great deal of the dredging work in the past and has necessarily done that work by contract.

Now, I quite agree that one of the most important things to be attended to is the matter of inspection. Of course, there are some cases where the engineers of the department can measure up the work in situ and determine with a considerable degree of accuracy the quality of material to be dredged, but in a great many cases—I think I am safe in saying in the majority of cases

—this work cannot be accurately performed without very great expense, without having a large staff of engineers going to an expense which probably the department would not be justified in incurring. Therefore, it has been found in most cases that the department were only able to let contracts and to pay for the dredging work on the basis of scow measurement. In order that the government may be properly protected it is necesary to have inspectors examine each scow load as it is taken away from the dredge with the view of making a proper report to the department. Therefore, a great deal depends upon the honesty of the inspectors and upon the faithfulness with which they do the work. I recognize that. The Minister of Public Works, the chief engineer of the department and even the resident engineer, who has a considerable territory to look after, cannot guard the public with respect to the quanity of material which is taken out of the scows and therefore, as I have already said, we must depend to a very large degree upon the honesty and upon the faithfulness of the inspectors who are appointed for that purpose.

Mr. BENNETT. But the department has imposed the further check that the owner or manager of the dredge also certifies as to the number of yards in these scows.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, that is true. There have been some cases that have come to the notice of the department in which inspectors have not done their duty. There has been one case which probably was the case that the hon. gentleman had in mind where a man who was entrusted with the duty of inspecting scow loads had farmed the work out to another party. He was getting, I think, $3 a day and he employed another person at $1.50 a day to do his work. That was a most improper thing to do. The department did not engage or rely upon the man whom he appointed, but the department relied upon himself and the department had a right to expect him to perform his duty.

Mr. BENNETT. But both of those men were appointees of the government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That may be, but still the man who was appointed as inspector was the man to whom the department had a right to look, and he was the man that the department appointed to perform this duty. When the matter came to the notice of the department that officer was dismissed. There was another case that occurred upon the great lakes.

Mr. FOWLER. Did you make him pay back the money ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was no evidence that there was any intention to commit a fraud. It was simply, on the part of this man, a misconception as to his duty.

Mr. BENNETT. That man actually got $30 for the use of the boat under his wifes maiden name, which boat was never used.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware of that case.

Mr. BENNETT. That is the same case.

Mr. BERGERON. He charged and was paid overtime.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was another case that occurred in connection with dredging at one of the ports of the great lakes, where a man who was appointed inspector was employing another party who was inspector upon a dredge which was working in the same locality to do his work. That was an improper thing to do, and when this matter came to the notice of the department the services of both of them were dispensed with.

I have a good deal of faith in human honesty, and I believe that the great majority of the people who are appointed to attend to these public duties do endeavour to perform their duties honestly, and I have no reason to suppose but what the great majority, if not all of the inspectors who are in the employ of the department, are men who can be relied upon. The minister and his officials are not accustomed to take the recommendation of local people as the hon. gentlemen suggests, but they make inquiry in regard to a man's character, in regard to his antecedents, in regard to his efficiency as an inspector of dredging and they appoint him after all these inquiries are made, believing that he will do his duty faithfully. I thought it desirable—perhaps I am taking undue precautions—to avoid in so far as could possibly be done any opportunity for fraud occurring as far as the inspectors are concerned. I have adopted a rule which has met with the hearty approval of the officers of the department, that the inspector must, with his returns, send in a statutory declaration to the effect not only that the quantity as certified by him is correct but, that he has personally seen and has had an opportunity of determining as to the measurement of every scow load of material to which he certifies. That is, I think, a pretty good check put upon the inspectors, because, when an inspectors knows that he has to make a statutory declaration which has all the force of an oath as to his personal supervision of the work and as to his personal knowledge of every scow load, I do not think that he will neglect his duties or certify with respect to scow loads he has not seen and as to which he has no personal knowledge. I have also caused a circular to be sent out to all the inspectors in the employ of the department calling

their attention to this important duty which rests upon them, and informing them that any omission to perform their duty will be a ground for instant dismissal. No excuse will be taken for failure to perform their duty in this regard. Therefore, it seems to me that in so far as the department or the minister could reasonably do so we have taken every precaution to guard against any difficulties of this kind as far as future work is concerned. I may say to my hon. friend who is not disposed to be over-warm in his praise, either of the Department of Public Works or any other department and who, I am almost inclined to think, may fairly be subject to the criticism of being unduly harsh in his judgments and making statements very often which have no foundation in fact but which really rest very largely upon his own imagination and upon his desire to make a point against the government——

Mr. BENNETT. Will the hon. gentleman allow me ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman will pardon me I am going to pay him a compliment.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. minister cannot mention one statement I have made for which I have not given the proof.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am glad that my hon. friend has shown that spirit which only can animate the members of this House in that he has given me, as the present minister, credit for having framed regulations which are of a most reasonable character and which are well calculated to protect the public in so far as dredging is concerned. The hon. gentleman has attempted to convince the House that it is wrong to fix the time during the present season for the completion of the work of Tiffin, Midland and Victoria harbours, and he says—if I understand his criticism, that is the only ground upon which he bases it—that the two companies who tendered for this work put in tenders which were written by the same person and which were for a larger amount than the contract was ultimately let for. I think I am stating the matter as the hon. gentleman put it to the House. Now, I am not aware that it is a ground for charging two men with fraud that they should be aware of the tenders which each respectively put in for a public work. If as a private individual I were to invite tenders for a dwelling house and there were a dozen tenders put in, and the tenderers got together and Mr. Brown said to Mr. Jones : You tender at $20,000 and I will tender at $25,000 knowing that a good many other tenders would be put in. I am not quite prepared to say that these two men could be charged with fraud or conspiracy because they did that.

Mr. BENNETT. The case is very different where there are two different works one of which would fall to each of the different tenderers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Until the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) spoke in the House I never heard the point raised that tenderers could be charged with fraud simply because they had done what I have described. It would be a very different matter if there were any collusion between them and the minister or an official of the department with regard to these tenders. If the hon. gentleman had been able to show that one of these tenderers had information from the minister or the chief engineer or the deputy minister so that the lowest tenderer might have been allowed to withdraw his tender, then he would have made an exceedingly strong point against the department because that would show collusion and conspiracy. But that is not the case at all here. Tenders were put in for different works and I suppose they were hoping that among them all both companies might be awarded contracts for certain dredging, but I am not aware that that constituted any fraudulent act upon their part.

Mr. LAKE. Does the minister approve of that in connection with public works ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not called upon to express my approval or disapproval. As minister I would much prefer, even where a large number of tenders for different works are called for, that one tenderer should not know the figure which the other tenderer is putting in. But where tenders are called for half a dozen different buildings and the contractors arrange to put in different figures in the hope that Mr. A. may get the contract for two or three different buildings and that Mr. B. may get the contract for two or three more, I am not aware that it is a fradulent act on their part unless it can be shown that a trusted employee of the man who is giving the contracts was a party to some conspiracy or collusion with the contractors. However, nothing of that kind has been suggested in this case. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) insinuates that there must be something wrong because the company which tendered to do a part of this work at 57 cents a yard ultimately took the contract at 27 cents. But if I were to express any opinion on that I would say that it shows that these tenderers found they could not get the work at a higher figure than the officers of the department said that work was reasonably worth, and that the Minister of Justice who was then acting Minister of Public Works insisted in the public interest that the work should be taken at the smaller figure which the chief engineer reported was reasonable. If that shows anything at all it shows that the acting minister was safeguarding the interests of the people.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it not fair to assume that the acting minister consulted the chief engineer on the matter ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I should think he did.

Mr. BENNETT. When I tell the minister that dredging had been done in Midland previously at 15 cents and 16 cents a yard, it is no wonder he looked surprised when they asked 56 cents.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a very great difference in the cost of dredging. It all depends upon the material to be dredged. In the city of St. John there are places where dredging can be done at 50 cents a yard at a profit, but there are other places where the contractors claim there is no profit in it at 90 cents a yard, and one of them insisted not long ago that he should be paid $1.25 a yard. Everything depends upon the nature of the material to be dredged.

Mr. BENNETT. What explanation can the minister give of their dropping from 57 cents to 27 cents ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It may very well be that upon further enquiry they found the work could be done for less ; or, that they found they could not get contracts in other directions where they might profitably employ their dredges, or, that on account of excessive competition they were willing to take the smaller profit and come down to the figure which the acting minister insisted on ; there may be very many reasons. Or, the work may have been of a different character, as my hon. friend behind me suggests.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister knows that the work was identically the same work and he cannot get away from the question in that manner.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The other day the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) professed to have a knowledge of carpentry work beyond that which an ordinary man of his profession and mine enjoys, but let me tell him that it often happens that the most reputable and experienced builders differ to an extraordinary degree in the tenders which they put in for a particular work. Not long ago it came under my own observation that in respect to buildings to be erected in one of the western provinces there was over $100,000 difference between the various tenderers.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the size of the contract ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $280,000.

Mr. BENNETT. And there was a difference of $100,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. That variation in tenders comes within my knowledge almost every day. It is remarkable how widely contractors of experience and good judgment will differ as to the probable cost of a work. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) was criticising the action of the government in allowing me to exercise my judgment in fixing the time during the present season for the completion of the work, he did not call attention to the fact that this same Owen Sound Company is only getting 8 cents per cubic yard for the dredging which it has at Victoria, so that although they are getting 27 cents per cubic yard at Tiffin they are only receiving 8 cents at Victoria.

Mr. BENNETT. If the minister is fair he will explain to the House what the nature of the work at each place is.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That just illustrates what I said a moment ago, that everything depends upon the quality of the material to be dredged. When the Owen Sound Dredging Company proposed to do the work at Tiffin at the same price as was provided by the contract, which was awarded to them after public competition, for dredging work at Midland, of which Tiffin forms a part, I said that I would not extend the time for the dredging work at Tiffin unless they would also agree to do the work at Victoria Harbour at the rate of 8 cents per cubic yard, and it was only when the company agreed to do the work at 27 cents and 8 cents per cubic yard respectively that I agreed to recommend the extension of time to my colleagues. The hon. gentleman apparently could not forbear to make reference to the fact that Mr. Stewart happens to be a son of the member for Ottawa. Hs says that his company tendered at 30 cents per cubic yard. Well, there could not surely be any objection to that, as it was the lowest tender obtained, after public tenders were called for. See, Mr. Speaker, how careful the department was in regard to that contract. When the Dominion Dredging Company declined to go on with the work, while the acting minister might have been justified in letting the contract to another party at the same price, he declined to do so, but only gave it to them on their consenting to reduce the price to 26 cents per cubic yard. So we have the work at Midland at 26 cents per cubic yard, the work at Tiffin, which is a part of Midland, at 27 cents per cubic yard, and the work at Victoria Harbour at only 8 cents per cubic yard. The hon. gentleman has a further criticism: He says that this work being an important work, I ought not to extend the time for its completion without again asking for public tenders. Now, there are reasons which I think are cogent reasons, and which might very well operate upon the mind of the minister in inducing him to extend the time for the completion of this work. I may say that these are not the only dredging contracts in respect to which a recommendation was made to council. To begin with, I had to consider the

character of the work that was going on at Midland and at Victoria harbour. The Grand Trunk Pacific are creating a new port at Tiffin, and are laying out their plans upon a most comprehensive scale, with a view to conveying across the great lakes from Fort William the vast traffic which is to be developed in the Northwest in the next few years. They are immediately planning for elevator accommodation there to the extent of 2,000,000 bushels, and their plans include accommodation for 10,000,000 bushels of grain at Tiffin. They are working with all possible rapidity. They are pushing their road through the western country at such a rate that they expect by this fall to be hauling grain from Edmonton to the great lakes, and they expect by the 1st of October to have their elevator at Tiffin completed and to have their rail connections there, so as to be in a position this fall to handle the grain traffic which they expect from the lakes; and they have strongly urged me in the public interest, in the interest of transportation, to have this work so far completed by the 1st of October of the present year that large lake vessels will be able to steam up to their elevator and unload the grain into it and so they may transport it eastward.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the date of the order in council?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A week or ten days ago. This company, it is reported to me, have performed their work in a most satisfactory manner. They have a thoroughly up-to-date dredging plant; they know the ground; they have been working there during the past season, and they are prepared to do this work in time for the Grand Trunk Pacific so that the dredging and the elevator will both be completed by the 1st of October. Now, Sir, I thought that it would be wise in the public interest to do everything that was reasonable to have this dredging work done by next fall, so that steamers might use the elevator of the Grand Trunk Pacific. My chief engineer reports that the price is fair and reasonable. I do not believe, if we asked for new tenders, that we would get the work done for less than 26 cents per cubic yard in one case, and 27 cents in the other case, considering the nature of the material. So far as Victoria Harbour is concerned, the Canadian Pacific Railway are pressing the matter in the same way. They too are adopting a new policy of transportation. They have made up their minds that the wheat of the Northwest, instead of going to Buffalo and seeking an outlet by American ports on the Atlantic ocean should pass through Canadian channels, and they are spending an enormous sum of money improving their line of railway. They are building a new line to Victoria harbour, and are spending, I believe, about $60,000 a mile to obtain a grade of three-tenths of one per cent, practically a level line, over which their large locomotives will be able to haul a train of sixty cars at a time, thus greatly reducing the cost of transporting the grain. They too have urged me to push on this dredging work and have it completed if possible this season, so that they can bring the grain over the lakes to Victoria harbour, and then transport it eastward. Seeing that this company were equipped with a magnificent plant, one of the best in Canada, knowing the satisfactory work they performed during the past season, and having the certificate of my chief engineer that these prices were reasonable, and getting the work done at Victoria harbour at the ridiculously low price of 8 cents per yard——

Mr. BENNETT. Does the minister say that the same company is doing the work at Tiffin and Victoria harbour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think so—the Owen Sound Company.

Mr. BENNETT. That is not my information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the hon. gentleman's information?

Mr. BENNETT. The information I have from Midland is that the Owen Sound Company have the Tiffin work and the Grant Company, the Victoria harbour work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Owen Sound Company, I am sure, have the dredging both at Tiffin and at Victoria harbour.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the Grand Trunk any work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. BENNETT. That is the company that is called the Canadian Construction Company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know as to that. I may be wrong, but I am quite sure that the Owen Sound Dredging Company have the contract both at Tiffin and at Victoria harbour. Being able to get the work done at Victoria harbour at the ridiculously low price of 8 cents per cubic yard and at Tiffin at what my engineer informs me is a low price considering the nature of the material, 26 cents per cubic yard, was it unreasonable that I should say to this company: If you are willing to do both of these pieces of work at the figures of last year, I shall extend the time for you for the purpose of providing the necessary accommodation for these great railway companies, so that they may be able to handle the grain traffic during the coming season?

Mr. SPROULE. Section 36 of the Public Works Act says:

Whenever any works are to be executed under the direction of any department of the government, the minister having charge of such department shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of such works, except in cases:

(a) of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest; or
(b) in which from the nature of the work it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department; or
(c) where the estimated cost of the work is less than five thousand dollars and it appears to the minister, in view of the nature of the work, that it is not advisable to invite tenders.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is exactly what I have done. We have complied with the law in every particular.

Mr. SPROULE. What item of the estimates is to pay for this when it is done ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the main estimates of the current year there is an amount for improvements at Midland and also at Victoria harbour.

Mr. SPROULE. Which are not voted yet ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Which are not voted yet. A sum was voted last year also but of course under the contract the department will not be obliged to pay if there is no appropriation or when the appropriation is exhausted and the contractor takes that risk.

Mr. SPROULE. At the end of the year the appropriation lapses ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and the moment the appropriation lapses the payments to the contractor must stop.

Mr. BLAIN. Was there some dredging at Victoria last year ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. At the same place ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. At the same place and the same price. Public tenders were called for both at Victoria harbour and at Midland. My hon. friend must not get into his head the idea as the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has, even although he lives at Midland, that Tiffin is a different place from Midland. Tiffin is a part of Midland harbour. Last year public tenders were invited for dredging at Victoria and Midland and after public competition—

Mr. BLAIN. Is the minister sure tenders were called for in Victoria harbour ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no question about it. I told the chief engineer of my department I would not extend the time except where public tenders were called for and the contract let to the lowest tenderer. The contract is for dredging works required at Victoria and at Midland and in it it is provided that the contractor shall finish the work at the close of the season of 1907 or at such further date as the minister may fix and determine. The contract therefore gives to the minister the power to fix a time later than the close of last season for the completion of this work. Therefore I am not letting a contract without tender, I am simply exercising the power with the approval of the Governor General in Council, given me by the contract, of fixing the close of the present season as the time when the work should be completed. As the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway required the work it could not be wholly completed last season. The hon. gentleman speaks of the money these dredging companies have made. He speaks of one dredge earning $200 a day. Let me tell him that not many years ago the city of St. John had occasion to hire a dredge. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel), who I think was then mayor of the city, will remember that they hired a dredge from Portland, Maine, and paid a rental of either $350 or $400 per day for it.

Mr. BENNETT. I made the statement that this same dredge that earns $210 a day had been hired by the department for $8 an hour.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That might very well be, but does not the hon. gentleman know that in that case the government would have to pay for her whether she broke down or not ? If she broke down during dredging we would have to pay the $8 an hour.

Mr. BENNETT. Nonsense.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Clearly we would, because she was there at the disposal of the government.

Mr. BENNETT. They were only paid when they worked.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some dredging companies make money and others do not. Not many years ago, a prominent contractor had some dredging work in St. John. I suppose he thought he was getting a fair price but he did not continue in the business, he sold out when he got through with the work, and went out of the dredging business. He is a man of large experience and I presume that if there was a certainty of earning great money in that business he would have continued in it. Dredging, as I understand, is a risky business. To begin with the plant is very expensive ; it soon wears out, after a very few years a dredging plant becomes old and worn out so that if the man continues in his business he has to renew his machinery. That matter would have to be taken into consideration by the contractor. Dredging machinery is very apt to break down. Not long ago in connection with one of the dredges working upon the Atlantic coast one of the spuds broke and they had to send to British Columbia to get a large spud to take its place. Very often dredges will be under repairs perhaps for weeks at a time. There are all these risks to be taken. I recognize that if a man is lucky to have skilled foremen in charge of his plant he

may make money ; if on the other hand he has not a proper man handling this expensive machinery he may very soon lose a vast deal of money and therefore I would advise my hon. friend not to take too much stock in those rumors which he hears from time to time of the enormous dividends which these dredging companies are making, because there are losses which have to be sustained also.

Mr. BENNETT. We see the results. When gentlemen build $20,000 houses who formerly lived in tenements, it is pretty plain what is going on.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I wish simply to refer to one matter to prevent any misapprehension on the part of the hon. gentleman as to the position in which I, as minister, stand with reference to extending the time for the completion of this contract. I said that the matter was under consideration and also that an order in council had been passed authorizing me to extend the time That order of course necessarily would be passed upon my recommendation and ordinarily I would be supposed to follow it up and fix the time for the completion of the work. I may say, however, that for some little time past I have been urged by quite large transportation interests and also by the Boards of Trade of Winnipeg and Port Arthur to consider the question of dredging the harbours upon the Great lakes to a greater depth than 22 feet. These contracts provide for 22 feet but my attention had been called to the fact that the new lock which is to be built by the American government at the Sault is to have a depth of water over the mitre sill of 24 feet and it has been urged upon me to dredge the harbours both on the western and eastern shores of the great lakes to 25 feet. During the last few days, since this order in council was passed, this view has been very strongly urged upon my consideration.

I am now making inquiries in the matter, consulting with the chief engineer. I am not sure whether or not I will recommend to my colleagues that authority be given me to make a change in the contract so as to go to a greater depth. Hon. gentlemen can see that the question is a very important one and one which will involve some considerable additional expense. At the same time, I realize that in dredging these great harbours, both upon the eastern shores of Georgian bay and Lake Huron and also at Port Arthur and Fort William, we ought to look to the future. The lake steamers are becoming larger and are requiring a greater depth of water, and we ought to do what we can to keep the grain traffic of the west in Canadian channels and prevent it going to American ports. The chief engineer of the department tells me that, even taking the depth of water which the new American lock will have, 24 feet, and comparing it with the data of our work both at Victoria and Tiffin and at Port Arthur and Fort William, it is not unlikely that, owing to the difference between the two data, the 22 feet depth proposed under the contracts will be sufficient. The matter is under consideration, and that is why I have not acted on the order in council and actually given the extension. For, if it is decided to dredge to a depth of 25 feet, it will require some arrangement to be made with the contractors that the work may go on and that we may not be compelled, having dredged 22 feet, to dredge to a depth of 25 feet. I am a thorough believer in the idea that, if it can be avoided, we must not allow these big ships which now transport the grain to Buffalo and other American ports to have an advantage in going to those ports, but we must make our harbours of sufficient depth to accommodate the largest vessel which in the future will navigate the great lakes. And, of course, the depth of the harbours on the western shore of Lake Superior must be the measure of the depth of the harbours on the eastern shore of Lake Huron and Georgian bay. Because if the big ships can enter Port Arthur and Fort William drawing 24 feet of water and cannot enter the harbours on Georgian bay or Lake Huron, they must of necessity take the traffic down to Buffalo and other American ports. This, of course, is a very important question as connected with our transportation problem, and I am sure the House will say that I am only exercising reasonable prudence in not acting immediately upon the authority of the order in council, and in taking a short time to consider the matter with the officers of my department, getting all the information possible before deciding what is the best course to pursue. I make this explanation because otherwise my hon. friend might feel that I had not been entirely frank in saying that the order in council was passed, but the matter was under consideration.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Just a few words in reference to the question of how dredging contracts should be let. I think the first thing is to have a proper staff of engineers and to make a profile of the locality to be dredged. That, the hon. minister says, is rather difficult engineering work. It is no more difficult than any other engineering work on a railway or anything else. The proper plan is to have a profile, and to know the quantities and the material to be dredged before you put a dredge in at all. Then when you let the contract and the parties are at work it may be inconvenient to measure prism quantities and pay on prism quantities. It may be necessary to pay on monthly estimates, these, perhaps, to be founded on scow quantities or measurements of the material taken out. But in every case these estimates should be corrected at the end of two or three

months, or, at the very least, at the end of the season. In no case should the party dredging have any other payment than for the actual prism quantities he takes out. That is the practice in England and in most of the states of the American union and in practically every other country where the dredging is done. But what are the facts here? A couple of parties collude together to get a contract, and, according to the new morals brought up from St. John, N.B., that is all right. They have influence enough with this government to get their nominee appointed to measure the work. He even farms it out in some cases. And on this party's certificate the contractors are paid. And that is the only certificate—no prism quantities, no profile, no correction of the work. In no other country in the world is such a thing permitted as is permitted by our Public Works Department. And why? It is no harm, according to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) where there are practically only two parties competing for a contract, for these parties to sit down and arrange prices for which they will bid. Why, that is nothing——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) pardon me; I was speaking in reference to this particular work. In this case there were a large number of tenderers besides these companies.

Mr. BENNETT. Only one other.

Mr. HAGGART. I paid particular attention to the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) and that statement was that the two parties who colluded were two-thirds of those who tendered.

Mr. BENNETT. No doubt about that.

Mr. HAGGART. And there is nothing wrong in that according to the Minister of Public Works—nothing immoral, nothing illegal. Why, in my reading of the statutes lately I have found that if a couple of parties attending a sale collude together, one saying to the other: 'You bid only so much for this and I will bid only so much for that,' and if that transaction comes before the court it is set aside on the ground of fraud and collusion. Why, there can be no greater collusion than for two to get together to arrange for high prices for such a contract as this. But, according to the new code of morals, this is all right—and, at least we can say that it is comparatively venial when we consider some of the other things done by those now in power. The Minister of Public Works seems not to take into account at all the statute quoted by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) which provides that every work involving an expenditure of $5,000 or over must be let by contract. And the hon. gentleman ignores this statute notwithstanding the report of the Royal Commission to investigate the civil service and its recommedation on this subject.

Mr. HAGGART.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How did I ignore it?

Mr. HAGGART. By letting a contract, or extending a contract which already existed, without tender, for works which may amount to $150,000 or $200,000 during the current year. There are estimates of $75,000 for one of the works and $75,000 for the other. And the hon. minister recommends to the Governor in Council to give him power to extend a contract for these works which contract was obtained by collusion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But it was not obtained by collusion.

Mr. HAGGART. It is a fraud, it is a violation of the law which the Royal Commission appointed by the hon. gentleman himself, has drawn attention to. There is a similar Act in England. How do they do there? As I have stated before in this House, they do not buy even a paint brush or a pound of nails without tender and contract. They do not do any piece of work, unless in the government workshops or navy yards, except by contract. The attention of the minister was forcibly drawn to it by the commission. They say to him: Look to England, there was a case in England where it was thought that for the purpose of keeping secret the construction of a gun of a particular pattern, it was in the public interest that the work should be done in secret; but the Public Accounts Committee in England said: That is not a sufficient reason to set aside the statute, that is not a sufficient reason to set aside the well known principle which has been adopted in reference to public works in England. No, they say, let every foreign government in the world know what the secret is, rather than that we should set aside the well known principle of letting public works by tender. But these gentlemen here in Canada—laws do not bind them, morals do not bind them. We had a set of morals brought up here the other day in reference to collusion. No effect at all upon hon. gentlemen. Statutory enactments are not of the least use. Wherever they think it is in the interest of their friends to let them a contract without tender, no statute, no law binds them. One would think that with the report of the Royal Commission before them showing violations of the law and making a comparison with the British system, they would at least have a little care. But the minister gets up boldly in the House and justifies the course he is pursuing. He says he thinks it is rather to be commended. Commended for what? Getting an order in council passed and not putting it into effect. For what reason? Because the amount to be excavated by the dredges may be largely in excess of the present estimate. He says that he has in contemplation the deepening of the harbour at Port Arthur and Victoria, and Midland to the depth of the new lock which is to be constructed at Sault Ste. Marie by

the Americans. It is true that the Americans contemplate a depth of 24 feet on the mitre sill of the new lock. But the new lake dredging will not be done, it will not be in use for seven or eight years more. It will take that time at least to complete the dredging, and they will have to build a new lock I suppose in order to give the same facilities as at present, and when they do that we will have to export by Midland and other harbours, because we must be able to use vessels of the largest draft that navigate Sault Ste. Marie.

I only rose for the purpose of showing how the chance of committing fraud with reference to dredging could be removed, if these gentlemen who have the administration of public affairs in charge adopted ordinary reasonable means for the purpose of doing it, and had a proper system of estimating the work that is to be done, and would follow the law in reference to the construction of public works. Never mind about morals, never mind about collusion; although the most damaging thing that could ever happen to a minister or a government is the exercise of nepotism, appointing their friends or relatives to public positions and helping them to secure contracts. No government can last long which does that. The strongest man that ever occupied the woolsack in England, on account of the appointment of a few relatives of his to positions under the government, was driven into private life. What has become of the public sentiment of this country if the statements of my hon. friend from East Simcoe are correct, that friends of members of the government, sons and relatives of members of parliament, are receiving large contracts from the government? It would be better that the commerce of the country should be stopped than that such things should be allowed to occur. Honour and integrity among public men are far above any wealth that can be acquired by such means, and hon. gentlemen will find out that the people of this country are awakening at last to these methods. I only rose for the purpose of making a few remarks with reference to what I considered the proper way of letting these contracts. It is simple, it is legal, there is no collusion about it. Above all things, let us keep the government and the people's representatives free from suspicion. For goodness sake, let us adopt the practice that, even when you wish to buy a pound of nails or a box of matches, you do it by open and public tender, by competition, and thus remove entirely temptation from the government.

Mr. R. BLAIN (Peel). I wish to express my disapproval of the policy laid down by the Minister of Public Works in respect to letting contracts without public competition. If any member of this House will take the trouble to look over the 'Hansard' of the last three or four years and read the discussions that have taken place in connection with tenders for dredging, they will arrive at the conclusion that something is wrong. For example here are two companies. My hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has from time to time been pointing out that some men were shareholders in both, that relatives were in both of them, and that in some cases there was collusion, there was a joining of hands in order to deceive the government in the tenders they put in for dredging. For instance, when these two companies, the Great Lakes Dredging Company and Mr. A. F. Bowman, were tendering for work to be done in Port Arthur, one of them, the Great Lakes Dredging Company, put in a tender for 9 cents a yard and A. F. Bowman put in a tender for 18 cents a yard, and A. F. Bowman is a member of the Great Lakes Dredging Company. If there had been no other tenders between the two, everybody knows what would have happened. The one for 9 cents would have been withdrawn, and the government would have been compelled to give the tender for 18 cents per yard.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Can the hon. gentleman point out any case in which a Minister of Public Works has allowed such a thing to be done?

Mr. BLAIN. I do not propose to enter into a detailed discussion of all these matters.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then why does the hon. gentleman assume that it would have been done when it never has been done?

Mr. BLAIN. I am expressing my condemnation of the policy. I would like the minister to understand that when he comes forward, as he does this afternoon, and states that there shall be no public competition for the dredging that is to take place at these two points for the coming year, then I say the people of this country will not approve of such a policy. Speaking for myself, I wish to express my condemnation of the new policy laid down by the minister. Not only is the minister guilty himself but he has, in the order in council, received the endorsation of the cabinet and we have therefore every member of the government setting aside a statute of this country as read by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and as cited by my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart). In reference to this statute we have a government, whose duty it is to carry out the statutes, coming forward his afternoon, and, through one of its representatives, saying that they will set aside this statute and that during this season dredging work shall be done without public competition at the prices they paid last year whether those prices were just or unjust. I see that the Auditor General has expressed himself upon this subject. Here is a letter:

Several cases came up during the season of 1906, where no public competition was in-

vited, but where a price for 1906 dredging was agreed upon between some official of your department and the contractor who had been dredging at the same place in the season of 1905.

In each of these instances the application for payment was accompanied by a type-written slip-form, stating that 'as the case was one of pressing emergency, in which delay would have been injurious to the public interest, the minister directed that the work should be executed without a call for tenders.'

It would generally be feasible for the engineering staff of one season to calculate what work remains to be done for the next year; and for the department to arrange its future policy in the early part of the winter. There would then be ample time to allow for public advertisement and tender, before dredging becomes possible in April or May.

Whatever difficulties have been caused in the past, by the late dates at which the votes of parliament were determined, will disappear under the new arrangement by which the fiscal year begins on April 1.

The money will now be voted several weeks or months before the opening of navigation; and there will always be sufficient time to invite tenders and award contracts, with the deliberation which is essential to such an important subject.

Here, the Auditor General, over his own signature, in the last Auditor General's Report (V—300) points out to the minister that this policy is a very bad one and he says that it ought to be discontinued. May I direct for a moment the attention of the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to a statement that he made some years ago with respect to the way in which public works should be carried on under his government when it came into power ?

It is an honest minister who makes a competent engineer. Sir, when we have a Liberal party administration at Ottawa, we shall not have such a system as that, we shall not have these errors which have been occurring, because the minister will then say to the engineer:

'My government wants a plan of a bridge, or a plan of a block of buildings, prepare your plans, but mind, if the contract which is given is not filled exactly as it is wanted or one cent has to be paid, off goes your head at once.'

From such men, to-day in the ranks of the Liberal party, can be produced such a Minister of Railways, Minister of Public Works, that there will be no disgrace upon the brow of any Canadian.

This was the policy laid down by the right hon. gentleman before he came into power in 1896. Now, we have ministers of the Crown setting aside the statutes. Now, after we have adopted a policy approved by the people of Canada which declares that there shall be public competition, we have that policy set aside and the right hon. gentleman and the members of his government adopt an order in council endorsing a brand new policy brought up from eastern Canada by the Minister of Public Works. I want to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to something that took place at a meeting of the board of trade at Collingwood

The regular Board of Trade meeting was held in the court room on Tuesday night last, and it was largely attended.

The principal question was the harbour. The president wanted to get at the actual condition of affairs. It was generally understood that we had a depth of twenty feet of water in the channel at low water, but facts did not bear out this supposition. He wanted to know who was responsible for the incomplete and unsatisfactory condition of the channel.

Mr. Hughes, the inspector, produced a chart of the soundings showing bumps and lumps dotted all over the channel, which was explanation enough of the trouble.

The board will take energetic steps to have the channel cleared up as the contractors are evidently digging out the soft spots where it pays the best, and the engineer is either indifferent or ignorant of what is going on. Mr. Hughes only does as he is told, and has no discretionary powers on the work.

That is the condition up at Collingwood, as presented to this House in 1907. Here was a contractor dredging out the soft spots in order to make money. There are other instances if I were to take up the time of the House but I want to direct the minister's attention to the fact that if any department in this government requires to ask for public tenders surely it is the department of my hon. friend. The amounts involved are large. There may be a difference of opinion as to whether an item of $2,000 or $3,000 should be made the subject of competition and tender but there surely can be no question that the competitive system is advisable when such large amounts are involved as are expended for dredging. I read from the last report of the Minister of Public Works that at Port Arthur :

The total amount dredged from July 1 to end of the season of 1906, was 443,175 cubic yards, scow measurements, and the expenditure for the nine months ending March 31 last was $67,990.91.

My hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has pointed out that the dredging companies that are under discussion have received more than $1,000,000——

Mr. BENNETT. Two million.

Mr. BLAIN—two million during the last few years for dredging. The newspapers have been pointing out that there is something wrong. My hon. friend from East Simcoe, in particular, has been directing the attention of the House to this condition of things. Here are two dredging companies, one assisting the other and both making an effort, of course, to make all the money possible. We find that tenders are ranging between these companies and other companies

from 57 cents to 27 cents, to 9 cents and to 18 cents. Surely that fact is sufficient to warn the hon. gentleman who is the controller of this department against allowing any man or any company to come to him and say : I will do this work at the same price as that which was paid last year. That is not the policy that the people of Canada want to pursue in the year 1908. That is a policy that was discarded years ago. That is a policy that no municipal council in any province of Canada would permit for a moment and yet my hon. friend who is supposed to lead in this respect, to point out how the public works of the country should be constructed and to see that every care is taken to protect the public interest, has assented to a proposal of this kind and has introduced a brand new policy with regard to this dredging work. What will these dredging companies think about it ? They will say: We have a friendly minister. Two tenders may go in for the one work and the same two contractors may tender for another work and they can decide with the approval of the minister which of them shall take one contract and which shall take the other. That is the condition of things in the Department of Public Works now. Are we to understand from the minister that these contracts are let for a term of years and that the government has no power to cancel them ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Which contracts ?

Mr. BLAIN. The contracts for dredging in different parts of Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought I had explained to my hon. friend that these contracts at Midland, Tiffin and Victoria harbours were let to the lowest tenderers after public competition of the widest character, and in the contract it is provided that they shall do this work during the season of 1907 or by such further later date as the Minister of Public Works may determine. Therefore, this is not letting work without competition at all. This is the case with regard to quite a number of contracts. This is nothing new with regard to contracts in the Public Works Department, and it is not at all a new thing for the minister to have to fix a later date for the completion of a work. It has been done ever since confederation I suppose ; done by the late government as well as by this government. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong in suggesting that I am letting this work be done without public competition. I am simply doing what the contract provides may be done. With regard to the dredging at Fort William and Port Arthur which the hon. gentleman included in his figures, in that case I am informed that in the call for tenders for the work at Fort William it was expressly stated that the work was to extend over a number of years.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask whether the government has the power to cancel a contract which extends over a number of years ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the contract with me, but if the hon. gentleman moves for it it will be brought down.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman corrects me when I say that this dredging is to be done without tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Certainly.

Mr. BLAIN. I made no such statement in the sense that the Minister of Public Works seems to take out of it. I know full well that last year or the previous year tenders were invited, and I suppose the lowest tenderer was granted the work, but that is not the point under discussion. What I am calling attention to is the work to be done this year, and I state now in the presence of the minister that he has continued this work for 1908 without public competition. That is my statement. Is it correct or is it not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It does seem to me that it is entirely wrong, because the contract was let by public competition. The prices were obtained by public competition and the contract itself specifies that the work is to be completed either at the close of 1907 or at such later date as the minister may determine. Therefore, the hon. gentleman is entirely wrong in saying that the work is being let without competition. All I am doing is exercising the power which the contract confers upon me to fix a date for the termination of the work.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the need of an order in council ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I felt that I could do it without an order in council, but I also felt that in important matters like this it is desirable that I should go to my colleagues for their approval.

Mr. BLAIN. At page 5985 'Hansard,' 1907, there is a discussion on the question of dredging which I quote :

Mr. BENNETT. Do I understand that contracts have been entered into with Weddell at one place and the Great Lakes Company at another that will run for six years or about $190,000 a year for the two?

Mr. FISHER (Acting Minister). The contract is terminable at any time at the wish of the government. The plan was made for the whole work and the contracts were let for the whole, expecting to occupy about seven years.

Mr. SPROULE. The contract was let on estimated quantities?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. How could the government let a contract covering work for six or seven years when the money has not been voted?

Mr. FISHER. The contract can be terminated at any time.

Mr. SPROULE. But if the contract is let and the money is not voted I take it the con-

tractor would have reasonable ground for claiming damages.

Mr. FISHER. The contract is let subject to the voting of the money in parliament.

Mr. BLAIN. In the session of 1904 a Bill was introduced by the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) relating to these two harbours, and I desired information on that subject and the minister at that time is reported in 'Hansard' as follows:

We are therefore to understand from this citation that the government has power to cancel this contract at any time and the very fact that the minister now asks for an order in council to continue the work for next year is the proof. I say it is wrong for the minister to do any such thing. I believe it will not receive the endorsation of the hon. gentleman's own supporters in the House. The people of Canada will not approve of it, and particularly where the dredging in this department is surrounded by suspicion on every hand. Suspicion is created, for instance, by the fact stated by my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) that one of the inspectors on one of these dredges never went near the dredge at all.

Mr. BENNETT. He swore to that himself.

Mr. BLAIN. The inspector swore to that himself in the Public Accounts Committee; he swore that he had let the work to another and that he stood in the position of a middleman and took the profits and put them in his pockets. Then we have other suspicious things about the dredging, and I therefore repeat that the policy the minister has adopted in allowing the dredging at these points to go on for the summer of 1908 without public competition is a policy that the people of Canada will not endorse. In the face of all these scandals in connection with the expenditure of public money, the people of Canada will be surprised that the Minister of Public Works should say that hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of work should be done without public competition.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I wish to say a few words on this question, because I think we have embarked on a very dangerous principle. I remember some years ago bringing up the question in this House in connection with the expenditure of public money under the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I drew attention to what I regarded as an innovation that would lead to very great abuses and probably great dishonesty if it were continued. The answer I received was that we had a new minister who was adopting a new and up-to-date method. I will ask any one who has given attention to the history of that department and to the report of the commissioners who were appointed to inquire into the civil service if I was not justified in the position I then took. For many years abuses were constantly creeping in, in connection with the expenditure of public money, and parliament in its wisdom thought well to embody what it regarded as the correct principle in a statute, with the view of controlling every minister in the expenditure of public moneys. What does that statute say?

Whenever any works are to be executed under the direction of any department of the government, the minister having charge of such department shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of such works.

That was the correct principle. That was crystallized in a statute for the purpose of controlling ministers of the Crown as well as their subordinates. There were some exceptions provided for; what were they? The first was: 'pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest. Has the minister shown us that in these particular cases there was any pressing emergency? Why, the very order in council was passed before navigation was opened. Had he not time to call for tenders for these works? What kind of cases were intended to be provided for by that exception? Perhaps the breaking of a lock of a canal or the breaking down of some bridge, when there was not time to call for public tenders, and when it would be justifiable to do the work otherwise. Does the minister pretend that there was any pressing emergency in these cases? He tells us what the Grand Trunk is going to do in hauling grain, and what the boats are prepared to do when the locks at Sault Ste. Marie will be deepened. But the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) tells us that these locks could not be deepened for six or seven years. Then what is the great emergency for dredging at Tiffin or Midland or Victoria harbour for the purpose of allowing large vessels drawing 24 or 25 feet of water to come down through the canal? Is there any necessity? Not at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If you build your wharfs and your revetment walls upon land which is dredged to a depth of 22 feet, how can you afterwards dredge to a depth of 25 feet without undermining your works?

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is not so young or so innocent as to think he can put that theory before this House. He knows that he does not require to do that. He presumes on the gullibility of this House to an extent for which I would not give him credit.

Mr. CONMEE. Not at all.

Mr. SPROULE. Now one of the dredgers is to the fore.

Mr. CONMEE. The very thing the minister mentions occurred at the wharf of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Fort William, and they had to rip-rap it to strengthen it according to the increased depth of the

channel. The same thing has to be done to the elevator at Victoria harbour constructed only two years ago.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is confounding two things—dredging and the building of wharfs.

Mr. CONMEE. Not at all. The wharfs at Fort William were built some years ago, the river was afterwards deepened to twenty-two feet, and on account of the extra depth the reinforcement had to take place.

Mr. SPROULE. The work was done before it was contemplated that they would require a greater depth. Dredging is not to build a foundation for a wharf or an elevator.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Must you not dredge for your foundation ?

Mr. SPROULE. The minister has the knowledge in his possession, and if he has to dredge the channel deeper he will have to put the public work to that depth, but in doing that he does not require to do the dredging this year. There is no urgency in that, so that this work does not come under that first exception. What is the next ? 'A work which, from the nature of the work, can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department.' In this case, are the officers and servants of the department doing the work ? Not at all. So it does not come under that. What is the last exception ? 'When the established cost of the work is less than $5,000.' These are the three exceptions, and I draw attention to them, because this case does not come under any one of the three. The minister chooses to ignore that statement. He is a new minister, and he is adopting new methods like the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and if he continues them, we shall find in a short time that they will lead to abuses which will be among the greatest scandals ever brought to light, and I am satisfied that the hon. minister knows it. He is not doing this innocently ; he is too old at the business. His history in the province which he has left is the strongest reason we have for reaching the conclusion that he knows what he is doing, and what it is likely to lead to. When the hon. minister is asked, what do you depend on for the faithfulness of your inspectors, he says, we depend on the government making inquiry in regard to their character and capability. But it was said in the House last session that when the government were told by one of their own supporters that a certain individual was satisfactory with regard to character, capability or anything else the minister is bound to accept it. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) shakes his head. I will show him from 'Hansard' that that was the reply. What did that lead to ? The inspector is appointed and we are told that he goes to the works about eight or nine o'clock in the morning. But the dredge commences work at five o'clock and the inspector, according to the sworn testimony, reported so many cubic yards of stuff dredged out of the harbour, and that is all the government had to depend on. He said that the engineer of the dredge told him the quantity. I drew attention to the fact that they had an inspector going around the hotels, puffing away at twenty-five cent cigars, hour after hour, while the dredge was working, but the certificates came in and the dredge was paid on the strength of this man's certificates. The money of the government has been dishonestly spent in that way without the department having any proper or intelligent knowledge of the work done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Who told the hon. gentleman that ?

Mr. SPROULE. I have it from a man living right in the locality. Some one raises an ironical laugh.

Mr. JOHNSTON. You do not blame them.

Mr. SPROULE. This man is just as honest and just as truthful, and I think a little more so, than the man who raised that laugh. He stands as well in the locality where he has resided for thirty years as the hon. member does in his locality.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Is he dead ?

Mr. SPROULE. More than that it can be verified by not one but many people. I brought it to the notice of the government some years ago and they paid no attention to it.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SPROULE. When you left the chair at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was dealing with a phase of this question which I had about concluded. I have a question to ask the minister, how many contracts that were let last year or the year before are to be extended under the principle that he has explained ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry that I have not a copy of the order ready to-night. As I said to the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) I will lay it on the table to-morrow. But I should say, speaking from memory, some ten or twelve, possibly more.

Mr. BENNETT. All in Ontario ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. They are all cases in which public tenders were called for and the prices fixed by competition.

Mr. HENDERSON. Last year ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. If each of these represents any considerable sum, the aggregate must be a large amount of money. In view of the facts brought out with regard to these tenders—presents to my mind perfectly conclusive—that there was collusion between the tenderers, the attitude which the minister——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) permit me? I do not admit that there was collusion between all the tenderers or any of them. There is no evidence of anything of this kind. It is not contended that there was any collusion with the Dominion Dredging Company which was the lowest tenderer at 30 cents. Another fact which I should mention, but which was not brought out this afternoon is that when the Dominion Dredging Company informed the minister that they could not take the contract at the price of 30 cents the tenderers were invited again to tender on the work and it was reduced to 27 cents.

Mr. BENNETT. Were there public calls for tenders in the newspapers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the tenderers were invited to tender again.

Mr. SPROULE. Did it look as if there was something wrong when one tenderer put in a bid at 56 cents and another at 27 cents and then would not take the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was one tendering at 30 cents who could not take it.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose, in the meantime he had been interviewed by the others and he had come to the conclusion that they could get a good thing if they had an understanding.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that is a very unworthy suspicion.

Mr. BENNETT. No tenders were called for.

Mr. SPROULE. Unworthy of what? Of a public man?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Did not the circumstances justify suspicion?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was not a fact to justify suspicion. There is not a tittle of evidence on which any suggestion could be based that the Dominion Dredging Company did not make their tender bona fide. But, in consequence of having other work they could not take this contract. It has not even been suggested that they were in collusion with the others.

Mr. SPROULE. Did they make their deposit when putting in their tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot say at the moment.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister knows that that is one of the conditions of tendering, that with a tender there must go the deposit. The minister, therefore, had them under his control and could have compelled them to carry out the contract. But he allows them to throw it up for some reason best known to himself, and divide it up with——

Mr. PUGSLEY. And we get it done at 3 cents a yard less.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to tell the minister that I have been too long in this House not to know something about how contracts are given in many lines. I remember a case, some years ago, when three corporations tendered for something in connection with the work of the Department of Justice. The tenders were collusive, but they were all different, and each was accompanied with the required deposit. But when the tender was to be awarded, the lowest tenderer, to whom the contract was to be given, represented that he had made a mistake in his calculations and that he stood to lose a great deal of money if he were compelled to carry out the contract. That is one of the common ways of getting out of these things. The result was that when they came to sign the contract the successful tenderer was in London and the unsuccessful tenderer in Ottawa. When the man in London was notified to sign the contract, he wired back to let so and so sign it—his supposed competitor—that all three were in it together and it did not matter who got it. I had this statement of the facts from the Minister of Justice of that time. He was confronted with this evidence of collusion. And I believe that this had been carried on for two or three times in succession in the same way. It has been shown over and over again in this House that there is collusion amongst tenderers in connection with public works. In the face of that fact I think there is not only suspicion but more than suspicion in this case. It is not enough to say that, because the contract was given at 3 cents a yard less than the original lowest tender, that we are justified in running on that line for several years.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Before the hon. gentleman passes away from that point, will he allow me to ask: Does he suggest that these prices are not as the chief engineer certifies, fair and reasonable?

Mr. SPROULE. That is a question that the minister could not reasonably expect me to answer. But I may tell him, from what I know about the business that it would depend upon the material to be taken out. If it were ordinary sand, gravel or clay, the prices are very big prices. I speak from the knowledge of a man in the business for years, who told me over and over again that in any moderately well-sheltered place, he could take out clay, gravel or sand at 10 cents a yard and make big profits. And the price in this case is 26 cents. I know of offers over and over again to do

this work for less than ten cents, for less than 9 cents, even as low as 8 cents, if the government would give the work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They always have a chance to tender.

Mr. SPROULE. If the stuff is ordinary clay, gravel or sand, as I assume it to be, these parties have a cinch in a contract at 26 cents a yard. It is not enough to say that the engineer certified the price as fair and just. We who have been in the House for any length of time have found, over and over again, that prices which were really two or three prices were certified as fair and just. For instance, we know that teacups were bought for the icebreaker 'Montcalm' at $1.04 apiece, and this price was certified as just and reasonable. Then in the case of the contract of M. P. Davis, on the Cornwall canal, the same certificate was given concerning prices. The Auditor General refused to pay and held up the accounts for over six months. And they took off the difference between $52,000 and $29,000 for the work of that year, and with this reduction the contractor was satisfied to accept payment. The government's own engineer was satisfied that $52,000 for what was done that year was a fair and just price, when the contractor himself accepted $29,000 and was satisfied. So it is not enough to say that because a price is recommended as fair and just, you ought to be satisfied with it. There are other ways of ascertaining what is fair and just. The minister says the contract is a continuous one, and they have a right to expect it to continue. How does he make that out? Let him bring down the contract.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The copy will be down at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. After this debate is over?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I regret I could not get the copy in time for this afternoons debate. I will say to my hon. friend that the items in regard to this very work will all appear, in fact are already in the main estimates, and the matter can be discussed in Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPROULE. That does not make any difference, it is a question of fact. Is it or is it not a continuous contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will tell the hon. gentleman what the words of the contract are, as near as I can remember. They are that the contractor shall do the dredging work required at such a place, say at Victoria harbour, and shall complete the work by the close of the season of 1907, or at such later date as may be fixed by the minister.

Mr. SPROULE. Which is at the end of the fiscal year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, at the close of the season of 1907, or at such later date as may be fixed by the minister.

Mr. SPROULE. Then it lies with the minister to decide whether the contract ends at the end of the fiscal year or not. Does the minister contend that the contract would not end with the end of the fiscal year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. You have to take it as it is.

Mr. SPROULE. I say that the contract closes with the end of the fiscal year. When the fiscal year expires and the money voted has lapsed, that contract closes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman does not seem to understand me. I did not say that the contract closed with the fiscal year, it is the close of the season of 1907 or at such later date as may be fixed by the minister. Those are the words.

Mr. SPROULE. Practically it means the close of the fiscal year, because after winter sets in they cannot do any dredging. Is the minister aware of this fact?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What does the hon. gentleman say is meant by the words 'or at such later date as may be fixed by the minister'?

Mr. SPROULE. That is a sliding clause the minister has put in, I do not think it binds any one. But I will tell him that I have an indistinct remembrance of some such contract let years ago, and because the government saw fit to take that work from the party and put it up for tender again, the contractor held that he had a right to collect damages because the government refused to continue the contract. The contractor asked permission to go into the Exchequer Court to establish the fact that he had a right to have his contract renewed. The government granted him permission, and the Exchequer Court decided that he had not the right, that the contract closed with the close of the fiscal year, and when the money that was voted for the year had lapsed, he had no right to a continuance of that contract. What does the minister say about that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. gentleman tell me what were the words of the contract upon which the contractor relied as entitling him to a continuance? Those words would be extremely important.

Mr. SPROULE. My remembrance is that it was a contract on schedule prices until the work was done. Now they could not do the work all in one year, and he claimed they could not do it in two years, I think he claimed it would take two years to do it, and he was entitled to continue that work until it was done. Therefore I hold his case

was quite as strong as the case under consideration at the present time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Any lawyer knows that everything depends, as to the rights of the contractor, upon the words of the contract; and if the contract was just as the hon. gentleman seems to put it, that the contractor was to do the whole of this work at schedule prices, then I would say as a lawyer without hesitation that he would have a right to do the whole work and be paid for it. But there must have been something in the contract which has escaped the attention of my hon. friend. Perhaps it was provided in the contract that if the appropriation became exhausted the contract might be put an end to. But that would be a very different case from the one we are now discussing.

Mr. SPROULE. I claim that when the appropriation is exhausted this contract ends. Parliament might change its mind, parliament might take up some other work, parliament might change the work altogether, and parliament has a right to end the contracts at the end of the fiscal year, whether the contractor likes it or dislikes it. Therefore the case is on all fours with this one. Now let me draw attention to another feature. Some think we are on the verge of hard times. The price of labour may go down, the price of everything may go down. Suppose that this contract continues. I saw a statement in one of the papers that it would take about six years to finish the work at Port Arthur and the work is being done there on schedule prices. If I understand the Minister of Public Works correctly, it was to the effect that this work would continue under the same contractors from year to year until it was done, at the prices at which they have taken the contract for the last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman entirely misunderstood me. I cannot see how I could have been so unintelligible. I stated this afternoon that in so far as this work at Fort William is concerned it is not a contract from year to year, but it is a contract for the whole work extending over a number of years.

Mr. SPROULE. For the whole work extending over a number of years ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, expressly mentioned in the contract.

Mr. SPROULE. Was there any time mentioned during which it was supposed the work was to continue ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it was supposed that it would continue for six years and that was the statement made by the acting Minister of Public Works, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher).

Mr. SPROULE. In what year was that statement made?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it was the year before last; it was either last year or the year before.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose the hon. gentleman does not know the price at which the contract was let.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the price is quite low.

Mr. SPROULE. How much?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The price at Fort William is 9 cents per cubic yard with an additional allowance of 2 cents per cubic yard based upon the distance at which the mud is carried out beyond a certain limit.

Mr. SPROULE. That contract was made at 9 cents per cubic yard and this one is 26 cents per cubic yard.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is very low.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is reasonable.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The one at Victoria harbour is 8 cents.

Mr. SPROULE. Victoria harbour is 8 cents and the other is 26 cents for the same kind of work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not for the same kind of work.

Mr. SPROULE. I take the Port Arthur contract to be on all fours with the case in which it was held by the Exchequer Court that a contract ended at the end of the fiscal year and that the contract could be abandoned by the government at that time. Let us look at the unwisdom and improvidence of entering into such a contract as this one. This contract is taken at 26 cents a yard. The minister was asked if there was any estimate made as to how much work was to be done there and his reply was that he thought not. Therefore, we do not know how long this work is likely to last. But, suppose it lasts for four, five, six or seven years——

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will not last that long.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, it will last a few years. Suppose that it was taken at a time when wages were very high, suppose that we were right on the verge of hard times when wages would drop 15, 20 or 30 per cent when the cost of supplies and everything else would drop and when work of this kind could be done for perhaps 75 or 80 per cent less than the price which would yield a good profit when the contract was made, in what position would the government find themselves with a contract of this kind on their hands? I will wait until I can get the minister's attention. I want to ask him whether, if I treated him in that way, he would regard it as an act of courtesy? I say that if he had the instincts of a gentleman he would not treat me in this way.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must withdraw that remark.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, I will withdraw those words but I wish that I had some other words that would convey my meaning.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I trust that the hon. gentleman will not again make an exhibition of himself in the manner that he has done this evening.

Mr. SPROULE. I will make such an exhibition as in my judgment seems proper until the hon. gentleman sees fit to treat me with that courtesy which is due from a minister of the Crown to any member of this House who is exercising the right which he has of dealing with these public accounts of a minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like your ruling upon the question as to whether, if a member does not choose all the time to look at the hon. gentleman who is addressing the House, he may be characterized as wanting in courtesy. I heard what the hon. gentleman said although for a moment I turned to speak to my hon. friend on my right (Mr. Carvell). But, that should not justify the hon. gentleman in saying what he did say to me.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it is hardly a point of order. It is a question of taste, I suppose.

Mr. SPROULE. I was saying that provided prices and wages fell the government would find themselves with a contract on their hands that represented hundreds of thousands and even millions of dollars, whereas, had they an opportunity of calling for tenders, they could save a lot of money to the country. I say it is an improvident and unwise contract, and that it will just as surely as we are here to-night lead to improper conduct on the part of somebody. This is one of the devices that the minister has in his own hands which enable him to improperly use public money, and to pay it out to his own favourites in such a way that the government does not get full return for it. The minister is a new man, he has adopted this new system, and I predict that we will live to remind him of what it has led to. The system, in my judgment, is a very bad one. The money which has been spent in a few years with three of these firms reaches the total of $3,700,000. That is a large amount of money.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is this new system that the hon. gentleman speaks about as having been inaugurated by me? It is not a new system. This has been done before in the case of contracts like the present.

Mr. SPROULE. I have not knowledge of it being done since the Act was passed to compel the government to do these works by tender and contract.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, this was put up for tender.

Mr. SPROULE. This was a departure from the statutory law. This sum of $3,700,000 has been paid out to these three firms one of which is doing dredging at 8 cents a yard.

Mr. BENNETT. They are now being paid 9 cents and the contract has been varied from 20, 30 and 40 cents a cubic yard.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, they were getting 30 and 40 cents for the same work that they are doing now for 9 cents. On account of the constant attention that has been given to this question in this House, especially by my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) for sheer shame they were obliged to put this work up to public competition and the contract was given and they are now doing the work for 9 cents a yard for which they were previously getting 23 cents. I will say that the work for which they are getting 26 cents a yard would have been done this year, if tenders had been invited, for 8 cents a yard the same as they are doing it for Victoria harbour.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not the same kind of work.

Mr. SPROULE. And yet the government have denied themselves the opportunity of saving the money of the country. They have paid $3,700,000 in a few years for one class of work and they would go on and pay out that money. Nothwithstanding the fact that many of these contracts may be let at a price three times as great as they should be let at they will allow them to go on from year to year and pay the price regardless of whether the country is getting any return for the outlay or not so long as it happens to suit their convenience. It is wrong, it is improper, it should not be continued and if the minister continues it, just as sure as he is here to-night, we will have an opportunity of reminding him in the future of the abuses that have developed under his administration, we will bring to light transactions similar to those which have been disclosed to-day, we will meet the minister with the argument that is presented to him to-night, and we will show him how improper and illegal is his conduct in making contracts and carrying on public work in this manner.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (Leeds). I want to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) to take a few notes as he has promised us that when his estimates come down he will be able to give us all the information that we want in respect to these contracts. I am informed that last year the department called for tenders for dredging in the province of Quebec. Tenders were invited for dredging at Blanche Shoals and the Stewart Company were the lowest, but they were full of work and could not take the job and it was handed over to Messrs.

T. F. Moore and Company of Montreal, who are a sort of manufacturers agents, something like Merwin and are dealing very largely with the government. The contract was awarded to Moore and Company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At what price ?

Mr. TAYLOR. It is for you to get me that information when the estimates are up.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Were they the lowest tenderers ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Stewart and Company were the lowest but they did not take the job and it was given to Moore and Company.

Mr. SPROULE. What became of their deposits.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Stewart Company were the lowest tenderers for the dredging at Dorion but they had to throw up the job and it was given to L. Cohen & Sons. L. Cohen & Sons are a firm of Jews in Montreal who run the jew vote in the interest of the friends of the government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware that that is any disgrace.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is not, but they are not dredging men.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Were they the lowest tenderers ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Stewart and Company were the lowest in every case but they were so full of other jobs that they could not take these.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What price did Cohen get.

Mr. TAYLOR. It will be for the minister to get that information. At Maskinongé Stewart and Company were the lowest but they were unable to carry out the contract and it was handed over to L. Cohen & Son.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was it at the same price?

Mr. TAYLOR. I know nothing about the price, I want the minister to get that information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will be very glad to.

Mr. TAYLOR. At Point Cavagnole the Stewart Company was the lowest but it was handed over to Cohen & Sons. At Racquette river the Stewart Company was the lowest tenderer but having their hands full of other jobs the work was handed over to Cohen & Sons.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If there was so much money in it one would suppose they would try to carry out the contract.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think there was something in it for somebody but we will deal with that later.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Who got that contract ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Cohen & Sons, this firm of Jews at Montreal.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why do you call them a firm of Jews. Can't Jews do dredging work ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly they can, but they are in a mercantile business and they are not the kind of men that should be given dredging contracts.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am told they have done the dredging work very satisfactorily indeed.

Mr. TAYLOR. At St. Placide, Stewart and Company tendered lowest but the work was handed over to Cohen & Sons. I want to know from the minister what he did with all these deposits of Stewart and Company and why the contracts were allowed to be handed over to other parties. Another piece of information I want from the minister is : Has the contract for the Quebec harbour improvements to Messrs. Dussault & Lemieux been renewed for this year. Has a new contract been entered into with this firm at the same prices as last year's work ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would put that in the form of a question and I will get the answer in the ordinary way.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thought you could answer that now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot keep all these things in my head.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the minister has not extended the contract this year I ask him in the interest of the country not to do so and for this reason. Some of his predecessors in office entered into a contract with Dussault & Lemieux in 1903 or 1904 for harbour improvements at Quebec. The contract given them was number 4163. They did that year $183,000 worth of work. That is what they charged for it, and I want to refer the minister for a moment to some of the charges that were made and will be made this year if this contract is extended. That contract was extended by order in council for 1904-1905 and no new tenders were called for and the government paid that year $224,000. The next contract was 5011 and that was extended by order in council for another year and at the same prices and they earned that year $107,609. Another contract was entered into with them, for the next year (1906-1907) by order in council, and they earned $98,937.40.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I must confess I am somewhat unfamiliar with the rules of this House, but I would ask you, whether, when a gentleman asks permission to move the adjournment for the purpose of discussing a particular matter, is it

open to another hon. member to discuss something entirely foreign to the question. The permission to move the adjournment was given simply to discuss the question of dredging.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is dredging.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Pardon me it is not. This is wharf building. I addressed myself to the question raised by the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) as to the dredging contracts at Victoria and at Tiffin and now the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) is dealing with wharf building at Quebec.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) was as to renewing contracts without tender. Because the minister had informed him yesterday that several contracts were to be renewed. I see in the Dussault contract an item of 18,000 yards of dredging at 75 cents a yard. That contract has been renewed year after year at 75 cents a yard and the person that the contract was given to had no dredge, and he farmed it out at 15 cents a yard and this government is paying year after year 75 cents a yard for it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I see by the terms of the notice given, that it is to discuss tenders for dredging at Midland, Tiffin, Victoria harbour and other points; so that under this notice I can hardly restrict the hon. member.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not object to the hon. gentleman speaking of dredging any where but what he has been speaking of is wharf building at Quebec.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not wonder at the minister wanting to knock me out because this is a delicate question.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all. I am prepared to discuss the question at any proper time, but I have no notice of this and cannot answer my hon. friend to-night.

Mr. TAYLOR. You will have an opportunity when the estimates come down and I want all this information then. These people were paid on a contract that was continued from 1903-1904 and since then they have been paid $614,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. For dredging ?

Mr. TAYLOR. For dredging and works in connection with dredging.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman knows that the great bulk of that was for wharf building.

Mr. TAYLOR. Harbour improvements include dredging. They were paid 75 cents a yard for dredging, and they used the materials dredged for wharf filling, for which they got 32 cents a yard, that is $1.07 a yard for work which they got done for 15 cents a yard. In connection with that work there were 105,000 pounds of iron driftbolts at 7 cents per pound.

Mr. SPEAKER. That obviously does not refer to tenders for dredging. I think the discussion is drifting away from the motion.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, I notify the government that if this tender has not been renewed, and if there is more work to be done there, they should immediately call for public tenders. On that dredging they have been paying 75 cents a yard for the last four years, when they could have got it done for 15 cents, because the party is now doing it for the contractors for that price.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Who is the sub-contractor who is doing it for 15 cents?

Mr. TAYLOR. I want the hon. gentleman to give that information when I ask the question. He knows who it is, or his department knows.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware of it, and I presume the department is not.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister is paying 75 cents a yard for mud dredging at Quebec when he is getting it done at other places for 15 cents. The thing on its face shows that there is something wrong.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend know that there is a vast difference between dredging in the St. Lawrence, where the tides rise and fall, and dredging on the lakes?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, there is some difference, but as the motion for adjournment is made simply to discuss dredging, I will take another opportunity to discuss the prices the government have been paying for supplies. Every time they renewed this contract they might have saved from 50 to 100 per cent on the prices.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N. B.). Mr. Speaker, when this matter came up I was somewhat at a loss to understand the object the hon. member for East Simcoe had, and I am not entirely clear about it yet. I may say that there have been a number of dredging contracts discussed in the Public Accounts Committee and evidence has been given in some of these cases, but, as I am not allowed under the rules of the House to discuss them, I will not transgress by attempting to state what the evidence shows. Suffice it to say, that in my humble opinion the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has gained very little satisfaction from the evidence that has been adduced in that committee, and it seems to me that he is now attempting to get before the country certain matters before they are brought out under oath in the Public Accounts Committee. If we can believe the statements we have heard this afternoon on both sides

of the House, we must come to the conclusion that had the hon. member for East Simcoe had his way, and stated everything he wanted to state, his story would have been very different from what the story actually is. We were led this afternoon to believe that a new contract had been entered into by the Minister of Public Works for dredging at Midland, Tiffin and Victoria harbour. Now, the facts are, that something like a year ago tenders were called by the then acting Minister of Public Works for dredging at these three places. The hon. member for East Simcoe has attempted to show that a great wrong has been done to the country because two of the tenders put in by presumably rival firms where in the handwriting of a gentleman who has the misfortune to be a relative of a member of parliament on this side of the House, and the hon. member for East Simcoe, with characteristic audacity, draws the inference that there must be something crooked in the transaction, but my hon. friend did not tell the House what he might have known from an examination of the documents—what he did know. My hon. friend, in the first place, went through a lot of cheap gymnastics in daring the government to bring down the papers and lay them on the table of the House in order that the members might have a chance to examine them. Does he not know that he and every member of the Public Accounts Committee and every member of this House has had a chance to examine those papers during the last two months? I think I am not trespassing on the rules of debate when I say that the hon. gentleman made that statement with the deliberate intention of making the people of this country believe that this government were trying to conceal from the public something which they had a right to see, although he knew that there was no attempt to conceal anything. He was asking the government to do something which they could not do. He knows that these papers are in the custody of the Public Accounts Committee. This House, which places those papers in the custody of the Public Accounts Committee, has the power to take them from the custody of that committee, if a motion is made to that effect, but what right has the Minister of Public Works any more than the hon. member for East Simcoe to say to the clerk of the committee, you will bring these papers down here and hand them over to a messenger and have them laid on the table of this House? It is simply a cheap way of insinuating that the government has been trying to keep from the House and the country certain papers which they were entitled to have. If those papers had been examined by the Public Accounts Committee and evidence had been adduced, then I am forced to the conclusion from what I have learned here this afternoon that the hon. member for East Simcoe himself knows that he would not have got from them anything like the evidence that he has attempted to place on the records of the House this afternoon. What would those papers show? I gather, from the statements made by the minister, who has not had an opportunity of examining the papers, and from the admissions of the hon. member for East Simcoe and other members on the other side of the House, that they would show that about a year ago tenders were called for this work; and I hope hon. members of this House and the people of this country will not forget that those tenders were open to the whole world. They were not confined to two or three dredging firms that happened to be in Owen Sound, and I have a very shrewd suspicion that perhaps one of the objects of the hon. member for East Simcoe is to get a rap at a gentleman who lives in Owen Sound and is a member of one of those dredging companies. There is an election coming on in the province of Ontario before very long, and a certain gentleman who lives near Owen Sound may play a prominent part in those elections, and I think the hon. member for East Simcoe had that fact in mind. However, tenders were put in by two rival companies at 53 cents and 57 cents respectively, and my hon. friend wants the people of this country to believe that because those tenders were in the same handwriting there was collusion. He says, what greater evidence of fraud do you want than that? Now, I am willing to admit that if those tenders were not open to the public, and those two firms alone had been invited to tender and had put their heads together to keep up the price, that would be evidence of fraud. But when the work is open to the whole world, I fail to see evidence of an offence against either moral law or the legal rights of any one in the fact that those two firms put their heads together to get as good a price as possible. The best proof of that statement is what took place in this very case. These two companies put in their tenders, and they were pretty high tenders, I should imagine. At the same time a third man came in and tendered at a little more than one half the price, 30 cents. The very fact that the third man came in and cut the price down shows that there is no harm in the action of the other two, because they were liable to have another tenderer come in. The Dominion Dredging Company received the contract at 30 cents, but found that they were not able to do the work. It was hinted this afternoon by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that there must have been a nigger in the wood pile somewhere. Why these hon. gentlemen can see graft in everything that takes place.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear, that is about right.

Mr. CARVELL. I sometimes wonder if they are going back in their minds to what

took place when they were in power. I cannot imagine people seeing something crooked in everything that takes place unless they were of a crooked mind. They must have been used to crooked transactions when they were running the government and therefore think that every one else does the same. I am afraid that this will be the case if ever this country should be so unfortunate as to again have them in control of the government. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says : I have been at this business so long that I know how these things are being done. Yes, he does, there is not a man on the front bench of the opposition who does not know how such things are done, they can go back in their minds to the old Connolly and McGreevy transactions. They are pastmasters in the art of manipulating tenders and contracts. There is nothing they cannot tell about in that line, and they have an idea that no matter what takes place on a government contract, whether by private contract or by public tender, there must be something crooked about it. The insinuation was thrown out this afternoon that because the Dominion Dredging Company were unable to carry out their contract at 30 cents and threw it up, there was graft in that somewhere and a scheme put up between these people by which the country was to lose money. What are the facts? The government did not go to the next lowest tenderer and offer the work at 53 cents but according to the statement of the minister this afternoon they sent out telegrams to every one who had tendered: these people came in and the country gets the work done at 27 cents instead of 30 cents. Is there anything wrong in that ?

Mr. TAYLOR. It is worth 9 cents.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend says it is worth 9 cents. That is why I say it is absolutely unfair, worse than unfair to bring up a discussion of this kind under the present circumstances. The hon. member from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) brings this up before we have had a chance to examine witnesses or to ascertain the character of the work, whether it is worth 8 cents as the work at Victoria Harbour, or 26 cents or 27 cents here. In view of that I am forced to the conclusion that the hon. member for East Simcoe brought this matter up in order to spread these statements broadcast over the country before witnesses could be examined on the case, and I believe if my hon. friend had been allowed to have these statements go to the country unanswered, you would never have heard of a witness being called before the Public Accounts Committee to get at the exact facts of the case. Now I presume they will have to go on with it.

These contracts were let at 26 and 27 cents instead of 30 cents, and in every move of the Public Works Department in this case the public interests were safeguarded and the price has been constantly lowered. My hon. friend, in the next place, raised the cry that the Minister of Public Works has let this contract without tender and that it is a new contract. The member for East Simcoe had no hesitation in saying that this is a new contract. The member for Peel (Mr. Blain) this afternoon would not take the word of the Minister of Public Works when he told him over and over again that it was not a new contract. I do not think the member for Peel (Mr. Blain) is so obtuse that he could not understand the Minister of Public Works. I give him credit for having ordinary abilities, his hearing is good so far as I know, and I am satisfied he must have understood the Minister of Public Works. Yet he would not take his statement and went on declaring it was a new contract. The member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) this afternoon took the same course and when driven into a corner he dragged up from his memory some old contract when he and his friends were in power and tried to argue that it was a parallel case. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) has told this House repeatedly this afternoon that contracts were let last year for the work at Victoria harbour, at Midland and at Tiffin, and that there was a clause in these contracts providing that they were to be completed before the end of navigation in 1907 or at such later date as the minister should decide. All the minister has done in this case is to carry out the terms of this contract. All he has done is by an order in council to provide another date when this work shall be completed, and, Sir, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who brought up this matter if they can see any reasons why the government should hope to get a lower tender for this particular class of work if they had put it up this year than they were able to secure last year.

There is another thing. When this work is well under way and the firm have their dredges and scows and plant at the location, surely they can go on and do the work cheaper than it could have been done if they were driven out, new tenders called for, and a new contract given to a new firm. I submit that under these conditions you would not get a new firm to go in there and do the work as cheaply as it is being done at the present time, certainly not cheaper. For these reasons it seems to me that the Minister of Public Works is amply justified in taking the course he has taken. I am satisfied the House and the country will justify the ministers in that course, and that the member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) will not be able to make the people of Canada believe that a new contract has been let by the Minister of Public Works without tender; they will realize that it was simply a continuation of the contract let last year and simply carrying out the terms of that contract, that under the conditions of the contract the public are getting this work done as cheaply as it could possibly be done

and that not only the terms but the letter of the law and the contract have been carried out to the full.

Mr. JAMES CONMEE (Rainy River). It will, I think, be generally admitted that it is quite the proper thing for the opposition to criticise public expenditures. I for one have never any objection to anything like a fair criticism, but I submit that such criticism as has been offered this afternoon, is entirely unfair and unjustified and I do not think that any good purpose can be served by gross misrepresentations—if I may use the word slander. I believe that a great deal of the discussion this afternoon is largely composed of misrepresentations and slander. As I understand the situation it is not a question of new contract, it is a question of properly dealing with a contract that had been let under special conditions. What were the conditions ? That a certain class of work should be done within a certain time and that it might be done within this time or at such later time as the minister would fix for the completion. I submit that any contractor taking the work would base his tender upon that clause of the contract and say: If it is not possible for me to do it with all reasonable effort within the time specified in the contract, I am in the hands of the minister of the Crown, and I expect such treatment as a subject ought to expect from the Crown, no undue advantage will be taken of me but I will be given a reasonable opportunity to carry that work to completion.

The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) this afternoon stated that this work was done on a very different basis from dredging anywhere else in America, that scow measurement was something that ought not to be tolerated, and this work was being done without proper measurement and on the mere certificate of the inspector who watched the loading of the scow where the dredge was operated. I am surprised at the hon. member making that statement because he has been Minister of Railways. He made the further statement that the measurement of dredging excavation was a matter that could be measured just as a railway contract could be measured and that it was always measured in place in every other country but Canada. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. I venture to say that, generally speaking, dredging in the United States is done by scow measurement, and done in that way after the government of that country had had experience in place measurement. And why ? Because a greater amount of mismeasurement—or, if you like a stronger word, of fraud,—existed under that system than under the present system. And that is why they adopted the scow measurement. All the dredging done in this country, so far as I know, is done upon plans and cross sections showing the depth of water, the area to be dredged, and the class of material, so far as the engineers can test it by borings and otherwise. And what does the contractor tender for ? He tenders to do a certain amount of dredging for a certain price within a limited time within the area shown by the plans. And usually, it is by scow measurement. Why ? A good deal of work can be done by place measurement, solid rock for instance, or excavation that is above or near the surface can be done by place measurement. But the case is altogether different if the work is at the bottom of a harbour. To get the measurements you have to send down divers, and the contractor has to send down divers to see that he gets fair play. And you cannot leave the work for more than two weeks or a month because there is a constant washing in of material. Prices would be one-half or one-third higher if the measurements were not taken as the excavation is made. I do not suppose there is a harbour being dredged in this country where there is not material of a more or less silty nature. In many places it partakes of the nature of quicksand or clay that will fill in in twenty-four hours and take away one quarter of the measurement that the contractor might fairly claim. I do not say that that appertains generally but it does appertain in some cases. Therefore, it is easy to see the enormous difficulty that surrounds this question of fair measurement and why frequent measurements would be necessary if full measurement is to be given for the actual quantity taken out. If you are measuring in place, everything depends on who holds the tape. And it is the diver who holds it. You cannot estimate the amount of dredging in any other way. That is the reason for favouring scow measurement both from the point of view of the government and from the point of view of the contractor. The best evidence of this is that if you take the work done by railway companies and harbour companies, where they pay not out of government funds but out of their own funds, they usually do it in that way. It is not a practical thing to do it otherwise. I need not dwell upon that feature of the case, because any one who will consider the difficulties of the case will see the reasonableness of scow measurement. Is there any great chance for fraud in scow measurement ? I am bound to say that there are cases where work is done by place measurement. I know of a case on the American side near the Soo, where a large quantity of dredging had to be done. But why was place measurement adopted ? Because it was a new channel, and nearly the whole area was through where the water was to run for the first time and the work was practically in plain sight. There is no contractor who would not prefer place measurement in excavating if he could get it. A contractor

never gets better fair play than when he has the work where he has an opportunity to see by his own assistants that he gets paid for what he does actually move. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says this is a new policy which comes to us from the east. Well, the wise men are said to have come from the east. But I must say, at the same time, this is not a new policy. The same criticism was levelled by the hon. member for East Simcoe and some other hon. members on that side in 1904 against the Minister of Public Works of that time and on pretty much the same ground, concerning work at Port Arthur and Fort William what they alleged was let without tender upon much the same ground as in this case. The minister of that time decided that as the work had been let under terms of competition in the first instance, and as the work was in part for bringing the harbour down to a certain depth and making slips in new places to the harbour line where elevators and other constructions had gone up in the meantime, this was a class of work for which he could not well get a tender. The work was done, not at the price of 33 cents, as the hon. member said, nor at 23 cents. But the basis of the contract as a whole was 15 cents, not 33 cents. The hon. member for East Grey must have a very short memory, because within the last year I went over this whole matter in detail. I had before me the return brought down to this House and I gave the facts in the case, and they were these : that fully 75 per cent of the entire yardage was on the basis of the contract price, 15 cents, and that the only case in which higher prices were paid was in the case I referred to—where there was the removing of an old structure such as a dock, and the making of certain slips into the harbour line, in order to facilitate the transportation of grain from that particular harbour. Now it is not fair to revive these statements which are without foundation in fact, which have been over and over again contradicted. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) made these statements this afternoon. He has no facts, he never did have facts, and cannot produce a single fact to warrant that statement. I think perhaps the hon. gentleman should not have made that statement.

Now, let me say a word with regard to the question that has been raised this afternoon, that of deepening the harbour. The hon. member for Grey says that there is no emergency, no hurry, no occasion for the government to move to deepen the harbour. I would recommend the hon. member to inform himself. Let him inquire from his own friends, I will give him the name of one of his own friends in the town of Port Arthur, a good Conservative, Mr. J. J. O'Connor. He is shipping agent for the elevators at that point, and he told me only a short time ago that for many years they have been under a great disability in the harbours of Port Hope, Port Arthur and Fort William, for the reason that they could not get the same charter prices that the shipper from Duluth got, and that even last year they were at a disadvantage of from one-eighth to one-quarter of a cent per bushel ; they had to pay that much more than the man at Duluth would have to pay for shipping his grain to Buffalo or New York.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member entirely misunderstood me. I did not speak of Port Arthur at all, I was speaking of Victoria or Midland, and showing that there was no great urgency to give a contract now to provide for ships that would draw a much greater draught of water than they do now, because they could not get through the Sault Ste. Marie canal until it was deepened there, and that would take some years.

Mr. COMMEE. He did say that, and he said more. Let me inform the hon. gentleman that I am advised on good authority that the Sault Ste. Marie canal will have a depth of 24½ feet and will be completed inside of two years. It is only a few months ago that I was discussing that question with an engineer employed on that canal, and he told me that he had prepared plans and submitted them, to deepen the water to 25 feet, and he felt quite confident that the canal when it was completed would have a depth of 25 feet. But I am pointing out what our difficulty has been for the last four or five years. I am sure he will find that all our Canadian shippers of grain find that all our Canadian shippers of grain through Canadian channels have been placed at a disadvantage of a quarter of a a cent a bushel up to last year. There was some slight decrease within the last few years because of the further improvement of the harbours of Port Arthur and Fort William. But we are still at a great disadvantage. You cannot charter a vessel and get the same prices as the American shipper. There is another disadvantage which militates against the Canadian shipper of grain which is mostly as bad, and it is this : If he wires for a charter for a cargo his offer will not be taken if the vessel owner can get a cargo from either Superior or Duluth. The American boat will go to the port where they have 25 feet of water today, and where they have had it for some time. The Americans have spent $5,000,000 on the harbour at Duluth. The minister has told us here to-day, and I am glad to hear it, that if Canadian shippers of grain are to be put upon equal footing with the American shippers of grain or other products they should have the same facilities, the same advantages in our harbour that the Americans have on their side of the line. Now I submit that we cannot have all these

things at once. Even if the hon. member's statement was true that the American canal would not be completed for four or five years, that would not diminish the urgency or change the responsibility of the government to relieve the Canadian shipper of the disadvantages under which he is placed to-day. There is a little more than the question of the depth of water in the new American lock. On our side to-day we have 21 feet of water on the mitre sill. Our harbours ought to be put in a state to enable us to enjoy the advantages of our own canal at the Soo, but they are not. Now, hon. gentleman will find when they discuss the subject with captains or gentlemen acquainted with navigation, that they cannot navigate a vessel drawing 21 feet of water in either one of those harbours. They can get her through with a tug, and that is a consideration. But she cannot go under her own steam into those harbours if she is drawing 21 feet of water, because that class of vessel must have more than one foot of water under her keel in order to steer her own machinery. She could not lay at anchor in our harbours, even if she did get into them as she would pound on the bottom. She cannot take part of her cargo at one elevator and the rest at another, as is often done, to take a certain grade of wheat. It has to be taken from a certain class of grain and from more than one elevator. They have frequently to go to more elevators to finish their load. Now in the harbour of Superior or Duluth they can go drawing two feet, perhaps more, of water, and they do not need to trim, and that makes a great difference in the cost. So all these things militate against the Canadian shipper and place him at a disadvantage from which this government should relieve him at the very earliest possible moment. It is important that the government should take the ground that all work from this date should be done on the new basis. The hon. gentleman knows that to cut out two or three feet from the bottom will be a very costly undertaking. The prices will be very much higher, and if we are to be ready within two, or three, or four years to meet the traffic up and down on the same footing as the American shipper, why. Sir, we ought to get to work at the earliest possible moment. There ought to be no hesitation in undertaking a work so meritorious in the public interest.

I am not going to discuss the resolution itself, that has been done by others. But I will point out that there are cases where it is in the public interest that contracts of this nature should be treated just as this contract has been treated. Let me say here that it is a mistaken policy to undertake to ask tenders for this class of work every year. It is a policy that entails largely increased cost. Let me give a case in point.

Mr. CONMEE.

In 1904, the Minister of Railway and Canals asked for tenders, to be closed on April 15. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) raised some objection. He thought that it was going to be an advantage to some dredging company on account of navigation being closed and he asked that the time be extended. I have heard the statement and I have seen it in the Conservative press that the minister resisted the request for an extension of time. It is not true. The minister did not resist an extension of time. He said very plainly that no objection had been made, he consented at once to make a change and he did make the change. The hon. member for East Simcoe and, I think, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) this evening said that the price of dredging had been brought down by reason of this action. I took occasion last year to make some remarks on this subject and these will be found in 'Hansard.' I went into the matter fully in detail and explained how this reduction in the cost of dredging occurred. Hon. gentlemen opposite have claimed that it was due to the extension of the time from April 15 to first of May. I want to ask if any hon. gentleman thinks than any condition of ice in the harbour of Fort William or Port Arthur between these dates would make any difference to a contractor. The contractor does not tender because there is ice in the horbour or because there is no ice in the harbour. He tenders upon the estimates, plans and representations as to the character of the work and specifications of the engineer, which he submitted to him in that regard. The hon. member for East Simcoe in a speech last year stated that the opposition kept hammering away at the minister and that the result was that the new companies came to the front and that the Weddell Dredging Company brought down the price. I heard the hon. gentleman make the assertion that he had never made a statement in connection with dredging that was not founded on fact. That assertion is absolutely wrong. There was not a word of truth in his statement as to the cause that had brought down the price of dredging. The Weddell Dredging Company did not tender in that year in which the extension of time was asked for. I could go on and show that of the statements which this hon. gentleman made 90 or 95 per cent were absolutely without any foundation whatever. To use the words of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) they were reeking with falsehood. But, I am not going to dwell upon this subject. If you strip it of the misrepresentation and slander which has been levelled at the government in connection with these contracts there will be nothing to find fault with. The work which was done in 1904 was open to public competition. The prices in 1904 were actually higher on the average than in 1903. What did bring down the

price? I have made that matter plain. I will make a statement again because I think it might very well be impressed upon the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite and I hope they will retain it in their memory this time. The work that was being done in 1903-4 was redredging, in a very large measure, a portion of the harbour that had been dredged years before, bringing it down to a uniform level, including some widening, which, of course, would be fairly good excavating. It involved a haul of over twelve miles in some cases and would any reasonable man say that class of work could be done for the same figure that you could do work in a heavy cutting where there was a face twenty or more feet or even twelve feet in extent and where there was not half the distance to haul ? That was the condition at Fort William. The work that is being done there now is being done altogether in another harbour, you may say. The river divides itself into three branches about two miles from the point where it empties into the bay. On the west branch is the Canadian Pacific Railway terminal, on the mission or southern branch is the Grand Trunk Pacific terminal. This is the harbour in which the work is being done for 9 cents a yard and it is a different class of work altogether. That is one of the cases that brought down the price. It is dredging largely in sand, silt, boulders and clay. I will give hon. gentlemen some further reasons for the reduction in the price.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nine cents does not include boulders.

Mr. CONMEE. I think there is a higher price for boulders and solid rock. The contract provides that solid rock shall be paid for by measurement in situ. There is some solid rock in the harbour I do not know that any of it has been excavated. I will just refer for a moment to what really brought down this price, or influenced it very greatly. In 1904, tenders were asked for and the hon. member for East Simcoe claims that his objection and action caused the extension of time that resulted in bringing down the price and I am going to give a stronger reason. In discussing this question in 1904, the then Minister of Public Works said that :

The tenders that are invited are simply for the present season's work.

I recognize that there is a very large amount of work to be done at Port Arthur. I hope that the officers of the department will be able to make a thorough survey of the whole work there, allowing time to advertise for tenders for work extending over two or three years, in which case there is no doubt that the cost of the work could be materially decreased for the reason that proper and up to date plant could then be supplied. At the present time the plants that are being used are not of the latest type of dredging plants. The dredging that has been called for is for the present season's work, but I understand that before we reach another season the department will ask for tenders for a more extensive work and giving sufficient length of time to enable those tendering for the work to provide plant to do it at the least possible cost.

That is the measure that brought down the price. Let me point out that to successfully compete for work of this kind involving many millions would necessitate the securing of a plant of very large dimensions costing in the neighbourhood of half a million dollars. Is it reasonable to suppose that any contractor would undertake to make that expenditure for a single season's work of five and a half months and run the risk of being cut out at the end of the season. The present method of letting a contract for a period of years covering a certain area within this harbour is the reason that the price has been brought down, and the reason is not that which hon. gentlemen opposite have undertaken to assign to it. When I was listening this afternoon to the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) telling us that there should be no nepotism and no favouritism, and that public matters should be transacted above suspicion, I must say that I quite agree with him, but what surprised me was that such professions should come from a member of the late Conservative government which was not only corrupt speaking generally, and which not only had a number of grafters around it, but was rotten at the very head. We have the word of one of its own members that it was a nest of traitors, and the hon. member (Mr. Haggart) was one of the nest. He was one of the gentlemen who condoned all the wrong-doing of the late government previous to 1896, when the people of Canada turned them from power. And yet he gets up this afternoon and administers to this side of the House a lecture on political morality. Well, we are justified in taking that kind of criticism with a regard to the source whence it comes. Now, Sir, we have the member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) who very frequently brings up this subject and I see he is not in his seat just now. But let me remind the House that last year when he thought he was attacked he retorted on those who accused him that they should remember that he had those who were near and dear to him. Does the member extend this principle to others, does he regard the feelings of others ?

Mr. LAKE. Mr. Speaker, is this matter germane to the question under discussion ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I am inclined to think it is not. I do not think this is pertinent to the question before the House.

Mr. CONMEE. What is the point of order ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The point of order is that the remarks the hon. gentleman is making are not relevant to the question before the House.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. gentlemen opposite have been all the afternoon violating the rules of this House, and I don't propose to violate any rule of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member is making a statement that is hardly a fact, when he says that hon. members have been violating the rules of the House all this afternoon.

Mr. CONMEE. Well I will put it this way: In my judgment these hon. gentlemen have been violating the rules of the House in a much greater measure than will any words that shall fall from me. I wish to express my wonder that this hon. gentleman above all others should deal with subjects of this kind. If there is an hon. member of this House who should be silent when there is a question of integrity or a question of the general character of the administration of public affairs to be considered it is that hon. member. Why, Sir, that hon. member comes here stamped by the courts of this country as a slanderer. I think his measure has been fairly well taken here but I think the people of this country have a right to know what is the character of the man who made the charge this afternoon. He has accused the minister of using the public funds for his friends. That is not a statement which should be made by any member of this House without any evidence whatever. Not only has this gentleman been stamped by the courts of this country as a slanderer of his fellow man, but, Sir, he is a self-confessed briber; here are his words: I know you Wilson, I bought your vote before and I can do it again.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Speaker, is this to the point?

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member is using this as an illustration as to why the statements of the member for Simcoe are to be considered by the House in a particular way I suppose I can hardly interfere. In the first instance when the point of order was taken against the hon. member he was not directing his remarks in that way, but more recently he has been doing so. I do not think I can interfere in that.

Mr. LAKE. Is 'slanderer' a parliamentary expression?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not. The term 'slanderer' is not a term that can be used in parliament towards an hon. member.

Mr. CONMEE. The people of the country will realize the character of the man who brings up these charges, and so far as I know he has never been able to adduce a solitary piece of evidence in support of them. All he has to rely on is the mere fact that one officer misunderstood his duties and did absolutely wrong in employing somebody else to take up his work for him. Then the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) who is usually fairer and from whom I would expect something better, both he and the hon. member for Grey characterized the transaction in language which they should not have used. The minister told us this afternoon that that one individual was dismissed as soon as his offence was discovered, and why should the minister and why should a public department, and why should all the inspectors from one end of the Dominion to the other be placed under suspicion because of that one man's failure. That is not fair criticism. It is surprising to me that hon. members with the record of those gentlemen opposite should be quite so flippant with these charges. I know that two wrongs don't make a right. I know that if the Conservative government did things wrong we are not justified in following their example. But I do say that the gentlemen who composed that government and who surrounded it with their support and who endorsed its wrongdoing and maladministration are not the men to lecture us on political morality. There was a provision in these contracts that the minister should have power to extend the time for their completion if in his judgment that should be done, and that is all the Minister of Public Works has done in this case. It is perfectly legitimate and perfectly fair for the minister to do that. But what did these gentlemen opposite do in connection with section 16, the Whitehead contract, or in connection with the Soo contract. I think the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) was then a member of the government, or if not he was very close to them, and what did they do. The records of the House show that to hold his contract Whitehead had to give Mr. Mackintosh then a supporter of the Conservative government some $28,000. That was boodling, and hon. gentlemen opposite have not got over it yet. They know they were wrong and they know they did that sort of thing. I have heard them ask what punishment was meted out to the dredge inspector. Well what punishment was meted out to Mr. Mackintosh. Why, he was honoured, he was made lieutenant governor of the Northwest Territorities by our Conservative friends. And what did they do at Sault Ste. Marie. Well, they did a great deal more than to extend the contract by order in council, they gave the contract at a price $150,000 more than the second tender; and they increased the price by half a million dollars by order in council on the grounds of emergency. They wanted it done quick, and their friends got an enhanced price for doing it, as it was claimed, within shorter period. If I wanted to take up the time of the House I could show that there was more than half a million dollars graft or whatever you like to call it. I do not call it so, but if gentlemen on the opposite side of the House call that sort of

thing graft, then more than half a million dollars went to the contractors more than ought to have gone to them in that particular case. And these are the gentlemen who are criticising the government in a most extreme way this afternoon and such language is used as: Favourites here and favourites there, and public money used for friends of the government; and without any evidence at all to back it up. I know that these gentlemen opposite may say that they are not responsible for what the previous government did, but I would like to know if they imagine that the people of this country believe that their honesty during the past ten years is because of their repentance. Not a bit of it. It is because they did not have the opportunity. They lost the key in 1896 and they have had no opportunity since. I don't think the people of this country are going to put back into power gentlemen with the record of the front benchers of the opposition. I do not refer to all the front benchers but to certain of them. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion the people of this country are too intelligent, and I believe when they come to understand the misrepresentations that have been made and the gentlemen from whom they have come, the party now in power need not fear the issue whenever it comes.

Mr. ROBERT STEWART (Ottawa). I desire to say a word or two before this debate closes because of some statements which were made by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and in the course of which I am sorry to say he endeavoured wilfully to mislead the House. The hon. gentleman held in his hand a statement from which he purported to read a list of tenders for dredging contracts during the last year and he repeatedly called out the name of the Stewart Company. There is no such company as the Stewart Company and nobody knows that better than the member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and the member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) who also used the expression. But, it would appear that these hon. gentlemen wished to endeavour by insinuation or by any other means to cause it to be believed that supporters of the government are endeavouring to make money wrongfully. As the hon. member for East Simcoe has been good enough to use my name repeatedly in this connection, I want to say to the members of this House that I have no interest whatever in the Dominion Dredging Company, that I never had any interest in the Dominion Dredging Company to the extent of one farthing, that my influence as a member of parliament has never been used on behalf of the Dominion Dredging Company, that I have never spoken to the Minister of Public Works or to any other minister or to an official of the Public Works Department, or to any official of any other department regarding the business or the tenders of the Dominion Dredging Company. I want to make that statement clear so that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House may have no wrong impression about the matter. I am afraid that some members on the opposite side are too apt to measure others by what they would likely do themselves if they were placed in similar circumstances, when no doubt their influence would be exercised on behalf of those in whom they might be interested. I do not know that I need say any more on this question. I do not know that it is any crime that the Dominion Dredging Company should tender in competition with other firms for work under this government or any other government. I happen to have a son who is a member of that company, and I do not know that that is any crime either. My son in that firm is only one of a number of honourable men in connection with it; men just as honourable, if not more so than those gentlemen on the opposite side of the House who have thought fit to refer to this matter on several occasions. Further I have nothing to say.

But I would like to ask while on my feet why it is that when a number of companies containing some very active friends of the opposition in this House are tendering every year for similar work, only those composed of men who are suspected of being supporters of this government are singled out for attack in this way. There are other dredging contractors, one of them a Conservative candidate for this House. Why is it that we never hear these men accused of doing anything dishonest in securing contracts, or attempting to secure them at higher prices than they should get? It seems strange to me, sitting in this House and listening to the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, that two or three companies should be singled out and referred to as if they were dishonest. I want to ask these hon. gentlemen who have mentioned the name of the Dominion Dredging Company, to state where that company ever got a contract from this government or from any other government that was not put up to public competition. I know very little about the business of that company. I happened to be in England last year when they received their contract, so that it cannot be said that I used my influence in that case on their behalf. It cannot be said truthfully that I ever used my influence on behalf of that company. Is it fair for hon. gentlemen opposite to be continually attacking a company because a son of a member of this House happens to be a member of it? I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to point to any dishonest act ever committed by that company, or to any contract they ever received for which their price was not the lowest. That company have never received any favour at the hands of the Minister of

Public Works. I make this statement to show how little ground there is for the assertions continually made by hon. gentlemen opposite in this regard. Perhaps I should not be surprised at the statements of the hon. member for East Simcoe, because we all know his record ; but I remember several years ago, when I was a young member of this House, and questions of this kind were being discussed, the hon. member for East Simcoe contended very strongly that the policy of the Minister of Public Works in asking for tenders was wrong. That policy was that Canadians should do work for Canadians, and that no tender would be received from any tenderer who had not a dredge registered in this country previous to the calling for tenders. The idea expressed by the hon. member for East Simcoe at that time was that in order that there should be the fullest competition tenders should be invited from our neighbours to the south. I can imagine what an outcry would be made by the hon. member for Leeds and the hon. member for East Simcoe if any hon. gentleman on this side of the House made such a suggestion as that. If the hon. member for East Simcoe was correct on that occasion, it ill becomes him, in this House and on public platforms in this city, to make attacks upon myself and upon members of the Dominion Dredging Company. I have nothing further to say. I desired simply to put myself right before the members of this House. I have been slow to speak on this question. I am anxious to retain the good will and the good feeling of members of both sides of the House, but when I hear hon. gentlemen speaking as the hon. member for Leeds and the hon. member for East Simcoe both spoke this afternoon repeatedly about the Stewart Company when they knew perfectly well that there was no such company as the Stewart Company, I felt it my duty to make this explanation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Might I have the permission of hon. gentleman leading the opposition and of the House to refer very briefly to the question of the cost of dredging ?

Mr. BERGERON. It can be brought up in Supply.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be very brief.

Mr. SPEAKER. It can only be with the permission of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only with the permission of the House. The hon. gentleman who is leading the opposition will remember that when I asked him whether 8 cents at Victoria harbour, 26 cents at Tiffin and 27 cents at Midland were not reasonable prices, he stated that in his judgment 26 cents was very excessive. I want to point to the figures given on pages 194 and 195 of the report of the Minister of Public Works for the year 1907, of the actual cost of operation of dredges which are owned by the government, and which figures do not include anything for interest upon the cost of the dredges or any allowance for depreciation, but represents simply the cost of operation, wages, fuel and the ordinary cost of repairs. Taking the whole period from 1872 down to 1906, the lowest figure is 18·31 cents per cubic yard and the highest is 35 cents per cubic yard. The average is 25·41 cents per cubic yard, and that, as I have said, does not include any allowance for interest or depreciation or renewals. From 1895 the prices of dredging by the government owned dredges were as follows :

Dredge.	Per cubic yard.
'St. Lawrence'	25·35
'Canada'	31·34
'New Dominion'	17:47
'Prince Edward'	26·53
'(Old) Cape Breton	25·99
'Geo. McKenzie'	41·66
'Cape Breton'	16·58
'New Brunswick'	21·82
'W. S. Fielding'	19·12
'Montague'	.....

Mr. SPROULE. I was speaking of clay, gravel and sand. This covers a great many other materials as well.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is true, but in a great many of these cases it is material such as this. I have here a statement of work done in my own province, on the St. John river, where there is very little rise and fall of the tide and where the material is, I should suppose, very similar to that in these harbours on the Georgian bay. The cost there ran up to something like 40 cents and at Evendale it ran up to 51·72 cents. That shows that I was quite justified in taking the opinions of the chief engineer of my department that these prices of 26 cents, 27 cents and 8 cents per cubic yard were fair and reasonable prices.

Mr. SPROULE. We will have an opportunity again of going into that.

Motion (Mr. Bennett) to adjourn, negatived.

SUPPLY—IMMIGRATION.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding : 'That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply,' and the proposed amendment of Mr. Monk thereto.

Mr. ALPHONSE VERVILLE (Maisonneuve). Mr. Speaker, I expected to commence the discussion of this question at the opening of the sitting this afternoon and it seems to me that when a member intends to bring up any other matter than the subject before the House, as has been done to-day, common courtesy towards the other members would prompt him to notify those who

expect to participate in the discussion of the subject set down for debate. This was not done this afternoon, and after the hot air we have heard to-day I shall try to talk business. I wish to deal with this question of immigration not as a party question but as a business proposition and to show why I and those whom I represent are opposed to the bonus system. I do not blame the government for having granted bonuses at the outset, as it may have been necessary at the time the law came into force to induce immigrants of the farming class to go to the Northwest. I admit that something had to be done to encourage this class of immigration. But the bonuses have been diverted to other classes and I am sorry to say that the system has opened the door to speculation. It would seem that there is ground enough for speculating without speculating in human flesh as has been done in many instances. During a previous discussion it was shown that misrepresentations have been made for the purpose of securing the bonuses on immigrants. The bonus system has opened the door and permitted the Canadian Manufacturers Association to flood the labour market. It has been the means of furnishing to unscrupulous agents the opportunity to take advantage of the laws and has brought to our cities more sufferers and more beggars. It has also enabled land speculators to realize large profits. It has even induced charitable institutions, church societies and the Salvation Army to step in and organize on a solid basis, all for one sole aim and object, the making of money no matter how. I am willing to grant the right to any one to make all he can but I do not grant the right to speculate on the good will of the poorer classes of people who are ready at the slightest suggestion to go anywhere in order to better their position, but who do not desire to replace their fellow workmen, so as to force them to starve or become undesirable citizens.

It would seem that the time has arrived when the flow of population to Canada is so numerous and Canada is so well known that bonuses are no longer necessary. While by that system we have induced a large number of farm hands to come to the western provinces, we have also succeeded in overflowing the labour market in all large cities of Canada. Has any one derived any benefit from this overflow? Some one will say yes, the merchants have, the industries as a whole. The manufacturers may have added for a time to their output and their profits, believing as usual that the temporary increase will be permanent and believing also that such an influx of population would be the means of crushing down labour as I have heard some eminent men say. Such men declare that they are friends of labour and of society. Are those who through the bonus system have thus brought these people to Canada ready to support the whole or part of the army of men who are crying for bread throughout the country? Of course not. Why? Because it is a business proposition for them, it is a money making affair and why should we any longer pay to induce men to come to our country? We may have to pay as much as we have paid in bonuses to return certain classes to the countries from which they came.

But it may be said, we have amended the law with respect to immigration. So we have, we have spread literature throughout England and the old country calculated to prevent skilled labour and mechanics from coming to Canada. I acknowledge that the government have done this but other powerful bodies have taken upon themselves to do the unjustified work that some of the government agents were doing some time ago. It may be said that we have good booking agents and their instructions are to be very severe so as to prevent others than those specified in the law as being subjects for bonuses from coming to Canada. Under our present system it is impossible to prevent any one who chooses to bring out undesirable immigrants from doing so. We may have to pay $5 a head on classes of people whom we do not desire. Is it possible to prevent any one from saying: I am going to Canada to work on a farm or in such other work as would bring me under the bonus system? It has been done, and is done every day, but it is wrong. They know that some men living on the other side—and we heard this last night—have only to say: I am going to Canada to work on a farm. I also asked some of these men who came there what they had to respond and they told me that they had been advised, that, if asked, all they had to do was to reply that they were coming to work on a farm in Canada. Are we to believe the booking agents on the other side are not up to date? Are we to believe that they are not looking for a dollar? Do we not know that the institutions I have mentioned are open for business the same as anybody else?

But we are asked: What about the construction of our great railways which must be built and for which we must have hands? I acknowledge that we must have men for these railways. But the work on railway construction generally lasts about seven to seven and a half months, as the work is paralyzed by the weather during the rest of the year. Well, are these men supposed to earn enough during the summer to keep them all winter? Will any hon. gentleman who happens to be a railway contractor say that that is the case? Of course, there is always the same answer—they can find work in the cities. Well, have they found any this winter? Have not we seen in the newspapers that in all the large cities hundreds and thousands of men are walking the streets or waiting at the doors of the city halls begging for bread? Would it not be

better to have our railway contractors put to some little disadvantage and expense in which this work lasts for but seven and a half months per year rather than have the army of labour suffer during the winter? The suffering endured during the past winter is apt to be lightly thought of. But if we were to ask the merchants and landlords probably we should have a better idea of what that suffering has been, because these classes have suffered through the poverty of so many others. We may also be asked: How about our prairie country? Where are we to procure the 25,000 men that are said to be needed to assist the wheat growers and the railway companies that are building through that country? We know that these men are needed. But, admitting everything that can be said in favour of that claim, the principle remains that it is not right to pay a bonus on any one who may get work for only five or six weeks in the year. Why do not the wheat growers keep more men in their employ? They could do it if they were ready to make some small sacrifices. If for a season many of them, instead of going abroad to have a good time —though that, of course, is perfectly legitimate—would stay at home during the winter and keep employed some of the men whom they have in the fall, they would do more than give these people employment, because these men, being accustomed to the life and the climate, would go on the land and would make the very best citizens and settlers. But a different policy is followed. Almost every year a great public call is made for men for the wheat fields, and men flock in from all directions. And what kind of men do the wheat growers secure by that means? They are what we call 'floaters,' men who are on the move all the time, though often taken as examples of the labouring classes. But the wheat growers, by sounding a trumpet in a call for labour, according to our present system, can afford to pay these men even $5 a day for the short time they are employed, and can leave them then to drift back to the cities to become a public charge. It is said that we must do something for the west. It seems to me that we are always doing something for the west. With all due respect, I think that quite enough of the time of this House is taken up with the west—I think that if it were figured up it would be found that fully two-thirds of our time is so occupied. With all due respect to their demands and the members who represent that portion of the country, it seems to me that a little more attention should be paid to the east and to our large cities. We know that those interested in the west are constantly demanding more and more immigration, it does not seem to matter of what kind. But I have reason to believe that if the question were left to the members of this House to be decided itself and on its merits, a large majority would be opposed to bonusing immigrants. We must also consider the effect of this bonus system upon a very important class, our organized workers. Have they criticised the policy of the government or objected to the expenditure on immigration? Such a thing is not to be found. But when this policy becomes a detriment to the country at large they protest and urge upon the government to abolish this system of bonused immigration. We may change the immigration laws year after year, but we shall never succeed in making them what they ought to be until we get at the root of the evil, which is the bonus. The Minister of the Interior has told us that with a large population the times are better than with a smaller population. I agree with him on that point, if the population is of the right kind. But the people must have the necessary purchasing power or they become a burden on the community.

Now, I know that it may be said that the bonus system is nothing new. Why, if you go back to the early days of the United States you find that some states granted a bonus to female help to induce them to come and work in the manufactories which were being established as a result of the invention of new machines. But when the supply of labour was sufficient, the system was abolished. It seems to me that the tide of immigration has been enough towards our west to justify the abolition of the bonus system. The opinion of organized labour is running strongly against the bonus system. The best immigration agent we can have is the satisfied settler. Instead of paying a certain amount of money in bonuses, I think the government would do better, if it must have agents, to send over to England some of the men who have already settled in the west and become prosperous, and these could tell their friends and relatives the advantages offered by this new country. I think such agencies would bring over bona fide settlers, with moral and physical qualities fitting them to become good citizens. Last night some hon. members mentioned that if we want to keep our people here we must provide industries for them. That, Sir, is the key of the whole situation. We will keep our own people at home if we provide industries for them. I have here a copy of 'Le Canada,' the French Liberal paper published in Montreal, and it has an article under the heading 'Rich Immigration.' It goes on to say that 39,000 American immigrants crossed the line last year and were supposed to have brought into the country with them $43,000,000. It shows that these men sold their farms in the western states and bought new farms in western Canada. Now, if this government only paid out $4,000 in bonuses last year for American immigrants, who brought in $43,000,000 into Canada, surely that was money well spent. But it would appear that bonuses do not have much effect so far as the

United States is concerned. I have here the names of the cities in Canada which have sent in protests against the bonus system. I will not mention the names, because it might put some members of this House in an awkward position, which I would not like to do. At the same time, I may say that from cities in British Columbia and from all the important cities of Canada, organizations have sent in strongly-worded protests against the government granting any more bonuses. The labour organizations are not opposed to immigration by any means; we believe that this country should be thrown open to the entry of all men who will make good citizens. We believe also that there is no harm in spreading reliable literature, but we think the people should be left to follow their own will as to whether they will come or not. We are aware that a good deal of misrepresentation has been made in England to induce immigrants to come to Canada, and this parliament two sessions ago had to pass a law to check that misrepresentation, and a law was also passed in England last year to the same effect. We see at present that there is a large steamship line subsidized by this government. I have some posters circulated by this company in England which have been sent to me by our agent, Mr. Trotter, whom we have maintained in England for five or six months. We are paying him a fair wage, and at the same time he is giving us a good deal of information of what is going on in England, and he is giving the English people a good deal of information concerning the labour market in Canada. Now, I have no objection of course to any steamship company spreading large and finely decorated posters in Great Britain to induce people to come to Canada. The government claim that they only pay bonuses on domestic servants and farm labourers. Well, I have no objection to them. But this poster goes on to say that the following classes of persons are wanted in Canada: 'Masons, carpenters, bricklayers, brickmakers and labourers.' Now, can any hon. member say that we are in need of men of any of these classes at the present time in Canada, or are we likely to need them in the future? But this is the kind of posters that the Dominion line is putting up all over England to induce immigrants to come here, and by this means working people are caught. The steamship companies have an interest in inducing immigration, no matter whether the immigrants will leave Canada or will remain to crush Canadian labour. I have here a report of an interview with Lord Strathcona which appeared in some of the London papers. It is headed 'Skilled workmen in Canada, people who are not wanted.' The article says :

Lord Strathcona, High Commissioner for Canada, granted an interview to a representative of the Press Association yesterday afternoon with reference to Mr. Trotter's address. 'Mr. Trotter's statement that the only persons whose emigration is encouraged by the Canadian government are agriculturists, is quite correct,' said Lord Strathcona. 'Only those who intend to devote themselves to the land in one form or another are advised to settle in the Dominion. The one exception is the case of female domestic servants, who have little difficulty in obtaining situations.'

I might read further, but the rest is merely a corroboration of the statement of Mr. Trotter made in one of his addresses. Another agency which is doing a good deal to bring out English immigrants is the Salvation Army. They are spreading a great deal of literature on the other side, and are bringing out a great many people. I want to show to the House what they are doing. Although I grant that their statements are made in good faith, at the same time they are drawing a bonus on the immigrants they send over here. Let me give you a sample of some of the literature they are circulating. This is a letter sent to a friend by Colonel David C. Lamb, of the Salvation Army ?

You were recently inquiring about the party we are at present organizing for British Columbia, 'the garden of Canada,' and I thought it would interest you to know that hundreds have already booked their passages, and that there is every prospect of our having a very nice party.

You will probably have seen or heard something of the reports recently in the newspapers about Canada, and the inclosed leaflet will therefore interest you.

It will be a convenience to me if you can give me some idea of your intentions, and for that purpose I inclose a card which you might return in a few days.

If there is any point upon which you desire further information, I will be glad to do my best to furnish the same on hearing from you.

Then there is a statement on 'Unemployment in Canada and United States of America,' and the Salvation Army authorities go on to say :

In any case, we are still ready to guarantee work to all whom we advise to emigrate, and who are prepared to comply with our conditions and follow our advice. Our labour bureau on board our special sailings enables passengers to secure work before reaching the port of landing, where experienced officers welcome and direct new arrivals.

Well, so far so good. Now, I say that they are really the chief agents in England bringing over immigrants. This letter or circular goes on to say :

N.B.—We are the only people in this country who control an organization in Canada and the States. For reliable and up to date advice we have no equal. Passengers will do well to purchase their tickets through our agency.

That is the way it goes—purchasing tickets through their agency. But, we have this little booklet which only left England two weeks ago : 'Canada wants five mil-

lions of Britain's overflowing population. It says :

Land settlement and cultivation is the way to prosperity in Canada. As the land is cultivated, so the demand for mechanics and skilled tradesmen of an active and enterprising turn of mind will increase.

They are advising people to come and they are holding out inducements to mechanics and skilled tradesmen. It has been said that that is not the class of people that we are trying to induce to immigrate. I will acknowledge that the effort of the government is not directed to bringing about the immigration of skilled mechanics but still this organization holds out inducements to skilled mechanics in literature of this kind. I also have a little booklet entitled 'Canada in a Nutshell.' This has been circulated all over Great Britain and on the back of it is pasted a little piece of paper on which is printed:

The Salvation Army emigration office in London is specially recognized by the government of the Dominion of Canada.

On the lower part of the title page it is stated that it is 'Issued by the authority of the Minister of the Interior, Ottawa, Canada.' That is a sample of the literature that is being circulated to induce people to come to Canada. It is impossible, whether it be the Salvation Army or anybody else, when it is made a matter of business, to entirely disassociate this movement from the monetary consideration. If I were in England and if I were placed in the same position I have not doubt that I would do the same thing. I would look upon every man who left for Canada in the light of the $5 that would go into my pocket and the Salvation Army and every other organization of this kind are doing the same thing.

There is also another feature of this question which I desire to bring before the House and which may have come to the notice of some hon. members. It will be remembered that there was a strike in the coal mines in the province of Nova Scotia. That has nothing to do with what I have just mentioned, but it emphasizes the claim which I make that misrepresentation is resorted to by people in Great Britain for the sake of the bonus. Here is a letter that was sent to Mr. W. Stanlake, 39 Russell street, Exeter, England :

181 Bellefair avenue, Toronto,
February 10, 1908.

Mr. W. Stanlake,
39 Russell street, Exeter, England.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your letter, we beg to state that our Mr. Smith is now in England booking up and despatching the men to their work.

We can offer you and friend position as loaders (underground) if you are prepared to sail at an early date. The mines are very busy and there is no fear of slackness, the men being required at once. In Nova Scotia —in which province the mines are situated—

living is very cheap, a single man being able to live for $3 per week (12s. 6d.).

If prepared to sail at an early date, send on £1 each deposit on your ocean passage to our Mr. Smith, 93 Warwick road, Birmingham, and he will keep a position open for you and book you through at the cheapest rate.

Wishing you every success,
Yours truly,
THE BRITISH EMPLOYMENT AGENCY OF CANADA,
(Sgd.) H. Oswald Ellis,
Manager.

That shows that while the coal mines in Nova Scotia were far from wanting men, representations of this kind were made in order to obtain the bonus, and it also shows that the government, while paying this bonus, has no control over the class of immigrants which are induced to come to Canada through agencies of this kind. We may say, as it was said yesterday, that the policy of the government is not to grant aid to immigration, but if it does not do it directly it does it in an indirect way. It gives the money to one to give to another which is exactly the same thing in the end as far as I can see. It goes to a third party instead of going direct to the immigrant himself. The immigrant does not get it but he is induced to come here by the money granted by way of bonus. I have some documents here that have a special bearing on the subject and which are of late date, but at this hour I shall not trouble the House by reading them all. I should like, however, while discussing this question of misrepresentation to direct the attention of the House to a resolution passed by the Montreal District Council of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. It is as follows:

Montreal, January 27, 1908.

Resolution presented by Messrs. J. Hibbins and J. Gauthier, and adopted:

Whereas, the present condition of the labour market is most deplorable, owing to its being continually augmented by unscrupulous builders' exchanges, manufacturers' associations, private companies and individuals, or their agents, who take every means in their power to obtain the country's money, and therewith negotiate with church homes, self-help societies, and more especially with the members of the Salvation Army to bring to this country at so much per head, anybody without regard to their fitness or the country's good, the main object being of course, for the profit obtained, which quite often results in adding to the ranks of the incompetents, and also to the criminal classes, thereby lowering the standard of both living and the active population.

We note particularly that which is carried on under assumed religious auspices as being the most pernicious and misleading. And, furthermore, that not within the writer's knowledge has there ever been a real scarcity of labour, but many depressions, especially during the winter months, which make the present conditions most reprehensible. And, while we do not propose to discuss who is the

most to blame, as the guilty parties everywhere are now doing, the results which must fall so heavy on all labour, make us resolve that we immediately withdraw both our support and influence from any and every member, of the federal or provincial parliament, or member of any municipal body, who does not immediately seek every means to stop one cent more of the country's money being subscribed in any form or manner for assisted immigration purposes, the whole of which is unnecessary and unwarranted.

Therefore, be it resolved, that the vote of this District Council of Carpenters be sent to our labour member, and also to the Minister of Labour, without delay, in order that a repetition of such a state of affairs will not be.

I will conclude by stating that instead of paying bonuses, instead of opening the door to speculation and encouraging the operations of unscrupulous agents, it would be of greater benefit to the country if we simply allowed our successful settlers in the west to act as our immigration agents. I claim that as long as we continue to pay these bonuses we will not achieve satisfactory results and we will not get the class of people in this country that we desire. I do not wish it to be understood that I am opposed to immigration, but I am opposed to the government offering inducements to bring to Canada an undesirable class. The country is well known, it is the promised land, everybody is looking to Canada and everybody will come. The 75,000, or 2,000,000 people who are walking the streets in England will be only too glad to come over to Canada without the payment of this $5 bonus. This is my position, and I may say that this is the expression of the views of organized labour not only in the city of Montreal but throughout Canada from Victoria to Halifax. I speak here to-night not merely as the member for my own riding, but I speak as representing the organized labour of Canada from ocean to ocean.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey). The hon. member (Mr. Monk) by whom this resolution was presented to the House, made many comparisons as between the present immigration policy of Canada and the present immigration policy of the United States. Lord Strathcona in a letter of date November 15, 1900, written to the Hon. Clifford Sifton, then Minister of the Interior, gave an illustration of the differences that exist between the conditions in the United States and the conditions in Canada, and he set forth many important reasons why it is necessary for us in Canada to make more strenuous efforts to obtain immigration than is the case with regard to the United States. Lord Strathcona wrote :

On the other hand the United States have been working for many years on the continent and had the advantage of direct steamship communication which we did not and do not now enjoy to any great extent, and in consequence they were able to attract a larger population which yearly drew more and more people to it. There is no immigration agent so potent as the successful emigrant; besides they secured the great bulk of their people before we were in a position to offer prairie land to any extent to immigrants to Canada and in times that were less prosperous than those of recent years.

It seems to me that with hundreds of thousands of acres of fertile land in our Canadian west that are to-day unoccupied, untilled and unproductive, we do require a large number of immigrants. We require immigrants to till that soil and to make it produce so as to add to the wealth of this Canada of ours. And not only to add to the wealth of our country directly by making that fertile soil produce crops that will give us wealth, but indirectly that it may give to the manufacturers of eastern Canada, as immigration to the west has done in recent years, added markets for the output of their factories. I think, Sir, that in connection with our immigration we may direct our energy with great profit to bringing to this country desirable immigrants for the cultivation of that western land, and we cannot bring desirable immigrants for that purpose in any too great numbers. On the other hand I think we may direct our energy to keeping out of this country any immigrants who would not make good Canadian citizens. I do not think it is desirable to bring to Canada, at least at present, immigrants who shall enter into competition with the labouring men and mechanics of our cities and towns, and I am pleased to say that it has not been the policy of the present government to induce to come to this country such immigrants as will compete with Canadian workingmen and artisans. I quite realize too that in bringing to this country an immigrant who is physically diseased or who is mentally unsound or who is a moral pervert, we may do more harm than the good we will do by bringing here a dozen men who are physically, mentally and morally sound. I have risen tonight, however, not so much to dicuss the question of immigration in a general way as to direct the attention of the House and of the people of this country to the important part that has been played and is being played to-day in the development of Canada by the German-Canadian settler.

If I occupy a few moments of the time of the House in discussing the importance to Canada of the German-Canadian, I think I shall be occupying the time of parliament in a manner in which it has not been occupied before in the history of Canada. When I speak of the German settler in Canada, I speak of him as I have met him and known him in my own province of Ontario. I know that the German settler in Canada has not played the very important part in the discovery of the country and in the laying of the foundations of the country that has been played by our French Cana-

dian friends ; yet I do contend that the German settler in Canada has taken, is taking and is likely to take a much greater part in the development and progress of Canada than most of our Canadian people who have not come into immediate contact with our German Canadian citizens have any idea of. The earliest settlement of German people in the province of Ontario was, I think, in the Niagara peninsula, and there are to-day considerable settlements of German people in the counties of Norfolk, Lincoln and Essex. But the German settlements that have thrived most and that seem to have taken the deepest root in Ontario are the settlements originally formed in the county of Waterloo and that have extended into the neighbouring counties. In the year 1800 two Germans named Joseph Sherk and Samuel Betzner, came to the present county of Waterloo and settled near the present village of Doon on the Grand river. They were the first German settlers, and the first prominent white settlers in the county of Waterloo. In the following year, 1801, they were followed by a number of other German families—Bechtels, Kinseys, Rosenburgers, Biehns and other families of German names and German nationality. These people came from the State of Pennsylvania to what is now the township of Waterloo. The distance from that part of the State of Pennsylvania in which they had their homes to the county of Waterloo was about five hundred miles, which they travelled, not by railway train, for in those days there were no railways, but by horses and wagons, coming over the Alleghany mountains, through swamps and forests, over roads that were bad, and through much country where there were no roads at all. The ingenuity of the German, the manner in which he adapts himself to his circumstances, may be shown by one little instance, that of Joseph Sherk, to whom I have already referred. The first table used in the county of Waterloo was in the house of Joseph Sherk. It consisted of a pine stump some five feet in diameter, around which this German pioneer built his first rude settler's cabin. The township of Wilmot in the county of Waterloo was settled by a society of non-conformists under the leadership of one Christian Naffsiger, who was a Hollander. He left his home in Amsterdam and went to New Orleans. From New Orleans he journeyed northward to Lancaster County in the State of Pennsylvania. Acting on information and advice given by German friends in Pennsylvania he made his way northwestwardly to the township of Waterloo, to the little German settlement there. Looking about for a tract of land on which to settle German friends he intended to bring to the country, he arranged with the then local government to obtain on easy terms what is now the township of Wilmot. Having concluded his bargain with the local government, he proceeded to Britain where he interviewed George IV, and by the British government the bargain he made with the local government was confirmed. That was in 1822. The township of Woolwich, in the county of Waterloo, was settled in the first place by German people about the year 1810, and German pioneers settled in the township of Wellesley in Waterloo county in 1832. These fertile tracts in Waterloo county, in those early days settled by German people are occupied by German people to-day, and there is no tract of agricultural land more productive, no matter where it is, within the bounds of Canada, than those German townships of Waterloo county, an no people engaged in agricultural pursuits in Canada that man for man are possessed of greater wealth or have met with greater success than the German people who occupy and cultivate them. The German settlements in Waterloo county extended in later years to the adjoining counties, so that we now have very considerable German settlements in the counties of Perth, Wellington, Huron, Oxford, Bruce and Grey, and there are no men in the Dominion of Canada who have made better settlers than these German people, whose names are rarely found on the lists of our courts and are seldom or never seen in any of our police records. The German as we find him in Canada is naturally a religious man, and the German citizens of Canada are probably the most faithful church attendants of any of our Canadian citizens. In Germany the people were for the most part members of either the Roman Catholic or the Lutheran Church ; but in Canada we have German people belonging to the Roman Catholic Church, the Lutheran Church, the Evangelical Association, whose people are commonly known as German Methodists, the Baptist Church, the Mennonite Church and some to the Presbyterian Church. The German is a man of domestic habits, fond of his home and of his home life ; and while the German families are not usually so large as those of our French Canadian friends, yet the head of a German household usually rules over a nest in which there are many younglings to be clothed and fed. The German people whatever may be their position in life, whatever may be their possessions or their financial standing, teach their children that honest toil, whether of muscle or brain, is no disgrace. The German people are brought up to work, and they all work, and are characteristically industrious. It is supposed by a great many people who do not know them so well as I do that the German, as we have him in Canada, is addicted to the excessive use of strong drink. This is an erroneous idea ; in fact, the very reverse is the case. He is usually a sober man. Perhaps a very small percentage of the German population would be in favour of a prohibitory liquor

law ; not a very large percentage of them may be classed as total abstainers ; many of them drink moderately of their liquors of lighter brew ; yet they are a sober people, and the German communities in Canada will be found to contain a much smaller number of men who are addicted to the the immoderate use of strong drink than will be found in a community of Irish Canadians or Scotch Canadians, or English Canadians.

I will not say that the German farmer is the best farmer we have in Canada. If I should say that my friend behind me (Mr. McKenzie) the chairman of the Agricultural Committee would perhaps call my attention to the Scotch farmers in this country and there are other members who would point out the excellencies of the English farmer and the Irish Canadian farmer. While it would not be correct to say that the German in Canada is the best farmer we have, I may correctly and truthfully say that we have no better farmers in Canada than the Germans. One characteristic of the German farmer is that he will not settle upon poor soil. He may settle upon a farm that is out of order, that will require a great deal of labour to make it a comfortable home, but he will see to it that he will settle on a soil that by his own hard work he can convert into a good, productive farm. The German will prefer to settle on a piece of good land and struggle to pay off a large mortgage to taking a piece of poor and unproductive land without the debt. As I have said, the German, whether upon a farm or wherever else he may be found, is industrious, thrifty and economical and usually succeeds.

But if our German Canadian succeeds as a farmer he succeeds in no less degree as a manufacturer. It seems to me that the German is naturally a man of mechanical ingenuity, that he is naturally a mechanic and, therefore, in that tract of Ontario through which more than a century ago the German pioneers either followed or created a blazed trail to guide them in their way through the Canadian forest, they now have large busy, thriving, manufacturing centres. The chief of these German manufacturing centres in Ontario is the busy town of Berlin in the county of Waterloo. A directory published in 1846 described Berlin as being a village of 400 people, principally Germans. Now the town of Berlin, in place of a population of 400, has a population of 12,000 people ; but as they were in 1846 so they are in 1908, principally Germans. In that busy German town that to-day prefers to be the largest town rather than the smallest and youngest city in Canada, you will find a greater variety of manufacturing industries than in any other town of similar size in Canada. They manufacture every thing from a button to a piano, a traction engine or a threshing machine. A peculiar thing about these German manufacturing industries is that they were not established by the aid or assistance of large municipal grants. They were not established by men who went into these German manufacturing towns with large capital, but are rather the outgrowth of the business of men who began in a very small way. As an instance of that, I may say that there is to-day in Berlin a large and successful boot and shoe factory, and the man who to-day controls that successful boot and shoe manufacturing business began his career as a boot and shoe manufacturer in Berlin by making slippers by hand, and the market for his slippers was found by his good wife who sold them on the streets of the town from a basket which she carried on her arm. Very close to Berlin is the other German manufacturing town of Waterloo, with a population about half that of Berlin. As an evidence of the success of the manufacturing industries of the town of Waterloo, I may say that I do not think there is any other town of its size in Ontario that pays such a large annual revenue into the treasury of Canada by its excise and customs duties. In the county of Waterloo there are also the thriving manufacturing towns of Preston, Hespeler and Elmira. In my own county of Grey, we have the busy, live German manufacturing towns of Hanover, Neustadt and Ayton. In Hanover we have the German names of Knechtel, Peppler and Messinger among our manufacturers. Our town is supported almost entirely by manufactories and they are almost altogether in the control of German citizens or men who have learned their trade and acquired their business knoweldge in the offices and factories of German Canadians. As another instance of the manner in which German manufacturing industries are built up, let me say that there stands to-day in Hanover an inconspicuous frame dwelling, one and a half storeys high, of small size, that in the beginning of his manufacturing career, was the combined residence and manufacturing establishment of Mr. Daniel Knechtel, who is now the president and chief shareholder of the Knechtel Furniture Company, one of the largest furniture manufacturing companies in Canada having a very large factory in Hanover, another in Walkerton and another in Southampton.

In the adjoining county of Bruce, there are the busy manufacturing towns of Chesley, Walkerton and Southampton. These towns have all been for years towns of more or less importance, but they have never been busy and progressive towns until in recent years German people have gone into them and established manufacturing industries. I may particularly point out the case of the town of Southampton on Lake Huron, that only a few years ago was a sleepy, quiet fishing village and summer resort ; but now by manufacturing in-

dustries in the hands entirely of German people, has become a busy thriving progressive town. In connection with these comparatively small manufacturing German towns let me say they are principally engaged in the manufacture of furniture, and that the furniture manufacturing business of Canada to-day is very largely in the hands of our German people.

One reason why our German manufacturers are so successful is because of their mechanical skill, their enterprise, their economy, their thrift, and their general business ability. But there is another reason why the German manufacturer succeeds as he does and that is because of the high character of the German workmen whom he employs. There is no better workman engaged, anywhere, than we have in our factories, where the workmen are principally Germans. Amongst them we have no trouble from unions, strikes, or lockouts, and this is largely because the German employee of to-day feels that he is likely to be the employer of to-morrow; or if he is himself not in the immediate future an employer of labour, that at least his sons will be employers, rather than on the payrolls of other taskmasters. Another peculiarity of the German workmen is that the majority of them live in attractive homes of which they are themselves the owners. In connection with these attractive homes of the German workmen, you will almost always find a very neat, well cultivated, carefully tilled fruit and vegetable garden. The German in Canada does not hold quite so tenaciously, it may be, to the use of the language of his fathers as do our French Canadian friends, and yet our German people are fond of the language that is spoken in the Fatherland.

They keep up the use of their language by holding their church services in the tongue of the old land, oftentimes when it would be quite as convenient to hold those services in English. They also perpetuate the use of the German tongue by forming local associations for the study of that language and also by establishing in various parts of Ontario and the Canadian west newspapers printed in German. Let me say that the various German settlements in Canada are being constantly added to by new arrivals from Germany. And it is astonishing, and very much to the credit of the German people, the readiness with which they acquire at least a speaking knowledge of the English language. The German, too, is fond of music and skilled in it. As an evidence of that musical talent and skill let me say, there are no church choirs anywhere in Canada that are, perhaps, equal to the choirs of the German churches whatever their denomination. Their bands and orchestras, too, are the best we have in the country. Any one desiring to enjoy a great musical treat cannot do better than attend at Berlin one of the many Sangerfests that are held in that town. As an evidence of the musical skill of the German, let me read a short extract from the April number of the 'Busy Man's Magazine,' published in Toronto. This is an article upon Dr. Augustus Stefan Vogt, the now famous leader of the Mendelssohn Choir of Toronto, who was born in the village of Elmira, in the county of Waterloo, and is the son of a German organ builder:

Will Dr. Augustus Stefan Vogt, the brillant leader of the famous Mendelssohn Choir, have the honour of knighthood conferred upon him when birthday honours are distributed by His Majesty on Victoria Day next? Dr. Vogt richly deserves such distinction. He has accomplished more than many a Canadian who has been decorated with a K.C.M.G., and it will not surprise his thousands of friends and admirers if he is soon known as Sir Augustus Vogt. A Canadian who realizes the value of an ideal, he is prepared to make any sacrifices for its accomplishment. All fellow countrymen are proud of him. He has done more in perfecting choral art than any other person, and has made Canada in this respect envied of all nations.

As financiers, our German Canadian friends excel, and, as an evidence of this, I may say that the towns of Berlin and Waterloo, in the province of Ontario, are the homes of very progressive, popular and successful life insurance and fire insurance companies, the shareholders, directors and managers of which are almost exclusively German people. Let me call the attention of the House also to the fact that the German Canadian excels also as a sport and athlete. We have all heard in recent weeks of Tommy Burns, the world's champion heavy-weight pugilist, who has been chumming with Lord Alverstone in England. Tommy Burns' real name is Noah Brusso. He was born and brought up in my own riding of South Grey and in my own town of Hanover, and is the son of Frederic Brusso, who was a workman in the factory of the Knechtel Furniture Company of that town.

Leaving the field of sport and going to the higher ground of science, the German in Canada is noted as a scientist, as is the German in his own land. And in evidence of this, it is only necessary for me to call attention to one man, Dr. Otto Klotz, who has been for many years in the employ of this government and is now at the head of its astronomical work. Our German Canadian friends, too, are adapted to public life and have taken an interest in public affairs in Canada. One of the best wardens that my own county ever had was the late Victor Lang, a German Canadian. In the provincial legislature to-day, we have Dr. Lackmer, member for one of the ridings of Waterloo, Mr. C. M. Bowman, the popular member for North Bruce, whose father, Mr. J. E. Bowman, was at one time a member

of this House, and also Hon. Adam Beck, who has achieved considerable notoriety and celebrity in Ontario because of the power scheme he has advocated. And, in this House, the German Canadian is well represented. We have the very popular and always industrious member for West Hamilton, Mr. Adam Zimmerman, the very popular and deservedly popular representative of South Waterloo, Mr. G. A. Clare, and also the equally popular representative of North Middlesex, Mr. Valentine Ratz, all of German descent. In the field of law, the German Canadian has held his own and taken a leading part. When I speak of the lawyers in Canada of German descent, I will mention but one, Mr. A. B. Klein, who is one of the county court judges of Bruce. Mr. Klien, who is of German descent, was one of the ablest and most popular lawyers having a country practice in Canada and is not less popular on the bench as one of our Canadian judges. And he showed his loyalty to Canada by the interest he took in the affairs of our militia, having retired from the 32nd Battalion of Bruce with the rank and title of major.

We have large German settlements in every city in Canada. For instance, there is a large settlement of this nationality in Toronto, and in that city many of our most prominent men are of German extraction, like the Breithaupts and the Heintzmans, who are well known in the business world. There is a large German settlement in Ottawa, and also in Hamilton. There are many Germans in Montreal and also in Winnipeg. We have Germans engaged in agricultural pursuits in considerable numbers in the county of Russell, Ont., and in part of the province of Quebec and also in Nova Scotia. In fact, there is not a province in Canada in which we have not a considerable number of German settlers.

It will be said that many of these German people came into Canada of their own accord and not as the result of any immigration policy of this government. That is true so far as eastern Canada is concerned. But we have a very large number of German settlers in western Canada who have come to that western country as a direct result of the efforts made by our immigration agencies and our Department of the Interior. The German settlers in the northwestern Canada will make, no doubt, quite as good settlers as did the Germans in the province of Ontario. Had it cost the government of Canada, not $5, or $20, but $10,000 apiece to bring to Canada some of the German people whose names I have mentioned, the investment would have been a good one and one by which we should have very largely profited.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. They came for nothing.

Mr. MILLER. We have a very large number of Canadian German settlers who came as a direct result, as I have said, of the work of the Department of the Interior and because of the immigration policy of the government of the day. I am very glad that the Department of the Interior has always, under the present government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, shown its appreciation of the value of immigration from Germany. And, in evidence of what the Department of the Interior of the present Liberal government has thought of German immigration and in evidence of its appreciation of the German settler, I want to read a sentence from a letter from Mr. Smart, then Deputy Minister of the Interior to Mr. W. T. R. Preston, dated July 18, 1900. He says: 'We are especially anxious to bring persons of German origin.' And, in another letter from Ottawa to Mr. Preston, dated August 26, 1901, Mr. Smart, then deputy minister, acting under instructions from the Minister of the Interior, said:

> I will be glad if you will let me know what has been the result of the efforts of the North Atlantic Trading Company in so far as its work in Germany is concerned. I may say that after two years the department is a little disappointed in not seeing greater results from the efforts of the company in Germany and also in Scandinavia. There is no class of people that Canadians are so willing to welcome as German settlers, and it seems too bad that some good commencement cannot be made in connection with the people of this nationality. I may add that Mr. Landy, whom I met in Winnipeg, told me a few days ago that it was confidently expected a good many Germans would come to this country, but in order to have authentic information on the subject, I would be pleased if you would communicate with the syndicate which is doing the work.

I was pleased when the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) stated to me that there are no settlers that his department welcomes more heartily and considers more satisfactory than the German settlers. I trust that no legitimate effort will be spared, whatever direction that effort may take, to continue the immigration to this country of the German people. I may say that in every respect we have no better people than the German residents of Canada, they make very loyal and in every way very satisfactory Canadians. The German settler as we have him in Canada, when he looks back to the history and traditions of the land from which he came, sings with great enthusiasm that national song of which he is so proud, Die Wacht Am Rhein. And when he looks around upon his home in Canada, and which he expects to be the home of his children, he sings with equal zeal and equal fervour, and with still greater interest, and with true loyalty, 'The Maple Leaf' and 'God Save the King.'

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM (East Huron). The question of immigration which we are

now discussing lies at the very foundation of our national prosperity and greatness, and no more important question could engage our attention. I must say that I think it is much more important than the question which we had intruded here this afternoon. Although I stand on the opposition side of the House, I desire to say right here that I have no sympathy at all with the intrusion into this debate of the question of a little bit of dredging. The character of the immigration that is coming to our country means everything to the future of our country. The subject was brought up in this House by one of the ablest men in it, a man who never speaks on any subject unless he has something of importance to say, a man who can handle a subject properly, and it is much to be regretted that the discussion was interrupted by the break that was made this afternoon. The future and greatness of the country depend on the people who inhabit it. Look at Scotland. Scotland is not a large country, but what other country in the world exercises so great an influence over the world, according to its size and its population, as Scotland? Germany is a wonderful country, and our good friend who has just spoken (Mr. Miller) has told us that the Germans are a wonderful people. They are, and they are exerting a wonderful influence all over the world. Now then what we want to do is to get people of the right kind to come to this country, and so long as they are of the right kind, the country will go on and prosper. I believe that this country will become in due time one of the great nations of the world. Cheap labour, as has been well said by an hon. member this afternoon, is not everything. You may get in cheap labour, but that will not make the country great. The Americans got in cheap labour in their negro population, but that did not make the country great, and it has been the occasion of the great civil war and the expenditure of millions of money. In the neighbouring republic they have that labour question on their hands, and it is complicated with the race problem, which is one of the most difficult problems that any country could have to face. In the same way we look to British Columbia, and some say that the bringing in of cheap labour from Asia will be a great help to Canada. But I think we can scarcely afford to allow immigration of that sort. These people will not assimilate with our western type of civilization, they will not assimilate with Canadians, and if they did, it would only be to lower the tone of our civilization. At the same time we have nothing against the Japanese, we admire the Japanese, but we don't wish them as immigrants because we cannot assimilate with them. Now then speaking of immigration, it seems to me that too much attention has been paid to settling up the west to the neglect of eastern Canada. It seems to me that the east has been forgotten. Of course we have a great country in the west, and there is no danger but that it will be filled up in time. On the one side, only four or five days journey distant, we have the teeming millions of Europe; and on the other side, only eight or ten days journey distant, we have the hundreds of millions of China and Japan; while to the south of us we have eighty millions of people. If we have got a good country the great trouble will be to keep people out of it whom we do not want to come here. For instance, the Doukhobors are occupying land in the west that we ought to keep for our children and our children's children. To get these people into this country our government have paid $7 a head, besides affording them assistance after they reach here. They occupy the best land in our western country; and I can say now that if they had never set foot in this country that land would now be occupied by good Canadians. On the 7th of June last year I was in the city of Prince Albert, and there were a number of Doukhobor homesteads, discarded homesteads, that the Doukhobors would not have, that were to be opened on that day. These homesteads had been held for the Doukhobors for seven years by the government. They had lived in their villages, and had made no improvements on the land for seven years, and still the homesteads were held for them. If a Canadian boy goes up there to get a homestead, if he is not on hand the very minute he should be, he loses his right, but the Doukhobor can hold it for seven years. One of my own Wingham boys went up there, and understanding that, according to the regulations, the first man who was on hand the next morning would get the choice of these five homesteads, he went into the office the night before and made some inquiries, and when the time came to close the office, he was requested to leave. He walked out, but he kept his hand on the door knob all night. I went up the next morning, it was raining, but still the poor fellow had his hand on the door knob. There were four or five hundred people surging around him, his hat was trampled into the mud, the rain was running off his hair, but still he stood there with his hand on the door knob. I was proud of him as a Wingham boy. The result was that he got the first homestead. Now here were 500 good Canadians ready to take these homesteads, and if the Doukhobors had never gone there those 500 Canadians would have taken up those homesteads. These homesteads were held for these Doukhobors for seven years, but a poor boy went up there last year from my riding. You know that we had a very late spring. He went up into Saskatchewan, he got into a half built hut and he took cold, inflammation of the lungs and pleurisy. His father had to go and bring him home, and he was brought to my riding. I went to the land office a little while ago to make some inquiry to see if they would hold his homestead open. He had his side opened three times and a tube put in. I was pre-

sent at one of the operations and the Liberal doctor who is attending him in Brussels sent a letter down to the department and said that the boy had still a tube in his side, and that matter was running out of his side and we asked the time to be extended until after the first of May. What was the reply that we got from the land office?—'they are not holding homesteads open after the first of May.' This poor fellow is expected to go back and he must go or he will lose his homestead and, of course, if he goes, he may lose his life. How does it come that these Doukhobors could have homesteads held for seven years and a poor boy in my riding cannot have a homestead held for a few months although he has a tube in his side.

The farmers of Ontario particularly are neglected under our immigration policy. They are very hard up for help. There is a famine of farm labourers in our country; everything is being done for the west and it is draining the east. We have harvest excursions at cheap rates taking away 20,000 of our young men to the west at a time when we need them most. When we get in the so-called farm help we find that the bonus system is bringing in the wrong class of settlers. They do not bring in men from the heather mills whence my own father came nor from the vine clad valley of Germany and France. They bring in men who have been brought up in the cities and no matter how foolish you may think a farmer to be when he goes to the city, no matter how many mistakes he may make, they are nothing to the mistakes which will be made by the city man who goes upon the farm. He is far more out of place. It is no use for a man like that to go to one of our farmers and tell him that he has been brought up on a farm in the old country. The farmer will very soon know where he comes from. I heard a little story the other day about a man who came from Glasgow and who hired out as a farm labourer. The farmer said: Now, Sandy, there is a farmer across the road and he and I are exceedingly good friends. We have an arrangement that if he in any way spoils any of his farm implements he is to have a loan of anything that I have and if we happen to break any of our implements we can go over and get his. If that man comes over and asks for the loan of any farm implements when I am not here, you must give it to him. One day the farmer was away and the neighbour came across and said: 'Sandy, man, have you a plough? I have broken my plough and I wish to finish my ploughing.' 'Och,' said Sandy, 'Ye can ha the pleu. The boss said ye cud ha onything aboot the place bit I dinna ken whaur the pleu is and I dinna ken whether I waud ken a pleu gin I saw ane, but there is the wagon and maybe ye can pleu wi' it till the boss comes hame.'

Then I heard another one about a man who came out to this country who was taken out to the bush to assist a farmer to get out some logs. The farmer said to him: 'John, will you go and get a cant-hook? John went home and soon brought back a mooly cow because he thought she could not hook because she had no horns and that therefore she must be a cant-hook. I believe that if an effort were made this difficulty would be solved if the minister would give attention to this matter and I am sure he has tried to do the best he could, but he does not understand the situation. The farmers have solved the difficulty of the cheese and bacon question, and I believe that the farm labour question might be solved by going about it in the right way. There is a great difficulty not only in regard to the scarcity of labour, but, since automobiles have been placed upon the highways, the farmers' daughters and wives cannot go to town and to market. They cannot drive the horses because farmers' horses, being more isolated, are more easily frightened. I have seen farmers in my county with 200 acres of land who would have to leave the farm work and drive to town on account of the automobiles. We must get into our country a class of men about whose history we know something. about whose life history we know something. A farmer must take his hired help right into the bosom of his family, to be the companion of his sons, his wife and his daugters. We must have the life history of such people. We cannot take every man that you pick up in Whitechapel, or Glasgow, or Dublin. These men may or may not be suitable associates for a farmer's family. We must know them and have their life histories. I propose that the province of Ontario should be divided into districts and that the farmers who wish help should be invited to assemble at some central point during the slack time in the winter. They would give in a list of the labour that they required. One man wants a man with a family because he has bought out his neighbour, he has 200 acres of land and he has acquired a nice brick house with it. There is some man away off in Europe, in Germany, or England or Ireland or Scotland living in a cottage with his family and if that man must come and occupy that house he would think that he was in a palace and the farmer, with 200 acres of land, might give him five or six acres to work for himself and his family. In this way the farmer could get the kind of help that he requires. Another man needs a boy. Each farmer would designate exactly the kind of help that he required and all these requirements would be written down. Then the farmers assembled together would elect one of themselves to go to the old country, hire the help and bring it to Canada. That man would go to the old country and he would say: Here is John Jones; he has a large family and he could occupy that house and culti-

vate a piece of land in connection with it. The man who would actually engage the help in the old country would see the man who had been delegated to go over there and ascertain from him exactly the kind of help that would suit him. If the man who was delegated to do this work did not do it properly the farmers would next year elect another representative. Let the government pay the expenses of these men who would be selected to go over to the old country and engage help. It is not my place to suggest how it should be done.

There is another thing that I desire to say and that is that as a result of the way in which our tariff is regulated the manufacturers enjoy rates so much in excess of those which the farmers enjoy on their products that it is impossible to keep farm labourers on the farm. They drift into the cities because they get work and the farmers are not able to pay them high wages because their products are not protected to the same extent as the products of the manufacturers are.

I regret that many of the immigrants we are getting in this country are not such as are desirable, or as are calculated to build up and strengthen our nation. On the contrary, far too many of them are subjects of charity and are filling our hospitals and our charitable institutions, and still worse, in some cases they are filling our jails and penitentiaries. I quote from the St. Thomas 'Evening Journal' of the 11th of April, a good Liberal paper, the following:

Dumped in Ontario is Hon. Mr. Hanna's claim.

Toronto, April 11.—Hon. Mr. Hanna called the attention of the legislature last night to the effect of immigration in the last year or two upon the inmates of the principal institutions. He had just received a telegram from Port Arthur, as follows:

'Fort William police magistrate has committed ten male Doukhobors to Central Prison; nine females to the Mercer Reformatory. They are in jail here. We have no room for them. Fifty-three other prisoners here now. There are fifty-seven other Doukhobors at Fort William to be sent to the Central and the Mercer. They have burned their clothes and are naked.

'ALEX. W. THOMPSON,
'Sheriff.'

This was not only a matter of so many more inmates of the jails, but indicated a condition of affairs that must be dealt with, and the responsibility for which placed where it belongs.

Although 80 per cent were native born in the province, the inmates of the ayslums were 30 per cent foreign born.

During 1907 there were 1,162 patients admitted to asylums of the province of whom 346 were foreign born. During the past five years the percentage of foreigners admitted to these institutions had increased from 20 to 30 per cent, while Canadian born patients had decreased from 80 to 70 per cent, in the same period, from 1903 to 1907, the cost of maintenance of foreign born patients had increased from $24,613.20 to $51,744.30. While the foreign born of the entire adult population were only 20 per cent, the total admission to asylums from that class was 30 per cent.

The figures showed the necessity of effective methods to prevent the dumping on the province of undesirables by friends, and others aided by charitable associations with no other object than to get rid of the responsibility of providing for them. Taking into consideration the probable length of life of these patients, the cost of maintaining those admitted in 1907 alone amount to $1,487,058.80 without including any proportion for capital expenditure.

Of the estimated total population of the province, over 16 years of age, 1,209,308 were Canadians, and 291,675 were foreigners, or 20 per cent of the whole. At the same time, of the commitments to jail, 38 per cent were of foreign birth, and the cost of providing for them amounted to $21,724.65.

Now, that is quite a large sum of money for the province of Ontario to be mulcted in by reason of this undesirable immigration. We should take care that the immigrants who are brought into this country are physically and morally fit to build up our country, and that they are not such as will deteriorate the character of the people with whom they mingle.

The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) spoke very kindly and very correctly about our German people, and I may be pardoned for following his example and saying a few words about them myself. The German settlers in this country have in every case made model citizens. In southwest Ontario, in Wellington, in Grey, in Bruce, in Huron, in Perth, in Oxford, and in Waterloo we have large German communities, and in these districts the farms are not only clean and well kept, but they are thoroughly and effectively tilled. The homes of the German Canadians are comfortable and commodious and the people honest, moral, respectable and in many cases wealthy. The Germans very easily assimilate with us Canadians because they are practically of our own race. We know that the Saxons of England came originally from Germany, and as a German would say: 'Die Deutche spreche ist die mutter der Engleschen'—the German language is the mother of the English language. The grammar and construction of the German and English languages are so much alike that even old persons who know the one soon learn the other, which in my opinion accounts in a great measure for the ease with which our German settlers have been able to adapt themselves to the language and customs of this country. Our German settlers are not only industrious and frugal and law-abiding, but in every case they are thoroughly loyal to our King and our country. It appears to be no trouble to them to yield allegiance to the uncle of their emperor, especially when they know that his father, the late lamented Prince Albert, was

a German and that his mother, the good Queen Victoria, was a descendant of the House of Brunswick and of German George I. Things are made still more easy for them in this respect when they know that many of the United Empire Loyalists who made great sacrifices when they came to Canada from the United States at the close of the revolutionary war were of Dutch or German origin.

It does not need any bonusing to induce German immigrants to come to this country, because the German people are so thrifty that they always have money to meet their own wants. In my opinion, Sir, we should encourage German immigrants to come to Canada. We should not only give the German people the glad hand, but we should strive in some friendly way to remove from our tariff that odious surtax which the Canadian government is levying against goods coming from the fatherland. I believe that the German people resent this tax and feel it very strange that their country should be singled out by us for such treatment. I notice here by a report of the Trade and Commerce Department that, while we have trade commissioners in Australia, China, Japan, Corea, France and Mexico, in the German empire, that great manufacturing and food consuming country, there is not a single trade commissioner. Our German friends are scarcely to blame if they feel that the Canadian government is not treating their country with that consideration which I believe it deserves from us.

Now, let me say a few words about the North Atlantic Trading Company, and in that connection I want to refer to the statement frequently made that the Prime Minister offered to give to the leader of the opposition the names of the members of the North Atlantic Trading Company. Let me quote from 'Hansard,' 1906, page 4472, what the Prime Minister said in reference to that:

> But, sir, I have in my hands at this moment the names of those gentlemen with whom Mr. Preston, Mr. Smart and the government dealt in 1890. and I am willing confidentially to put those papers——
>
> Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.
>
> Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am willing confidentiallv to put those papers into the hands of the hon. leader of the opposition or of any hon. gentleman he will select.

What names were they? The names of the gentleman with whom Mr. Preston, Mr. Smart and the government dealt in 1899. According to what I see here, the North Atlantic Trading Company was not in existence at that time, so that it could not have possibly been the members of that company whose names were to be given. Now I quote from a letter contained in the report of the Public Accounts Committee of 1906, written by Lord Strathcona to Mr. Smart, in which letter he says:

> Inclosed with this letter you will find a copy of the certificate of registration of the North Atlantic Trading Company, Limited, dated at Greffe, Guernsey, the 14th day of June, 1905, together with a copy of the memorandum and articles of association of the same company, dated the 3rd June, 1905.

Now, how can any person make out that an effort was made to give the names of the members of the North Atlantic Trading Company five years before such a company existed? Another point is this: I notice in 'Hansard' of the 2nd of April of the present year that a member stated:

> Lord Strathcona sent a man by the name of Charles A. Allen to Amsterdam to get these names. He felt that there was great demand in the public mind of Canada to know those names, and so he sent a special messenger over there for the purpose. And this is what he sent back to Lord Strathcona, dated June 5, 1906:
>
> Just received letter from company, as follows: begins, very utmost we are able to do is to allow Mr. Preston to show names to Premier, Hon. Mr. Fielding, and if absolutely necessary also to only one Liberal and only one Conservative member of confidential committee, on condition that they each give a sworn declaration in writing never to mention names either verbally or in any other way and on condition that Premier takes full responsibility that these sworn declarations are kept, as disclosing names would result in some prominent members committing suicide.

Now, suppose our leader had been given those names—not, mind you, the names of the members of the North Atlantic Trading Company, but those of the gentlemen with whom these other gentlemen had dealt five or six years before—he would have been sworn to secrecy. He dare not tell us that he had been trapped and misled, and we would have all been sitting here like boobies behind him, knowing nothing about it. I deny that the names of the members of the North Atlantic Trading Company were ever offered to the leader of the opposition, If they were, I do not understand the English language as I read it in 'Hansard'. Another thing: These men mentioned as having done business with Mr. Smart and Mr. Preston and the government in 1899, Mr. Smart himself, in his evidence, stated positively were only in business a few months. Therefore they were out of business for five years before the North Atlantic Trading Company came into existence at all; so that I either misunderstand the English language very much or there is some great mistake.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE (South Perth). Mr. Speaker, this debate has travelled over considerable time, yet its continuity is very much broken. The hour is late, and there are a number of members who would yet like to speak. Perhaps the House will al-

low me to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

THE EASTER ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FIELDING. The House on Thursday last passed a resolution that when the House should adjourn on Wednesday, the 15th, it should stand adjourned until the following Tuesday. If we followed that resolution, the House would sit to-morrow, and at the close of sitting, the Easter recess would begin. But during to-day's sitting several hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House have expressed a desire that we should not meet to-morrow, which is a short day, as a good many desire to go by the early trains so that at the best we would have a slim House and a short day. Anticipating that in responding to that suggestion we shall meet the wishes on both sides of the House, I would now move :

That the resolution of Thursday, April 9, respecting the adjournment of the House on Wednesday the 15th be rescinded.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that this is being presented with the unanimous consent of the House.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING. I would now move :

That when the House adjourns this day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday the 21st instant.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will be taken up on the day the House resumes ?

Mr. FIELDING. It was anticipated that we would proceed immediately with this debate ; but an intimation has been given by hon. gentlemen opposite that it may suit the convenience of the House that on Tuesday, when the House resumes, we take up some routine business and let the debate stand over to the following day. In the absence of the Prime Minister I would not wish to make any definite arrangement ; but we hope to arrange accordingly.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.58 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, April 21, 1908.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. RALPH SMITH moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 157) to amend the Railway Act.

Mr. G. H McINTYRE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Explain.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. The object of this Bill is to provide for an 8 hour day for despatchers and operators on the railways of Canada. This matter was put into my hands by the parliamentary representative of the railway men. but too late for anything to be done this session, as I informed them. This class of railway men in this country are prompted to seek legislation of this kind for the reason that the United States Congress has passed a law which came into force on the 1st day of this month, providing a 9 hour day for despatchers and telegraphers. They regard this legislation as important to secure the safety of employees and travellers upon railways by limiting the hours of service of employees. I am strongly in favour of this legislation and am sorry it cannot be passed this session.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On the orders of the day being called, I would like to ask the government whether their attention has been directed to a statement in the public press that Major Hodgins, formerly engineer on the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway, has charged the making of improper classifications on that division, and whether the government propose to make any investigation of the matter in detail ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Upon reading this morning the correspondence to which my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) has just alluded I at once telephoned to the chairman of the commission, Mr. Parent, to ascertain if he had read it also ; but, I was told that Mr. Parent was out of the city to-day. I shall communicate with him as soon as he comes back.

ANGLO-AMERICAN TREATY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to inquire also when it may be expected that the treaty which has been communicated, as I understand, to the Senate of the United States of America will be laid on the table of parliament.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I must inform my hon. friend that up to the present time we have not received that treaty which, I presume, has been communicated to the American Senate in conformity with the constitution of the United States for the concurrence of the Senate with the consent of the president. I may say to my hon. friend that I caused a telegram to be sent

this morning to the British embassy to have this treaty forwarded as soon as possible.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—CIVIC ELECTIONS IN HALIFAX.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) whether any intimation has been given by the officers of his department directly or indirectly to the employees of the Intercolonial Railway at Halifax as to how they should vote at the approaching civic elections. The statement has come to me that certain officers of the government are giving directions to the employees. I desire to know whether it is or is not the policy of the government that the employees of that road should be permitted to vote exactly as they desire to vote without any intimidation or influence whatever by the officers of the railway or of the government.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is the first intimamation that I have had that the employees of the Intercolonial Railway were being interfered with in any way or by any person on behalf of any candidate. The position of the government is that every employee of the Intercolonial Railway shall exercise his rights of citizenship without interference from anybody.

INVESTIGATION OF DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like also to inquire whether counsel have been appointed, as stated in the public press, in connection with the investigation which is to be carried on by Mr. Justice Cassels, who are the counsel, whom do they represent and whether any counsel are to be appointed for the purpose of representing Messrs. Courtney, Fyshe and Bazin, whose report seems to be under review by the investigation now proposed by the government.

Mr. BRODEUR. I may say, in answer to my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden), that Mr. Geo. Watson, K.C., and Mr. J. L. Perron, K.C., have been appointed to assist Mr. Justice Cassels in the investigation. I had an interview some time ago with Mr. Justice Cassels, and he expressed a desire that some lawyers should assist him to carry out the investigation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Have they been appointed at the request of Mr. Justice Cassels ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, he intimated to me that it was desirable that counsel should be there.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. These particular gentlemen were not suggested ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, no particular names were suggested to me. I do not know but that perhaps the name of Mr. Watson was suggested.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister did not answer a part of my question which was as to the appointment of counsel to represent Messrs. Courtney, Fyshe and Bazin as their report seems to be under review in this proposed investigation.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, I do not think that their report is under review in this case or that their report will have to be particularly investigated except that they have made some representations in their report and the investigation will be based upon those representations.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Possibly I may have misread the order in council. I will take it up again at a time when it can be discussed.

MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPARTMENT—OFFICERS SUSPENDED.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to inquire also what is the present status of the three officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries who have been suspended. Are they still under suspension and is their fate dependent upon the investigation which is to be made by Mr. Justice Cassels, or is it dependent upon some investigation which is being made by the minister himself, or, if not dependent upon either one or the other of these tribunals or investigations, what is the attitude of the government in regard to the matter ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The order of suspension respecting one of them has been removed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Which one ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Owen, who was suspended long before the report of the Civil Service Commission was brought down. The two others are under suspension for the reason given the other day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister has not answered my question as to whether or not their fate is to be determined by the investigation before Mr. Justice Cassels or is it to be determined by the investigation, which I understand, is being made by the minister himself.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not come to any decision in regard to that yet.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is still open ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the investigation to be made by Mr. Justice Cassels to be an investigation with open doors or closed doors ? Is it to be a public investigation ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know. It is a matter for the judge to decide. I have not discussed this question with him.

Mr. BERGERON. The Minister of Marine has answered that Mr. Owen was relieved on suspension. Are we to understand by that, that he has been discharged, or that he has been granted his pension, or, that he has been taken back to the department. What is the meaning of that answer?

Mr. BRODEUR. He has applied for leave of absence.

Mr. BERGERON. What does that mean?

Mr. BRODEUR. He has applied for leave of absence and he is not coming to the department now.

Mr. BERGERON. Does that mean that he is going to be discharged, or superannuated, or taken back to the department when his leave of absence expires ?

Mr. BRODEUR. He has applied for leave of absence and has asked for his superannuation.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is it not a fact that an order in council has already been passed granting his superannuation ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Has a recommendation been made ?

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to call the attention of the government to certain returns which I moved for some time ago and which have not yet been brought down. They are as follows :

Moved for.	Votes and Proceedings, page.
Quebec bridge, December 12.. ..	56
Naval station at Esquimalt, January 13..	94
Wharfs, &c., January 13..	94
Public buildings, January 13.. ..	95
Metlakatla and Songhees Indian Reserves, March 23..	350

I would like to have the returns expedited.

DOUKHOBOR PRISONERS AT FORT WILLIAM.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the government a question with regard to an intimation in the Montreal 'Gazette' of this morning in connection with the Doukhobors at Fort William, which is as follows :—

Magistrate Palling, of Fort William, who passed the Central Prison sentence upon the nineteen who are now in jail, received a telegram from A. Power, Deputy Minister of Justice at Ottawa, asking him to recommend a pardon preparatory to their being taken back to Saskatchewan. Mr. Palling will agree to whatever arrangements are made by the Ontario or Ottawa governments and will recommend the pardon. The following are the telegrams which were received by the magistrate, the second being received before he had time to answer the first:

The Minister of Justice requests that you will be good enough to send immediately report upon case of ten male and nine female Doukhobors committed by you to Port Arthur jail.

Please report pardon for Doukhobors now in Port Arthur jail preparatory to their being shipped back to Saskatchewan, where they came from.

I would like to ask whether the statement regarding the telegrams is substantially correct and whether it is true that the government have pardoned or contemplate pardoning these male and female prisoners who have been sentenced for a grave offence against public decency. If it is true that they intend to pardon these prisoners——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can merely put a question ; that is all.

Mr. LAKE. I thought I was putting a question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No argument must take place.

Mr. LAKE. Is it true that they contemplate sending these people to the province of Saskatchewan ; if so, on what grounds, under what authority and at whose expense will they be sent ? Will they undertake the responsibility for the good behaviour of these people in the province of Saskatchewan if they send them there, and all expenses in connection with them should they again misbehave?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is rather an involved question, and my hon. friend had better give notice in the regular way. As to giving bonds for the good behaviour of these people, I am afraid that is more than we can undertake to do.

Mr. LAKE. Can I ask one question; Under what authority do the government propose to send these people back to the province of Saskatchewan?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend puts his question in due course I shall give him the answer also in due course.

MR. WATSON, K.C.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). May I ask if Mr. Watson, K.C., who has been appointed to assist Mr. Justice Cassels in the Marine Department investigation, is the same Mr. Watson who a few years ago acted as counsel before a commission appointed to investigate a provincial election in the riding of West Elgin in the province of Ontario?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I do not know anything about that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You never heard about it?

Mr. NORTHRUP. The Minister of Marine is the one man in the Dominion who does not know about it.

BRITISH COLUMBIA FISHERIES.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Nanaimo). Before the orders of the day are called I draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to an item in this morning's issue of the 'Citizen,' and I wish to ask the minister if he has any information to give in connection with it. The item is as follows:

Province takes charge—Legal clash imminent between British Columbia and Ottawa.

Vancouver, British Columbia, April 20.—Attorney General Bowser announces that the conferences with Mr. Bastedo, sent here by the Dominion government to adjust the fishery differences with the province, have proved fruitless. The provincial government, therefore, will take charge of the fisheries under the decision of the Privy Council and a legal clash with the Dominion is immediately expected. The Dominion government proposed, a short time ago, that the province should relinquish its interests in the fisheries to the Dominion, the latter to pass all regulations and not pay the alleged share of the province in the revenue under the agreement made seven years ago, the Dominion to recoup the province for its expenditures in the hatcheries, &c.

Mr. Bowser declined to agree to this and insisted that before a settlement could be considered, payment should be made of the alleged share of the revenue due to the province. Mr. Bowser also wanted a local joint administrative board appointed, with one provincial nominee, and, third, that more consideration be given to halibut.

The Victoria government will immediately enforce its jurisdiction by issuance of licenses to fishermen, five dollars to each boat, good to the entire province.

The present Dominion regulations provided licenses of $11 per boat and good only on the river on which it is issued, the open season on the Fraser to be July 9 to August 5, with closed season August 5 to September 15.

Mr. Bowser says the salmon industry is in great danger of depletion. In the last nine years there has been a steady depletion in the salmon run, ranging from 22 to 59 per cent. Mr. Bowser added: 'Of course, from now on the modus vivendi hitherto existing between the Dominion government and ourselves will be terminated, and we expect that the moneys collected from the source of license fees will hardly be sufficient for the work we propose to do in the way of properly maintaining our fisheries.

Can the minister inform us if the facts are as represented here?

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Bastedo arrived in Ottawa this morning and he has reported orally the result of the different conferences with the representatives of the British Columbia government. He has discussed with me some claims which have been made by the British Columbia government, and these are now receiving the consideration of the government.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC CONSTRUCTION—ACCIDENTS.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT (Bellechasse). I wish to draw the attention of the government to a great disaster which has taken place in my county in connection with the construction of the Grand Trunk Transcontinental Railway, and by which nine men have been killed and three seriously injured. Is it the intention of the government to give instructions to the commission in charge of the construction of the Transcontinental Railway that measures should be taken to prevent further disasters of that kind?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). This matter was discussed in the House the other day, and I have asked for certain information. I have been told that taking into consideration the number of yards of rock being excavated the accidents on the Transcontinental Railway are less than on any other road ever constructed on this continent.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The number of yards of rock that have been taken out or that are to be taken out. The minister's statement is equivocal.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is not equivocal to any one who does not wish to make it so. What I stated was, that taking the number of yards of rock already excavated the number of accidents have been less than on any road on this continent. I look upon this as a very serious matter and as well worthy the close attention of the government, and I am seeking further information. As I understand it, the accident referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Talbot) was caused by a premature explosion. In discussing this matter with railway men and others of experience I find that their conclusion is that these accidents are largely due to the carelessness of the men who become so accustomed to that class of work that they neglect to take precautions. The difficulty about this sort of accident is that the witnesses from whom we might get evidence as to the cause of the accident are unfortunately killed. The matter is a serious one, and it is not being overlooked.

ENGLISH AND FRENCH ORDER PAPERS.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Some time ago I drew attention to certain irregularities which appeared on the Order Paper, and Mr. Speaker in a casual way said it would be looked into and that the Order Paper would be made right and kept right. I see that exactly the same blunders are repeated in the Order Paper of to-day. I notice under the public Bills and orders,

that the French version follows rule 28 and puts the items down in the natural order, but according to the English version the first order (No. 26) should really be the third order, the second order (No. 22) should really be the first order, and order (No. 30) away down on the order paper, should be the second order. The rule appears to me to be plain enough to get it right. The first order should be: House in committee on Bill (No. 18) An Act to amend the Railway Act (reported as amended). That should be the first order because it is House in committee on an Act to amend the Railway Act as amended. When Bills are amended they should come first after Bills set down for third reading, and sometimes they come first on some order papers and in others they come second, and in others they come third. They ought to be in their regular order as they are taken up by the House. As I say, the second order should be the first because it is House in committee on Bill (No. 18) to amend the Railway Act (reported as amended). Then take the second order should be: House in committee on Bill (No. 4) An Act to amend the Railway Act (reported as amended). On the present order paper these Bills come after Bills which really should be after them. I notice that these errors are happening right along. I take up several of the order papers. In the Order Paper of March 6 I find this item :

Third reading of Bill No. 25, an Act respecting the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company.

The fact is that the Bill did not stand for the third reading, but there was an amendment moved by Mr. Clarke which should have been on the Order Paper, but does not appear there at all. If any one thinks that is not correct, all he has to do is to look at page 4690 of the unrevised 'Hansard', there he will find that a question arose as to whether it was the third reading of the Bill that was before the House or an amendment that had not been disposed of. The question was raised by Mr. Henderson. Mr. Graham said :

I think the discussion now is on an amendment proposed by the member for Toronto (Mr. Macdonell).

Further on, Mr. Brodeur said :

I see that on the 3rd of March it was proposed:

That the Bill (No. 25) an Act respecting the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company, be now read the third time.

Mr. Macdonell moved in amendment thereto, that the said Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of amending section 2 of the said Bill, as follows:

Giving the amendment:

And a debate arising thereon, and the hour devoted to private Bills under rule 25 having expired.

The House went into committee.

Mr. SPROULE

Although that amendment was not disposed of, the Bill was put down on the Order Paper as standing for a third reading. This is not regular and ought not to occur. There ought to be some conference, so that members would not be misled as they frequently are by the Order Paper. Again, I take up the Order Paper of March 9, and I see there this item under private Bills :

House in committee on Bill (No. 32) an Act to incorporate the Bank of Vancouver (reported as amended).

This Bill was not reported as amended, but it was reported as amalgamated with another Bill. Then I take up the Order Paper of March 19, and I find a government notice of motion appearing in this way :

In Committee of Ways and Means—the following proposed resolution.

A resolution to be considered in Committee of Ways and Means is never printed on the Order Paper, as it is considered only after the House goes into committee ; but in this case the resolution is printed in the Order Paper as an ordinary notice of motion. That is not in accordance with the rules at all, and is misleading to the House. Then I take up the Order Paper of April 9, and I find the following as item No. 3 :

House again in committee on Bill 135, an Act to amend the Immigration Act.

That should be the fourth order, and the fourth order should be the third order. In the Order Paper of Friday, April 10, I find exactly the same error as occurs in the Order Paper of to-day. It seems to me the Order Paper should be made in accordance with a fair interpretation of the rules, and not in a way to mislead the House and to cause our business to be carried on in an unseemly and improper way.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend called the attention of the House to this matter a few days ago. I cannot speak as to past errors, but so far as to-day's order is concerned, I understand that there is a variation between the French Order Paper and the English Order Paper.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. For my part I am glad to know—and perhaps my hon. friend will share the pleasure—that it is the English Order Paper that is wrong and the French Order Paper that is right.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the case.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The proper officer will no doubt try to have the matter regulated properly for the future, and I shall be glad to second my hon. friend's efforts in seeing that the French have their rights respected in this House.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Speaker, the same matter was brought before the House by myself about four months ago, and the very same answer was made by my right hon. friend. When the question was brought up again the other day, my right hon. friend answered, I understand, that the matter was in the hands of the officers of the House, and the speaker said that he would see to it. There is only one way to have the Order Paper made correct, that is, to bring together the French officer in charge of the French paper and the English officer in charge of the English paper, and have them understand that one copy must be as correct as the other. In this case I understand that the French Order Paper is correct and the English Order Paper is not correct. The English paper could be made correct if it had to be translated from the French. I may say that some of the papers in the country took a very extraordinary view of the position taken by my hon. friend from East Gray (Mr. Sproule), chaffing him for appearing to be defending the French orders of the day. I need not say that he is defending not the French orders of the day, but the rules of the House, though he said with impartiality that the French Order Paper appeared to be right.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have no authority over this matter, but it is for Mr. Speaker to see that the proper officer attends to it.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. BENNETT. On the 13th inst., the Minister of Public Works promised to lay on the table on the following day, the 14th, the order in council and the report of the chief engineer relative to some contracts for dredging. It was not laid on the table on the 14th, but the minister promised to lay it on the table the next day. As however the House adjourned the next day, there was no opportunity for him to do so. I would ask him now if the report shall be placed on the table to-day together with the order in council or a copy.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said I would lay the order on the table preparatory to a discussion which the hon. gentleman desired to undertake with regard to dredging. He went on with the discussion, however, without waiting until a copy was made. The hon. gentleman will also remember that I said that the question of extending the time for the completion of certain dredging works was under consideration. I said the order in council had been passed authorizing me to extend the time, if I so decided, but that I had not decided. Without waiting until I had announced my decision, the hon. gentleman precipitated a discussion. Since then I have decided not to extend the time for the completion of the works mentioned by the hon. gentleman and by myself, but have decided to ask for new tenders. Therefore it will not be necessary to submit the order in council. That order in council has in fact been rescinded.

Mr. BENNETT. How many works were to be embraced under that order in council ? I have some information by correspondence from various quarters since then, and I am advised that not only Victoria harbour and Midland but a dozen other works were embraced under this order in council.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The matter is entirely immaterial because the order has been rescinded.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not agree that it is immaterial, and as the minister has promised to bring the order down, he is bound to do so, and it will be wise for him to do so.

Mr. BENNETT. I have this to add——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I cannot allow any debate on this question.

PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN SCHOOL STATUTES.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny) I wish to move the adjournment of the House to discuss a question of great urgency. I refer to the Statutes of the province of Saskatchewan, 1907, Chapters 2 and 25, concerning which I put certain questions to the Minister of Justice on the 13th April and received certain replies.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne) has put a statement in my hands, in compliance with rule 37 of our Rules and Orders. Section 4 of that rule provides that a member who desires to make a motion to adjourn for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent public importance must hand a written statement to the Speaker who, if he thinks it in order, reads it out and asks whether the member has the leave of the House. I have some doubts as to whether this is a question of urgent public importance, and I would like the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lavergne) to state his reasons.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. What is the written statement he gave you ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The written statement which the hon. gentleman put in my hands is as follows :

That it is urgent the adjournment of the House should be moved in order that the House may consider chapters 2 and 25 of the Saskatchewan statutes, 1907, and a certain declaration regarding the same made by the hon. the Minister of Justice on April 13 last.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. The Minister of Justice said that he would not have disallowed the statutes had they been brought to his notice, and the delay for disallowing expire to-morrow. There can therefore be no clearer case of urgency.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I have very serious doubts that the matter is urgent since the House has been in session for four months and it could have been brought to our attention at any time. However I shall not press the point.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Has the hon. gentleman leave to move the adjournment of the House ? Those in favour will please rise.

And more than twenty having risen, the Speaker notified Mr. Lavergne to proceed.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I am sorry to take up the time of the House at this stage of the session, but I shall be as brief as possible. I am sorry also that the government did not see fit to consent to a discussion of the question without any reservation. On the 13th of this month, I put the following questions to the government :

1. Is the government informed that chapters 2 and 25 of the statutes of the province of Saskatchewan, 1907, intituled, respectively, 'An Act for raising money on the credit of general revenue fund of Saskatchewan,' and 'An Act to provide for the organization and maintenance of secondary educational institutions,' contain provisions contrary to the educational clause of the law of Autonomy for the province of Saskatchewan, 1907?
2. Does the government know that the delay for the disavowal of these laws expires the 22nd April next?
3. Will the government disallow these statutes?

To this the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) replied as follows :

To question 1, no ; to question 2, yes ; to question 3, no.

I do not think that the Minister of Justice, in the whole course of his political career, was ever so clear or so brief. If I analyse these replies, I find that the government, in the first place, did not know whether these statutes were illegal or not, and, in the second place, would not in either event disallow them. These statutes might be ultra vires or intra vires, the province of Saskatchewan might have the right to pass them or not, this government would not take the trouble to inform itself and had no intention of disallowing them.

Mr. BERGERON. They did not care.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. That is what it amounts to practically. We have had the right hon. the first Minister of Justice telling us that these statutes had been passed a considerable time ago and had never been brought to the attention of parliament and that consequently there was no urgency. Well, I am not the Minister of Justice—and at times I am sorry for the minority in the House and the country—but the moment the matter was brought to my notice I took the trouble to look up the statutes and find out whether they were illegal or not. It seems to me rather strange that when a member of the Catholic minority, which comprises about 41 per cent of the total population of the Dominion, puts a question concerning the most sacred interests of that minority and even the rights of this parliament, which passed the law giving the province of Saskatchewan its autonomy, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) does not take the trouble to consider whether the statutes passed by that province are in contravention of that autonomy law and consequently should be disallowed. But on the other hand, if a province in the west thinks fit by statute to exclude from its own limits Asiatic immigration and determines to remain a white man's country, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) has no hesitation in disallowing any such law without waiting for any one to put him a question regarding it in parliament. More than that, the correspondence brought down with reference to the Japanese treaty shows that the government promised the Japanese consul that they would disallow the laws of British Columbia even before they were passed, when they had simply been mentioned in the speech from the Throne. Thus, the situation is that it has come to pass that 40 per cent of the Canadian nation are less in the estimation of the government than a few Japanese yellow citizens who are coming to this country against the will of a whole province.

Were these statutes ultra vires? Of course it is not my place to answer and I shall not attempt to give a definite answer; it would be for the Minister of Justice to state whether they were or not. He did not think it expedient to answer the question or necessary to examine the statutes; he was prepared to disallow them without even knowing what they contained. He will find that in this case a report has been made to the government of Saskatchewan more than six months ago and it appears that he reported to that government without even knowing what was contained in the statutes. As I have said I do not know, and I would not express a legal opinion as to whether these statutes are or are not illegal. I do know that when the statutes were passed and certain taxes were raised in Saskatchewan, a certain portion of the population, the Roman Catholic taxpayers, refused to pay the taxes imposed under chapter 2 and chapter 25 of the statutes of Saskatchewan. Cases were entered before the courts. The courts did not decide the cases, I think the election of the Attorney General of Saskatchewan took place before the cases were concluded and they were not pushed to a conclusion, somebody paying the fine which was asked from the Catholic taxpayers. Whether the fine was paid by the taxpayers or by friends of the government or by friends of the opposition I do not know and shall not say.

It is certain that, judging from what has taken place, the minority in Saskatchewan felt that these statutes were infringing on the rights granted to them by the constitution of 1907. If we look at the debate of 1905 on the Autonomy Bill of the Northwest in this House we will find at page 5984, May 15, 1905, the then Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Fitzpatrick) described the privileges left to the minority in the Northwest in this way:

1. Right of separation—by the ordinance—common to Protestants and Roman Catholics alike;
2. Half-hour religious instruction—by ordinance—to Protestants and Roman Catholics alike; common to public and separate schools.

He then goes on to describe the rights which are left to the separate schools and says :

4. Right to elect trustees, who choose the teacher—by ordinance; common to all schools.

It may be objected that the statutes passed by the Saskatchewan legislature concern especially secondary and not primary schools; but I have carefully examined the British North America Act and the statutes of interpretation and find nothing making a difference between schools for primary and for secondary education. By chapter 2 of the statutes it is provided that the population may be taxed for permanent public improvements authorized by the legislature, after the first day of September, 1905, and by chapter 25 of the statutes of Saskatchewan, we find among these improvements, high schools. The law at first sight appears to permit the high schools to be established without any separation and we see nothing there granting separation to the minority if it wishes it in a public district. You will see also that they have the right to choose all text books, which is contrary to the law of the Dominion passed in 1907. They have also the right to choose trustees and it is enacted that the population may be taxed for the maintenance of their high schools, even if they want to have a separate school of some other kind, and that no municipality can exempt them from those taxes.

Therefore I shall not say that the statutes are unconstitutional, but I may say that they have a strong flavour of being unconstitutional and contrary to the educational clause of the Act passed by this parliament in 1907. The least we should expect from the Minister of Justice was that before stating that he would not disallow these statutes he would have looked into them, would have had a report made upon them and have had the opinion of his officers as to their constitutionality. He said before the House that he would not disallow them even without looking at them; so it has come to this that in this country the Catholic minority is considered by the Department of Justice and this federal government to be less important than the yellow allies who come from the extreme orient. If this is the spirit which is to be maintained in our confederation, I may say that our confederation has seen its best days. It is time that the rights of the minority should be a little more respected and also that when there is some doubt about the rights of the minority or when those rights are placed in jeopardy, the Minister of Justice who is the natural guardian of the rights of minorities should take the trouble to glance over the country and see whether or not the laws of any province are against the rights of the minority, I care not if it is the Catholic minority of the other provinces, or the Protestant minority of the province of Quebec. A thorough examination of these statutes would be only common courtesy on the part of the government towards 41 per cent of the population of Canada. But it is more than that; it is a matter of the future prosperity of our country, because while it may not be the opinion of the entire province of Quebec now, it is the opinion of the entire youth of that province, of the men who are in the colleges and universities and who will come out from them to-morrow or the day after to-morrow. If the confederation is to go on in this way with a superior race and an inferior race, a superior religion and an inferior religion, confederation has seen its best days. The youth of our province are loyal to our confederation but they want it to be remembered in this parliament and in the country that they are a part of the confederation in the terms of equal partnership.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I have to express my regret that my hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. A. Lavergne) should have found in the answer which I gave last week to the question he put, anything of discourtesy or of too brief a nature in the circumstance that I answered in monosyllables. My hon. friend's question was propounded in the French language, and he translates it as inquiring whether or no the government is informed that the chapters of the statutes of the province of Saskatchewan to which he refers are contrary to the provisions of the Constitutional Act known as the Autonomy Bill. I cannot pretend to be acquainted with the niceties of the French language, or to be able to appreciate exactly the meaning of the French phrase in which the question is couched. I certainly understood it to be somewhat the equivalent of the English phrase, Is the government aware. I did not for a moment understand it as meaning, Has the government taken pains to inform itself. If the question had been put in the latter form, if the question had the meaning, Has the government endeavoured to ascertain, or, Has the government taken any means to find out or to

inquire, I can assure my hon. friend that the answer would have been the very reverse of the monosyllable. No. Understanding the question to be, Does the government consider, or, Is the government aware that the statutes of the province to which reference was made, are ultra vires of the provincial legislature, or are contrary to the provisions of the Autonomy Bill, I answered, No, meaning exactly what I said, that the government was not aware that anything appearing in the provisions of the provincial statutes in question was in any way opposed to the provisions of the constitutional Act of the province. I disclaim therefore any sort of intention to give a short or curt answer to the very important question which my hon. friend propounded.

I can assure my hon. friend, and assure this House, regretting, Sir, that it should be necessary to do so, that the most careful consideration was given to both of the statutes to which he has now especially referred. So far from it being the fact that the government, or the Minister of Justice, disdained taking the trouble to inquire whether these statutes contained in them anything ultra vires of the legislature of the province, or anything contradictory to the constitution of that province, I can assure my hon. friend that the whole subject was one of anxious consideration. The report of the Minister of Justice upon the constitutionality of the statutes of the province of Saskatchewan was prepared and was adopted by His Excellency in Council some six months since. These statutes were received by the Secretary of State on the 22nd of April, 1907; the time for consideration of the question of disallowance or non-interference counts from the date of their receipt. To-day is, I take it, the very last day upon which action could be taken in the way of disallowance by His Excellency, if he were to be so advised. From the time when these statutes were received twelve months ago, knowing that any quesion of interference with the legislation of a provincial legislature was one of delicacy, was one of importance, these matters were under careful consideration. In October a conclusion was come to, and in October a report was made, no special reference appearing in that report one way or the other to the two particular chapters my hon. friend has singled out as possible objectionable.

Now when these statutes come themselves to be examined what do we find? My hon. friend has examined them from his standpoint, no doubt with the most anxious care. My hon. friend is himself an advocate, a professional man of distinction. He represents in this House the minority of which he is a member, and looking at these statutes with the critical eye which in these circumstances we must anticipate, he tells us to-day that he cannot say there is anything illegal in them, that the most he can say is that he considers they have a decided flavour of illegality about them. Well, Sir, I need not say to my hon. friend as a legal gentleman that statutes are not to be disallowed for a flavour, that statutes are not to be disallowed unless there is an actual illegality. Nay, speaking for myself, and entertaining the views I personally entertain upon the question of interference with provincial legislation by His Excellency in Council, I would almost go the length of saying that unless it could be clearly seen that in legislating upon a particular subject a provincial legislature had overstepped the limits of the jurisdiction which is conferred by section 92 of the British North America Act upon provincial legislatures, there ought not to be interference with their legislation by His Excellency in Council. It is perhaps not in accordance with precedents, it very probably is not in accordance with the views expressed by the fathers of confederation in their discussion of this question of disallowance, that there should not be any supervision over the Acts of provincial legislatures at the hands of the government of the Dominion in the way of considering 'the advisability, the propriety, or even if you like, the inherent justice or injustice of a particular measure. But, however that may be, certainly, considering statutes of the charter to which reference is made to-day, the only inquiry, I take it, for His Majestys' legal advisers to make is whether or not the province, in what its legislature has done, has overstepped its constitutional limits, or has legislated about a matter in regard to which the province has no authority to legislate at all. Now in that respect I can again assure my hon. friend that the most anxious consideration was given, not merely to the particular chapters of the volume of legislation from the legislature of Saskatchewan to which he has referred, but to every chapter and to every clause contained within the two covers of the bound book in which those statutes appear. That is of necessity, that is the very purpose for which a period of one year from the receipt of these statutes is given by the British North America Act, in which their validity falls to be considered by the advisers of the Crown in Canada. But in these cases I have simply to say that I reached precisely the same conclusion that my hon. friend has expressed when he said that he cannot say that there is any illegality about them. I cannot go with my hon. friend in the remainder of the opinion he has expressed, where he tells us that he thinks there is some flavour of illegality about them. I cannot detect even the flavour that he thinks he finds somewhere lurking about the provisions of these statutes. He has not explained wherein that flavour consists, and speaking for myself I certainly am not able to find its presence.

It perhaps is not advisable or desirable

that there should be a discussion of those provisions in the circumstances which exist here to-day. It could serve no practical end that I am able to perceive. My hon. friend has, however, referred to chapter 2 of the statutes, an act for the taxation of every individual within the province, and because there is no express provision in that legislation with regard to the separate schools of the province, my hon. friend thinks, or if I understand him, inclines to the opinion, that there is some flavour of illegality about the measure. Surely it is not to be said that in every possible Act which the legislature of Saskatchewan or Alberta may pass there must always be a careful expression of the rights which are secured to the minority in these provinces in educational matters by the provisions of the Autonomy Bills. If I understand my hon. friend correctly he would think that no legislation which could be passed by the legislature of either of these provinces could have effect or could escape disallowance unless there was some special exception or provision made in it in regard to the educational clauses of the Autonomy Bill. These pieces of legislation must be read together. Effect is to be given to any legislation of the Dominion or of a province if effect can properly be given to it, if a meaning can properly be assigned to the language which has been used by the legislature, which meaning is not in conflict with the provisions of the law under which the power to legislate is conferred, and if this statute is susceptible of a meaning which will give full operation to its provisions without there being, of necessity, any conflict with the constitutional Act under which the legislature is passing the law, then the statute ought not to be disallowed and ought not to have any interference with it. It was in these views that the report was made which I have already alluded to and which, making no special reference to either of the two enactments which have been referred to, recommends that the statutes of the province shall be left to their legal operation.

Now, my hon. friend finds something wrong on the part of the Minister of Justice and of this government in what he assumes to have been the attitude of the government in regard to legislation of the legislature of British Columbia upon a most important question, and he said that promises had been given that it should be disallowed and that there had been undue haste in the disallowance of it, if I understood his observations correctly. Surely my hon. friend is entirely, for the moment, forgetting the fact that there has been no disallowance of the British Columbia legislation to which he refers, that it has been, by the courts of the province itself, declared to be beyond the power of the legislature of British Columbia and that it has not been interfered with in any way by His Excellency in Council.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Does my hon. friend say that no statute of British Columbia has been disallowed?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. It is, Mr. Speaker, upon the minutes, upon 'Hansard,' upon the records there, in answer to a question put by my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Smith), that in the course of the last ten or twelve years there have been no less than five statutes of the province of British Columbia disallowed, but I am answering to my hon. friend that there has been no disallowance of the statute to which he refers, a statute passed by the legislature of British Columbia within the last few months. On the contrary, that statute was the subject of proceedings in the courts of British Columbia and within the course of a few weeks after it had been assented to was held by the courts of British Columbia to be ultra vires the legislature which had passed it. Under these circumstances the illustration which my hon. friend has selected as the means of showing that there has not been, in his judgment, due attention paid to the interests of the highly important minority for which he purports to speak is, I think, an unfortunate illustration and is certainly one that has no application in so far as I am able to see.

My hon. friend accuses me, and I regret that he should think that there was any cause for the accusation, of some feeling, if I understood him correctly, of illiberality towards that ancient faith to which he gives adherence. Let me remind him that it is only a few days ago, that, across the floor of this House, as I saw next day by 'Hansard,' although I did not hear it at the time, I was accused, as if it were a reproach, that I too had been called a Roman Catholic. I think, under these circumstances, my hon. friend might have spared me the attack which he has made upon me personally and in respect to which I certainly am not aware that I have given to him or to any one the slightest cause.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Mr. Speaker, I never thought that the position taken by some of us with regard to the Autonomy Bill a couple of years ago would be vindicated so soon. When the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) brought down the measure to grant autonomy to the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan there was, in the first instance, incorporated in that measure clause 16 which was in accordance with what we thought to be the constitution of the Northwest Territories as embodied in the statute of 1875, and which gave to the minority of these provinces entire autonomy and the rights and privileges to which they were entitled. But, for reasons best known to himself and which were disclosed to this

House by the retirement of one minister and by the protest of another the right hon. gentleman brought down clause 16, No. 2, which was vague and which could produce no other result than that which we have before us now. There were some other hon. gentlemen who, taking a different position from the one that the right hon. gentleman took, or who did not entirely share his opinion, said that it was better to leave these new provinces free to do whatever they desired to do in the future. They were willing to grant these provinces autonomy, having entire confidence in the judgment which they should exercise in time to come. We, myself and others, who were of my opinion, and who were afraid to leave this question in the hands of the new generations coming into the west, expressed the opinion that it was dangerous and stuck more than ever to clause 16, No. 1, which was a repetition of the statute of 1875. Now, we have proof that the position which we took was the correct one. These things are done with a great deal of cuteness. This is the opening of the door to what will happen later on. The hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) knows very well that it is not a question as to whether it is legal or not. It is a question whether the legislatures of these provinces are acting in the spirit in which this parliament granted autonomy to them. Did we mean to say that the minority in these provinces should be entirely at the mercy of the majority? Did we mean to say that the minority in these provinces should have no power, no rights and no privileges? If we did the law passed by the legislature of Saskatchewan is legal, but it is not according to the spirit of the Autonomy Bill as expressed at the time by the majority in this House. Now, the ministers or the government who do act in that way have a very cunning way of going about it. When my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and myself happened to be in the west the Liberal organs in the province of Quebec, which are not at all in partnership with truth, said that we had gone to Prince Albert for the sake of influencing the election at a time when the Attorney General of Saskatchewan was seeking election in that part of the province, I being a French Canadian and a Roman Catholic. It was known to those who wanted to know the truth, that there was nothing in that statement. It had been decided weeks and weeks before it was known that there was to be an election that we should have a meeting at Prince Albert on Saturday night. In the meantime the election was announced. The election was on the very same day we were to have our meeting and our friends, without our knowledge, decided that it would be better to have the meeting the night before so as not to interfere with the election taking place next day. Instead of holding a meeting at Prince Albert on Saturday night we held the Prince Albert meeting on Friday night, and held a meeting at Rosthern on Saturday night. And, Sir, the man who at that time was defending what my hon. friend from Montmagny condemns to-day—and which I think is an act of infamy and a lack of good faith on the part of the Saskatchewan government towards the minority of that province—the man the Saskatchewan government had to defend that measure was a Roman Catholic and a French Canadian. Had we wanted to take any part in that election we could have done so, but we chose not to mention a word about the local election for we were there to discuss federal affairs and we spoke about nothing else but federal affairs. The election of Mr. Turgeon took place the next day. I saw a good many French Canadians on the evening of the meeting who were in favour of Mr. Turgeon because he was a Roman Catholic and a French Canadian. Men I knew intimately said to me: How can we vote against a man of our race and our religion; it is true he is championing what we are opposed to; we do not believe in Prime Minister Scott forcing the Roman Catholics of this province to contribute towards the support of schools to which we shall not be allowed to send our children, but how can we vote against one of ourselves, a Roman Catholic and a French Canadian? I neither answered yes nor no to that because had I spoken my own mind I certainly would have said something that would not please them. And, Sir, this is but the commencement of what is going to happen in Saskatchewan. When this government granted autonomy to the Northwest provinces they knew that thirty years before the minority in these provinces had been promised justice, and promised that they would have respected their rights and privileges in the matter of education. But to-day we have the Minister of Justice approving of a provincial law which will force the minority to pay taxes for schools to which they will not send their children. Is that what the right hon. Prime Minister had in his mind when he changed the first clause, No. 16, for the second clause, No. 16. That was what was probably in the mind of the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) and in the mind of the Minister of Finance, but surely the Prime Minister did not contemplate that. And when the delegate who represents the highest authority of the church accepted the second clause 16 was he told that before a year the government of Saskatchewan was going to give the lie to all the promises which had been made to him, and the minority would be forced to contribute towards the building of schools which their children would not be allowed to attend?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Are we to understand from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ber-

geron) that the amended clause No. 16 had to be submitted to the delegate of Rome before it could be passed by the Canadian government?

Mr. BERGERON. I will tell my hon. friend this, and with his usual intelligence he can draw his own conclusions; I can tell him that when it was decided to substitute the present clause 16 for the original clause 16 it was explained to the delegate. My hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) can draw all the conclusions he wants from that. My hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne) appears to be surprised at all this but I can tell him that I am not a bit surprised. The party which prevented the minority in Manitoba from having their legal rights and privileges could not be expected to give justice to the provinces of the west. It is a most extraordinary thing that when the Manitoba Remedial Bill was before parliament the right hon. gentleman and all his followers from Quebec except seven of them, voted to prevent the Manitoba minority from getting their rights—I am not speaking about privileges now but their legal constitutional rights. And when the question was before the Manitoba legislature and when Mr. Roblin, the present premier of Manitoba, voted against the member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) who was then Prime Minister, and the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) and Mr. Joseph Martin who were taking away from the Manitoba minority their rights and privileges as Roman Catholics and abolishing the use of the French language; when Mr. Roblin told these men that they were stealing from the Manitoba Catholics to act in such a way; when Mr. Roblin, a Protestant, took that course, nearly all the Roman Catholics in the legislature were against him and supported Mr. Greenway. It was a most extraordinary state of things and I direct the attention of my hon. friend from Montmagny to it. It was history repeating itself. It was like the settlement of the New Brunswick school question, when men were fighting there for their very existence and when high dignitaries of the church were accepting the half measure of Mr. Mackenzie. I will tell my hon. friend (Mr. Armand Lavergne) more than that: In Manitoba today, where the Prime Minister of that province, a Conservative, is trying to be as kind as he can to the minority without transgressing the law, does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lavergne) know that it is Roman Catholics of Winnipeg who go over to the Manitoba 'Free Press' and say: Why don't you write against Roblin because he is transgressing the law and allowing the Roman Catholics more privileges than they should have? It is French Canadians and Roman Catholics who are acting like that today. It is a most extraordinary state of things and I direct the attention of my hon. friend from Montmagny to it. The hon. gentleman is astonished but he will see a great deal more than that probably before very long. I want to say one word more. I want to tell the right hon. gentleman that this kind of thing has gone on for some time and that it may go on for some time longer but it will not go on for ever. Just fancy what occurred in this House in 1895 and 1896 in connection with the Manitoba Remedial Bill when a majority of Protestants and Orangemen in this parliament were voting to give their rights to the Catholic minority in Manitoba, and when the Roman Catholics in this House were voting against that measure. That kind of thing cannot last very long. A time will come when these people will discover the insincerity of those men who go to them and say: We are your friends, we think like you, don't you think we will do more for you than will the people over there who are Protestants and Orangemen. A time will come when there will be a stop put to that, and then I fear for the result. I am very glad that my hon. friend from Montmagny has brought this question before the House. It is a matter to which the attention of the public should be called, but the hon. gentleman will find that he will not get much thanks from certain quarters.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is not the first time in this House or out of it that I have seen a Roman Catholic trying to be more Catholic than the Pope, and we have just had an instance of that from my hon. friend from Beauharnois. It is not the first time he has raised discussions of this kind, and that he has availed of every convenient opportunity to say something calculated to spread the very sentiments which he attributes to others. The hon. gentleman tells us that he was in Prince Albert during a certain election and for a certain purpose, and that a meeting which he was to address along with the leader of the opposition and which was to come off on the day of the election at which Mr. Turgeon was running as attorney general for the province, was postponed; not, mind you, till the day after that election but to the day before the election. Of course, the meeting could not take place on the very day of the election, and so it was transferred to the day before election, because it might interfere with polling, which would have been completed two hours before the meeting was held, and so it was transferred to the day before the elections. It could not be postponed till the day after the election, and so in order not to arouse those Roman Catholic prejudicies which he deprecates, or those Protestant prejudicies which he also deprecates, he had his meeting put off till the day before the election. If my hon. friend thinks this is not too thin, he is very much mistaken. He

says that co-religionists of his and of mine told him that they could not vote against Mr. Turgeon because he was a Roman Catholic, but they deprecated the legislation now under review. I take his word, but will my hon. friend permit me to tell him that if there were Roman Catholics in Prince Albert who entertained such sentiments as he now attributes to them, which he says were expressed by them to him, how is it that they proffered their complaint to him who could not do anything in the matter, while the government never heard a word of complaint from them ? My hon. friend says this legislation is a tyrannical invasion of the very rights which have been conferred by this parliament on the minority. That is his complaint. I have to say this to my hon. friend, that from the day this legislation was passed to the present time there has never come from the province of Saskatchewan to this government a single word of complaint against it. With all due deference to the great confidence which the minority repose in my hon. friend, I venture to believe that if they had been so oppressed as he says they were by that legislation, they would have thought proper to proffer that complaint, not to him, but to us. We are asked to disallow this legislation. If there were any substantial minority in the province of Saskatchewan to find fault with that legislation, I suppose they would have done what was done by the minority in Manitoba in 1891, in 1892, in 1893, in 1894, in 1895, when the party supported by my hon. friend was in office. That minority complained to the government and asked for disallowance. The minority in the province of Manitoba had a grievance, and they brought that grievance before the parties who could remedy it. But the minority in Saskatchewan have not asked for the disallowance of this legislation. Under these circumstances I think that these men who went to my hon. friend and shed a tear on his bosom were very poorly advised. They could have done better than that on their own behalf if they had a grievance, a thing of which I have my own doubts. But my hon. friend tells us that this is the result of the measure we gave to the minority in 1905. My hon. friend remembers the legislation that we passed at that time. He knows that it was passed with his concurrence to a certain extent, but not with the concurrence of those who sit beside him. He knows that such questions are always involved in a great deal of difficulty. He knows that the Manitoba question, of which he spoke a few moments ago, was for five years before the government which he supported, and that they never dared in that time to come to a conclusion upon it, and he knows that when they undertook to give the minority a remedy, it was an illusory remedy. He knows that it is impossible to legislate on questions of this kind without arousing the prejudices, the honest prejudices, of either one section or the other. We did the best we could under the circumstances. We thought we gave the minority the legislation to which they were entitled. If I could have done more I would have done it, but I know this, that little as my hon. friend says we did, the minority in the province of Saskatchewan were duly thankful, and no one knows it better than the representatives of that province who sit in this House. Now, it is charged that the legislature of Saskatchewan has already violated the disposition of the statute which we then passed. If such be the feeling of the minority, which I do not believe, what would have taken place ? Before we could proceed on the lines my hon. friend suggests, we would have to consider this question : Is this legislation legal or illegal ? Is it an invasion of the rights of the minority or is it not ? Is it a violation of the dispositions contained in the Act of Saskatchewan or is it not ? Upon this question we have a division of authority. My hon. friend from Montmagny, who has looked into the question, says he cannot tell us whether the law is legal or illegal, whether it is intra vires or ultra vires of the legislature of Saskatchewan. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice, who is an authority on these questions, tells us that he has looked into this matter and he cannot find that the legislation is an invasion of the rights of the minority, and under such circumstances he would not advise disallowance. My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), who is more of a champion of the rights of the minority in these later days than he was in former day, tells us that we should disallow the Act, though the Minister of Justice expresses the opinion that there is no violation of the law. I would expect that the members from the province of Quebec would be chary, and very chary, about advising the government to disallow any Act as to the validity of which there may be even a doubt. We have taken the position, in the province of Quebec and in the province of Ontario, that disallowance is a power to be exercised very sparingly, and unless it can be shown that the Act is absolutely illegal, it should be left to the courts to determine, because the subject is too sacred a one to be lightly treated.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed to say a word.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. With the indulgence of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Spoke.

Mr. BERGERON. I ask only with the permission of the House, but I shall have another chance of doing it, and I will do it better.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. If the hon. Minister of Justice had answered my ques-

tion, which was put as plainly in French as I could make it, and had made only one-half the statement he has made this afternoon, probably this debate would not have taken place. What we might have expected from the Minister of Justice was that he would have said that the government were informed that the statutes were legal, and the debate would have ended there; or that the government were informed that the statutes were illegal and that he would look into the matter. It would have been less curt and less brutal to the minority. The minister knows that I am making no personal attack against him. I have simply taken his answer as he gave it, and it is not the first time he has answered my questions in that way. So long as the curtness of his replies merely reflected on my own personality, or indicated lack of personal regard for myself, I paid no heed to that fact, but when interests more important than my personal feelings are involved, I think it my duty to protest. The hon. minister has accused me of mis-statement when I said that this government had shown no scruple in disallowing statutes regarding immigration passed by the province of British Columbia, and he added that it was not the government but the courts that had disallowed the British Columbia statutes. Well, on the very same day I find this question put by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith):

What number of provincial Acts in all the provinces have been disallowed by the Dominion government since January, 1904, to January, 1908, and in what provinces respectively?

To this question the Minister of Justice replied:

Five; all Acts of British Columbia.

Two of these statutes were to regulate immigration into British Columbia, and these two statutes, with two others following relating to other matters, were re-enactments of statutes which had been previously disallowed and were disallowed again for the same reasons. The minister must admit therefore that I made no mis-statement of fact, and it is evident this government has been more anxious to disallow provincial statutes passed by a province which wanted to exclude undesirable immigration than disallow statutes which take away the rights of the minority. I would just say a word in reply to my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). I know that in this parliament we need not expect that any statute passed by any province will be disallowed out of respect for the rights of the minority. We have seen no such disallowance in the past, I care not under what government, and I do not expect any change in the future. I know therefore that my protest is useless. And as I am not Minister of Justice, I know that my opinion is not worth mentioning, but that opinion nevertheless is that these statutes of the province of Saskatchewan have a strong flavour of illegality, and if not disallowed, the government of that province will be able to tax the minority for schools in which they do not believe and make them pay for schools to which they will not send their children. That is likely to be the result of the autonomy law which was passed in 1907. It seemed to me that that law did protect the minority in that respect but it may not. I was in favour of clause 16, not as it was drafted by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), but as it was drafted by the then Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Fitzpatrick). Unfortunately however when the hon. member for Brandon resigned from the government on that question, the government took fright and allowed him to redraft the clause. I stood with six other members of this House in favour of the clause as first drawn, but the law as it now stands is an accomplished fact and we cannot undo it. My words therefore are useless, but nevertheless I thought it my duty to take the stand I have done, and I hope I can leave my case in safety in the hands of the English speaking majority of this House and country.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

CANNED GOODS ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 147) to repeal the Canned Goods Act.—Mr. Fisher—read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). This is an old statute, passed twenty years ago, which has never been put into effect. It applies to all canned goods, whether sold in the province or not, whereas the Act we passed last year only applies to foreign and interprovincial trade. When we passed the Act of last year, we decided that it would be better to leave the local trade in the hands of the provincial authorities. As last year's Act deals with the matter, there is no reason why the previous Act should remain in our statutes.

Mr. BERGERON. But suppose the local authorities do not do their duty, you will expose the whole province to the danger of having canned goods sold, which are injurious to health.

Mr. FISHER. That point was thoroughly discussed last year, and parliament in its wisdom decided that it would be better for the Dominion not to undertake to deal with purely local trade. My hon. friend seems to intimate that we ought to hold the power to act in case the provincial or municipal authorities will not do so.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. I am not disposed to agree with my hon. friend because if we hold the power the municipal or provincial authorities may take that as a reason for not

themselves acting; whereas if we relieve ourselves of that duty, then the municipal and provincial authorities will have to act. It is almost impossible for a department of this government to deal with these purely local affairs and it is contrary to the general spirit of our constitution. There is no doubt as to the authority of municipal and provincial authorities to deal with these matters of public health and sanitary affairs, while eminent authorities have expressed doubt as to our power to do so. Unless it is absolutely necessary for us to undertake that work, I believe it will be better to leave it in the entire control of those as to whose authority there is no doubt. If we retain the power here to deal with these matters it affords the local and provincial authorities an excuse for their remissness, whereas if we have not the power it is clearly incumbent upon them to take action and the public will hold them responsible if they are remiss.

Mr. BERGERON. Have the provinces the organization and legislation necessary to carry on the work?

Mr. FISHER. They have the machinery in their health officers, market inspectors, &c. I cannot at the moment quote the exact scope of the provincial statutes, but they can, at any time, add to their statutes whatever provisions are required. The provisions of the Act concerning export and interprovincial trade are covered by the Canned Goods Act of last year and therefore there is no necessity for the existence of this Act, especially as the penalties imposed in it are much less than those under the Act of last year and some people maintain that they should be prosecuted under this Act and not under the Act of last year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why, for instance, is it necessary to repeal the section of this old statute requiring that every package of canned goods for local consumption must be stamped with the name and address of the packer?

Mr. FISHER. I have explained to my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) the reasons for doing this, that it was thought better to allow these matters of purely local trade to be left to the local authorities.

Mr. J. D. REID. After this Act is passed, exports will be subject to inspection?

Mr. FISHER. By the Act of last session.

Mr. J. D. REID. According to the Act of last year there was an inspection for interprovincial trade. Now under this Act is that inspection abandoned for local trade or interprovincial trade?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. J. D. REID. For instance, goods manufactured in the province of Quebec and sold to a Montreal wholesale merchant, can they be distributed into other provinces?

Mr. FISHER. Subject to the Act of last session.

Mr. J. D. REID. As I understand it, if they are manufactured in that particular province they would not be subject to inspection?

Mr. FISHER. They are subject to inspection if they go out of the province.

Mr. J. D. REID. Therefore, local trade throughout the Dominion is practically without inspection?

Mr. FISHER. So far as we are concerned, yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. So far as the Dominion government is concerned. I do not see how the provincial governments can carry an inspection into force. For instance, to-day a person can ship an animal from the province of Ontario to the province of Quebec without inspection, and that animal may be diseased. Even if it is a dead animal they can ship it without inspection. For instance, any person in my own county can purchase dead hogs and ship them to Montreal without any inspection whatever.

Mr. FISHER. No, by the Act of last session that has been forbidden up to the present time. If it is not shipped to a packing house which has been declared to be under the operation of that law, it is forbidden.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not see anything in the other Act with regard to false marking the quantity or weight of the package.

Mr. FISHER. Section 17, subsection 3.

Mr. SPROULE. This all applies to exportations.

Mr. FISHER. The whole Act applies to exported articles.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the other would apply either to products for home consumption or to exports.

Mr. FISHER. If the hon. gentleman will read the Act 134, he will find that clause 3 says 'every package of canned goods, &c., in Canada for consumption therein.' It does not apply to exports.

Mr. SPROULE. Then it would apply to a product used for home consumption but not exported. Then if I understand it, chapter 27 does not provide any remedy for false marking the quantity of goods in any package when they are to be used for home consumption. That ought to be provided for also.

Mr. FISHER. I have already explained that so far as the local consumption is concerned, that would come within the purview of provincial or municipal authorities to deal with.

Mr. SPROULE. Don't you do it with regard to butter and cheese? We passed a law here some years ago concerning markings on cheese.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems to me the proposal of the minister is a departure from the policy which has been in force in this country for the last twenty years. This Act was obviously passed for the purpose of protecting public health, among other things. You find it in the revised statutes immediately following the statute which forbids adulteration. You might as well say that the Act respecting adulteration should only apply to articles for export. The minister shakes his head, but that does not settle the matter by any means. Now, why is it that the parliament of Canada, having jurisdiction over public health, should by this statute permit any person throughout the country, so far as this parliament can permit, to put up packages on which the date or the weight, or the quantity may be falsely stated? What particular inconvenience or detriment was the country suffering from the enforcement of this Act for the past twenty years?

Mr. FISHER. It has never been enforced.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That might be a very good reason for enforcing it, but it is not a very good reason for repealing it.

Mr. FISHER. I have explained it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister has explained it, but he has not explained it very satisfactorily to my mind. He says that this is a matter that might be dealt with by the provinces and that it had better be dealt with by the provincial or municipal authorities under provincial laws.

Mr. FISHER. For local purposes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. For local purposes. Is there any particular reason why this parliament, having jurisdiction over public health, should not enforce the provisions of this Act all over Canada? What is the particular reason against it?

Mr. FISHER. I am not quite sure that this parliament has jurisdiction over public health. That is a moot question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, if it had no jurisdiction over the subject dealt with by this statute it has surely no jurisdiction as to the adulteration of food.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What provision of the British North America Act would support the statute in regard to adulteration of food and would not support this?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot say offhand that there is any particular section defining it, but I can only reiterate the argument which was made here last year when the Act was passed that it was unwise for us to undertake local business which was clearly within the purview of the provincial or municipal authorities and which might not be within our powers. I can only say that it is possible that it is not within our powers. It may be within our powers. I am not altogether sure upon that point. There is a question as to whether it is within our powers whereas there is no question as to its being within the local powers. I therefore thought it was better not to undertake to enter upon a work that is clearly and definitely local and in regard to which possibly we might find ourselves without due authority, especially when, as I consider, it is better not to have a mixed authority in regard to any subject. It is better where a subject is clearly and definitely within the purview of one authority that the doubtful authority should not enter into that field.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What brings it definitely within provincial authority?

Mr. FISHER. There is no question about the provincial authorities being able to deal with market inspection, meat inspection and things of that kind in connection with the sale of foods. We all know perfectly well that every considerable municipality provides for the protection of the public health, that municipal authorities, under the provincial laws, have local health boards everywhere. There is a law in the various provinces giving authority to municipalities to provide for the inspection of foods sold within their respective limits.

Mr. SPROULE. But they have no power to analyse.

Mr. FISHER. They can analyse for the purpose of enforcing the law.

Mr. SPROULE. They certainly have no staff for that purpose. The Department of Inland Revenue makes an analysis of food in connection with the enforcement of the Adulteration of Foods Act.

Mr. FISHER. I know that in Montreal there is an analyst who is employed by the board of health of that city and whose special business it is to analyse foods sold there. He is regularly employed, I am inclined to think, on salary, but if not on salary, on fees. I used to know a gentleman who was engaged in that work. Dr. Girdwood was employed for years for that purpose. I know there is an analyst in the city of Toronto, although I cannot give his name.

Mr. SPROULE. That might apply to large cities, but it does not apply to rural districts generally. Under the Inspection of Foods Act, which was passed years ago, the country was divided into districts, and each district had its analyst to whom samples of food might be sent for analysis. The local authorities do not provide for the

analysis of food as far as I know. We have here the weights and measures branch of the Department of Inland Revenue, so that the question of weights and measures must be controlled by us and the inspection must be made by the federal authorities. The Department of Inland Revenue make an analysis of food under the Adulteration of Foods Act to ascertain whether they are adulterated or not. The work in that respect is not duplicated by the provinces in so far as I know. It has always heretofore been understood that the adulteration of food was attended to by the Inland Revenue Department, that it looked after the adulteration of molasses, honey, butter and everything of that kind, and if you drop it here I am quite sure the provinces are not likely to take it up. They have not the machinery that we have to do it, and they are not likely to do it to the extent that the interest of the people requires.

Mr. FISHER. I have not been able to find any instance of the enforcement of this Act during the twenty years it has been on the statute-book. This matter has been attended to by the provinces.

Mr. LENNOX. How does this question arise at this time? We passed the law of last year dealing with the subject and I would like to know whether there have been any protests or representations from any of the local governments. This statute, as I understand it, has been in force for twenty years, and unless there have been some protests from some of the local governments it seems rather peculiar that this question should now arise at all.

Mr. FISHER. The way in which the question arose was that when we were undertaking to enforce the new Act there was some question as to whether the penalties provided by this Act or the penalties under the new Act of last year should apply. A question was raised as to the legality of the prosecution under the new Act. As we did not see that the old Act was of any benefit we thought it better to repeal it.

Mr. LENNOX. The question arose as to the legality of the new Act?

Mr. FISHER. Not as to the legality—I should not say that—but as to which Act the prosecution ought to be taken under.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose that you had the Act under which you were attempting to prosecute, would you not lay the complaint under that statute? I would think that you would lay it under the statute that you were undertaking to enforce.

Mr. LANCASTER. In my opinion the very reasons given by the minister for repealing this Act would be the very best reasons for repealing, or improving the Act of last session and making it apply to the whole trade. Last session I had the temerity to say that the Bill ought to apply to the food that Canadians eat as well as to the food that is shipped out of the country for other people to eat. I have been confirmed in that opinion after having conversed with my constituents and with people in various parts of the country since then and I am bound to warn the minister here, in so far as my humble opinion may be regarded as any warning, that if it is a wise thing, notwithstanding what he says about mixed jurisdictions, for this government to interfere, I think it should interfere in regard to all food and not limit it to the food consumed by a certain class of people. While my hon. friend's inspectors, under the Act of last year are doing their work, while they are seeing that these marks are upon packages of food which are intended for the export trade and while they are condemning food that they find not up to the standard for export, why should this Act not provide that the condemned food shall not be eaten by Canadians? What province is going to create a civil war because the Dominion government should undertake to protect the lives and the health of the people of that province? I believe the Dominion government should do all within its power to guarantee the purity of the food we eat, but, if the Minister of Agriculture is going to say that food for export shall be pure and shall be condemned if it is not pure, why should he be afraid of offending any province by saying that the food which is eaten locally shall also be pure? I have not even a remote idea that any province would raise a question of provincial rights under such circumstances as that. If the Act is not applicable to the conditions it is intended to remedy it ought to be repealed, but if by repealing it you are going to remove the only protection we have to the lives and health of Canadians, then I would certainly be against its repeal. In my opinion the provisions of this measure should apply to the province in which the goods are produced as well as to other provinces or to foreign countries.

Mr. J. D. REID. It is a new thing for the Minister of Agriculture to be so anxious about provincial rights, and I am rather surprised at his anxiety in this case. This is a most important measure and this parliament should do all it can to improve the food products of this country. The minister has not yet been able to show that any provincial government has complained because the federal government is applying this law to all the provinces, and until there is such a complaint I think we should assume that we have power to take measures for the protection of the health and the lives of our people. Under existing circumstances hogs can be shipped for export

to Montreal and if an animal is found diseased his export is prevented, but it can be disposed of locally and given as food to the working people of that city. In the same way the unhealthy organs of an animal are taken out and while the meat would not be allowed to be exported, it can be shipped to Montreal, Toronto and other centres and disposed of there. The Minister of Agriculture knows that in repealing this law he is taking a retrograde step, and I am surprised he should propose to parliament any such measure. The hon. gentleman tells us that a judge cannot tell under which Act he is to impose a penalty, but if there is any doubt as to the jurisdiction of the court it would be a sensible thing for the minister to propose an amendment to the law which would make it plain.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. While the government seems to have one policy with regard to canned food they have an entirely different policy with regard to drugs, because Bill 146, which has been introduced by the Minister of Inland Revenue, contains provisions of exactly the same character as those which the present Bill proposes to repeal. Section 4 of the Inland Revenue Bill says:

All proprietary or patent medicines shall be put up in packages and bottles and every one of them intended for sale or distribution in Canada shall have placed upon it in conspicuous characters forming an inseparable part of the general label the name and number under which the medicine is registered and also the manufacturer's name and address.

Section 7 says:

No proprietary or patent medicine can be manufactured, imported, exposed, sold or offered for sale when it contains any drug which is included under schedule A of this Act and the name of which is not conspicuously printed on the label.

I cannot see any distinction in principle between the provisions now proposed to be repealed and the provisions in chapter 134, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906. The minister says there is some doubt as to our power to legislate as to public health. Wherein is the power contained which enables us to legislate with regard to the adulteration of food; wherein is the power to be found which enables us to legislate respecting proprietary and patent medicines?

Mr. FISHER. I will explain, in answer to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) I may say, that last session we fully discussed the application of the Bill not only to local but to export matters. I want to take straight issue with my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) upon one point. I am sorry he is not in the House, he said what he had to say and then goes away evidently not taking enough interest in the discussion to follow it up.

Mr. LENNOX. He may have a reason for leaving the chamber.

Mr. FISHER. He may be back. I do not think it is the duty of this parliament to supplement or implement the duties of another legislature. I grant that if it is the duty of this parliament to look after the public health, we ought to perform that duty; but I do not think this parliament is called on to do or ought to do what it is the duty of the local legislatures to do; and if the local legislatures are remiss in the performance of their duties, that is not a reason why this parliament should step in and perform those duties. I take direct issue with the hon. gentleman on that point. This parliament would be committing a wrong if it overstepped the bounds of its duty and did what the local legislatures ought to do and are remiss in doing. The local legislatures are simply shirking the question, and the people should hold them to their duty and not call upon another legislature to do that which is no part of its duty. Last session it was clearly understood and discussed, and I think unanimously decided by parliament, that as the provincial legislatures, through their municipal Acts and their health Acts, had full power to deal with these subjects so far as they related to trade within the province, this parliament would not legislate upon them in that respect.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like to ask the minister if he holds that this parliament has not the power to pass such legislation?

Mr. FISHER. No, I do not hold it. I have said, however, that a doubt has been raised on that point.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who has raised it?

Mr. FISHER. A number of lawyers.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the opinion of the Minister of Justice been sought on this matter?

Mr. FISHER. The Minister of Justice said he was not prepared to say positively that we had not the power, but he said that there was a doubt as to our power.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If there is a doubt about it, it seems to me that there is a similar doubt about the Adulteration Act.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think so, because that Act applies to commerce all over the country, both that Act and the Act respecting proprietary medicines. These relate to subjects of general commerce in the country, which are not subject to local restrictions or police regulations.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister is entirely mistaken, as I will show him in a moment.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to point out what I think is the difference. The restrictions in the Adulteration of Foods Act

and the Patent Medicines Act are not confined to any particular locality, but apply to general trade in the country everywhere. The Act passed last session applies to all trade which is not within a province—to interprovincial trade and to export trade; because the provincial and local authorities could not deal with these. But the provincial and local authorities can deal with transactions which are entirely within one province or one locality, therefore it is not necessary for this parliament to deal with them, and I think it is better that we should not do so. Where the provincial legislature can deal with the inspection and sale of food in a locality or within the bounds of the province, I contend that it is the duty of the provincial legislature to deal with it, and if it is their duty, it is not wise for us to step in and do what the provincial legislature is called on by the constitution of the country to do.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister has absolutely convinced me that there is not the slightest ground in anything he has said for the repeal of this Act.

Mr. FISHER. I was not discussing that now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I admit that the minister has confused two things; he has confused the jurisdiction to pass the Act with the expediency or the necessity of continuing it. I will deal in the first place with the question of jurisdiction, which he has explained not to my satisfaction, but in a way absolutely contrary to the position he has taken. He justifies the jurisdiction of parliament to pass the Adulteration Act and the Act respecting Patent Medicines on the ground that these extend to trade and commerce all over Canada. The Act which he is repealing does precisely the same thing, and therefore he has argued most convincingly that this parliament has absolute power to pass the Act respecting Canned Goods. Therefore his suggestion that parliament has not jurisdiction to pass it falls completely to the ground.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend has not understood me at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think I have understood the hon. gentleman a little too well. Let us take up the other argument. Let us not confuse two things; jurisdiction is one thing, the advisability or expediency of passing a statute is another. I find no words in the British North America Act which enables parliament to pass the Adulteration Act or the Act respecting Patent Medicines which would not also enable parliament to pass the Act respecting Canned Goods. Let us now come to the question of expediency. The minister says parliament has no duty in respect of this particular matter because it can be dealt with better by the provinces who will enable the particular municipalities to pass by-laws regarding it. In that connection let me point out that the words in section 92 of the British North America Act 'Municipal institutions,' do not go quite so far probably in the direction the hon. minister suggests as he may imagine. There have been pronouncements of the Privy Council on the construction of those particular works. I find, in the Adulteration of Food Act, that you may not offer milk for sale if a certain quantity of water has been added or certain constituents taken therefrom. How is it that milk is less a matter of local consumption than canned goods or why is it more the duty of parliament to legislate with regard to milk than canned goods? I can see no distinction. If any distinction be made, milk might be regarded as more of a local article than canned goods. So far as expediency is concerned, I can see no reason for eliminating the Act respecting canned goods from our statutes and leaving the Act respecting the adulteration of milk.

Mr. FISHER. The Act of last session covers everything except the local trade and it is only a question of the previous Act remaining on the statutes for the purposes of the local trade. Under the Act of last session we are required to have inspectors wherever the goods to which that Act applies are produced in Canada and sent out from one province to another or to foreign countries.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the difference between that Act and the Adulteration Act or the Act regarding Patent Medicines?

Mr. FISHER. The difference is this. The Act we passed last session regarding canned meats and canned goods requires that we should have inspectors wherever the goods to which the Act applies are produced in Canada and sent from one province to another or outside the country. The adulteration of Foods Act and the Patent medicines Act do not require a complete system of inspection. They are a good deal like the Fruit Marks Act in that respect.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the hon. gentleman dealing with the question of jurisdiction or expediency?

Mr. FISHER. Expediency. The matter was dealt with last session from that standpoint. If we were required to undertake a very complete inspection of all canned meat goods, for local as well as interprovincial and export trade, we would be asking something practically impossible for a department of the Dominion government to do effectively.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Leaving the Act on the statute-book does not bring about any such results.

Mr. FISHER. If it remains, it is in direct conflict with the principle on which the Act of last session is intended to be administered.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not see how.

Mr. FISHER. To this extent The clear intent of the Act of last session is that the local trade is not to be dealt with.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The result of leaving the first Act on the statute-book is simply this. So far as the articles for interprovincial trade or export are concerned, you must have inspection. So far as concerns the articles for local consumption in the province, you would still have prohibition of false labels or statements.

Mr. FISHER. That Act has been on the statute-book some twenty years and has never been enforced, but when we began to enforce the new Act there seemed to be a clash or doubt, because the provisions of the new Act are different for the same kind of offence from those of the old Act. I do not think it matters very much whether it remains on the statutes or not, but it has never been enforced.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It ought to be.

Mr. FISHER. It provides no machinery for its enforcement. It would have to be amended and machinery created for its enforcement, and it would be impossible, unless the Dominion inspectors are to be increased infinitely, for them to undertake to do work which is purely local.

Mr. SPROULE. Then what need was there for clause 10 of the Adulteration of Foods Act which provides for the appointment by the Inland Revenue Department of local inspectors to examine articles of food in any city, township, county or other municipality, after they have passed an examination showing their competence to act as inspectors, on the nomination of the municipality? That is purely local and purely for the safety of health. The Adulteration of Foods Act defines clearly what shall be considered as adulteration.

Mr. FISHER. That is a question of adulteration, not of public health.

Mr. SPROULE. It is an Act respecting the adulteration of foods and other articles, it defines adulteration and provides for these inspectors all over the country. They are local inspectors, but that service is administered by the Inland Revenue Department.

Mr. FISHER. That is not for public health only but for trade and commerce, because they are deceiving the public in pretending to sell something which they are not selling.

Mr. SPROULE. But it is for public health, because it provides for the case of articles injurious to public health; it deals not with export trade but with public health. What does it mean by saying that vinegar shall be considered as adulterated if any mineral acid or vegetable salt having copper or lead as its base has been added thereto? That is adulteration because it is injurious to health.

Mr. FISHER. Partly.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the reason we take it up, we do not say anything about commerce.

Mr. FISHER. Oh, yes.

Mr. SPROULE. No, this is for public health. It is the same with regard to alcohol and milk. Milk to which water is added becomes adulterated.

Mr. FISHER. That is not health.

Mr. SPROULE. It is for the benefit of health.

Mr. FISHER. That is because you are being cheated.

Mr. SPROULE. If you are feeding children on milk represented to be pure which is not pure and you are destroying the health of the infant, because the milk is of less value——

Mr. FISHER. That is it, because it is of less value.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So with canned goods improperly dated, the consumer is getting less value.

Mr. FISHER. No, it is a matter of trade and commerce.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. LAKE. The discussion on this Bill has included the Meat and Canned Foods Act passed last year. Before this Bill passes I wish to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he has made any special provision for such parts of the world as the northwestern provinces.

Mr. FISHER. As soon as this Bill passes I will ask the committee to take up the next Bill which deals with the Meat and Canned Foods Act. I will suggest that my hon. friend wait until that Bill comes up.

Mr. LENNOX. I think that if we are repealing this Act because we have not jurisdiction to deal with it in this parliament, we must repeal a great many other Acts standing in practically the same position. I understood the minister to say that one of the main reasons, if not the reason, for this Act is that a doubt had been expressed as to the jurisdiction of this parliament, and that the suggestion had been made that this was a matter which should

be left within the exclusive control of provincial legislatures, so far as this Act that we now propose to repeal chapter 123 is concerned. I understand the minister to say that this Act had not been enforced as a matter of law, but that it was practically a dead letter. As to that I do not know ; I take it that the Minister of Agriculture has ascertained that to be a fact. But assuming that to be a fact, we must not shut our eyes to this other fact, that as soon as we repeal this Act there will be an intimation to all parties who have found this Act embarrassing, that they are no longer controlled by it as they were before. So we may expect that the evils that sections 3, 4, 5 and 6 were aimed at will probably prevail. I am not innocent enough to believe that the minister has not some reason for wanting to promote this legislation, and I am almost suspicious enough to believe that there are some motives for promoting this legislation that the minister has not seen fit, for reasons of state or otherwise, to divulge to the House.

Mr. FISHER. I have given all my reasons.

Mr. LENNOX. At all events, there is this peculiarity, that we find the minister, who is an astute and clever debater, resorting to arguments which, so far as I can see and as appears to many other members on this side of the House, are not borne out by the facts before us. I commend the minister on the position he has taken, and I suppose he stands alone in the cabinet in that regard, in realizing to some extent the proper limits of provincial rights. I would be glad if other members of the government were more pressed by the desirability of keeping strictly within the limits of our own jurisdiction. I agree with the minister when he says that the failure of a provincial legislature to exercise jurisdiction is no reason why we should usurp it and attempt to legislate. I am with the minister in another respect, that I think we have too much legislation. I am bound to say that the minister who is promoting this legislation is not the least guilty of the ministers in that regard. I often think that if there is anything in which he has conspicuously erred it is in having tried to spoon feed the farmers, and in interfering too much with private and domestic concerns, trying to legislate where no legislation is required. So in this view I am not at all sorry that he is repealing this Act, and I would be glad if he would sweep away a lot of other legislation that he has put upon the statute book recently. But this statute is an old statute of some twenty years standing, and while I agree with him that we are interfering far too much with provincial rights, yet when we have a statute in existence for some twenty years we ought to hesitate very much before repealing it. As regards the difference between this statute and others, such as the Adulteration of Foods Act, I am entirely unable to follow the minister in his reasoning. The Act chapter 144 is, so far as it goes, an Act that relates to every package of canned goods that is put up for consumption in Canada, not in any particular province or locality, or by any particular class of men. Misrepresentations relate to all misrepresentations in Canada. The Act is as general and as broad as Canada itself. When I turn to the statute immediately preceding that, the Adulteration of Foods Act, I find that it is also general in its character relating to questions of health and also relating to questions of trade and commerce. I quite agree with the minister when he says that not only does this Adulteration of Foods Act deal with questions of public health, but it also deals with questions of trade and commerce, with dealings between man and man and that it aims, in addition to protecting public health, at securing honest dealing between parties. So, we have this provision in section 23 :

> Milk from which the cream has been removed by skimming, or by a separator or creamer, may be sold as skim milk, if contained in cans bearing upon their exterior the word 'skimmed' in letters of not less than two inches in length.

Can the Minister of Agriculture point out how that provision is broader or more general in its nature than sections 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the statute which he proposes to repeal ? I am not at all opposed to simplifying legislation and I would not be sorry if we could eliminate some of the provisions of law that the minister has from time to time introduced. I am delighted to find that he is, for the time being, a convert to the principle of provincial rights. The sin of ignoring provincial rights is becoming more prevalent every day and I take this as an intimation that we will have a better state of things soon. Maybe to-night we will have a question of provincial rights before us in another form. I notice that the Adulteration of Foods Act has been held to be intra vires of this parliament in the case of the Queen vs. Stone, so that if we have the power to pass the Adulteration of Foods Act we had certainly the right to pass the other Act. We have legislation with regard to the subject of adulterating maple syrup and sugar which contains a provision that if these articles are not pure there shall be a statement on the can or receptacle that they are adulterated or mixed. I see that the law is observed to some extent at all events and that is exactly upon the line of the statute that we propose to repeal.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood from the minister that one reason why he proposes to repeal this law is that there was some confusion, when prosecutions took place, as to which Act would apply, having regard to the penalties imposed. Could he give

any instance of such a prosecution taking place ?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot give an instance. The deputy minister drew my attention to the fact and told me that that was the case but I could not give an instance.

Mr. SPROULE. When you draw an indictment against an individual do you do it under a certain statute and under a certain clause of that statute? The violation of that clause must have some penalty attached to it in the statute and I cannot understand how there will be any confusion in prosecuting under such a statute as to which penalty shall apply. The penalties in the statute should be the penalties that would apply to a case taken under the statute.

Mr. FISHER. I confess I cannot exactly explain what the difficulty was that arose but I know there was such a difficulty.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Act that the minister proposes to repeal and which deals with canned goods applies to Canada as a whole. Section 12 of the Act of 1907 provides that :

All articles prepared for food in any establishment and packed in cans or similar receptacles, or in any package whatever, shall be subject to inspection during the whole course of preparation and packing; and all such packages shall be marked with—
(a) The initials of the Christian names, the full surname, and the address, or, in the case of a firm or corporation, the firm or corporate name and address, of the packer;
(b) A true and correct description of the contents of the package.

Now this is the provision that I suppose conflicts :

Provided, however, that if it be established to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council that such marking would hinder the sale of any of said articles in the British or foreign markets, he may exempt such articles from the provisions of this section.

That implies that the Act has reference entirely to the export trade. Is there any reason why the minister should not embody in this Bill a clause that would cover the whole of Canada ? There is no objection, as I understand, from any of the provincial governments. It strikes me that there is some other motive than that of simply desiring to repeal the Act, that there has been some influence brought to bear on the government to secure the repeal of the Act.

Mr. FISHER. You are altogether too suspicious.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have reasons to be suspicious.

Mr. FISHER. No, you have not.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Act of 1907 applies entirely to goods that are exported. If a person were brought up for violating the law, as I understand it, no judge would convict him under this Act, because it simply applies to export goods, but a conviction could be secured if the Act which has been in existence for twenty years were retained upon the statute-book. If there has been no complaint from the provincial governments why should not that Act be allowed to stand or else amend the Act of last year in such a way that it will apply to goods consumed in Canada as well as to export goods ? I want the Act to apply to the whole of Canada.

Mr. FISHER. I think my hon. friend had this question pretty thoroughly explained to him this afternoon. I do not think I could explain it any more clearly. I do not know why my hon. friend does not understand it. The imputation of the hon. gentleman that there is anything behind what I said is absolutely without foundation or justification. I have given my reasons and I want the hon. gentleman and his friends to understand that there are no other reasons in my thoughts. It is therefore not right for them to say that I am hiding ideas or reasons. My hon. friend should accept that statement, and it is true. I state frankly to the hon. gentleman that the parliament of Canada decided last year that a clause should not be inserted making this Act apply to local trade within the province.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is because we had an Act that did apply to it.

Mr. FISHER. No, it was not. The hon. gentleman did not know that Act was there.

Mr. J. D. REID. I knew it.

Mr. FISHER. It was not referred to during the whole discussion. The hon. gentleman himself I believe urged that the Act of 1907 should apply to local trade.

Mr. J. D. REID. Why should it not?

Mr. FISHER. Because parliament decided that the Act of 1907 should not apply to local trade and it is not feasible that it should apply to it. The only reason for repealing this Act is that it provides for somewhat the same offences, different penalties and different provisions from the Act of 1907 covering practically the same thing. As a matter of fact, section 134, R.S.C., has been on the statute-books for over 20 years, and it has been practically a dead letter ever since. The Act of 1907 deals with interprovincial and export trade and it is well known that the provincial authorities can deal with the trade within the provinces.

Mr. J. D. REID. There is no reason why both these Acts should not be incorporated into one. The necessity for protecting our Canadian market was discussed last year, and the Minister of Agriculture preferred to have chapter 134 apply to local condi-

tions, and so long as we had that Act it was satisfactory, although I would like to have the whole thing included in the meat and Canned Foods Act. My idea is to protect our own Canadian people as well as foreigners, but the repeal of this Act leaves our people without protection. Even if the provincial governments have laws bearing on the subject, there are unorganized territories under federal jurisdiction, and if for no other reason this Act should be left on the statute-books so that they might be protected.

Mr. FISHER. Is that the only reason the hon. gentleman has?

Mr. J. D. REID. Have I not given other reasons?

Mr. FISHER. So far as that particular reason is concerned, the only unorganized territories are Mackenzie, Keewatin, and as there are not going to be any canned goods put up in these territories for a number of years to come, they are protected by the Act of 1907 the moment canned goods are shipped to them from any of the provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the minister to say that certain clauses of chapter 134, which it is proposed to repeal, are practically repeated in the Meat and Canned Goods Act. Section 17 of chapter 134 provides a penalty for falsely representing the weight in the package or falsely representing the date, and that applies to canned goods for home consumption as well as for export. But if chapter 134 is repealed then the corresponding provision in the other Act would only apply to export goods that are to be sent out of a province.

Mr. FISHER. That is quite right.

Mr. SPROULE. Don't you think it is a very salutary provision to guarantee the date of canning and the quantity in the package? If you repeal chapter 134 there is no enactment to prevent false marking of goods put up for consumption within a province.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend is quite right in saying that so far as the Dominion law is concerned, there would not be any such provision if this Act is repealed.

Mr. SPROULE. They have been depending on the federal law all along.

Mr. FISHER. Although they have been depending on the federal law, it does not provide any machinery for the enforcement of its provisions, and the consequence is that anything that is done under it can only be done by the authority of inspectors provided by provincial Acts for provincial organizations. The Act of 1907 does provide full machinery for the enforcement of its provisions, but it does not provide machinery for the enforcement of the provisions of chapter 134.

Mr. SPROULE. Clause 7 of chapter 134 provides for lodging a complaint before a justice of the peace. That is all the machinery that is required to put the law in motion and to secure the infliction of a penalty. It is the same as many other laws in that respect. Although there may never have been a conviction under the Act, I am far from reaching the conclusion that it is of no value. We know that many laws which provide penalties for doing wrong are the very things which prevent people from doing wrong—they fear the danger of the penalty. How can we tell how many thousands of people have been prevented from falsely marking goods by fear of the penalty provided by this law. The fact that no prosecutions have taken place under it may be only because people knowing that the law was in existence were deterred from violating it to the extent that would bring them under the ban of the law. If this law has been instrumental in preventing people committing these offences, though no prosecution has taken place under it, it would be valuable nevertheless.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend perhaps did not understand what I meant when I said that there was no machinery provided for enforcing this Act. I grant that there is a penalty provided, but there is no machinery for inspection. It was only because the Act of 1907 provided machinery for the enforcement of that Act that anybody found that this Act was in existence, though it was absolutely ignored.

Mr. SPROULE. Under the provisions of this Act inspectors are not so much required, because any one dealing in the article can lodge a complaint before a justice of the peace. If this Act is repealed, I think we ought to go further and amend the Meat and Canned Foods Inspection Act, and make clause 7 of chapter 134, both as to quantity and weight and false marks, apply to goods manufactured for consumption in the country as well as to goods for export. If the minister would amend the other Acts in that respect, I do not think there would be any objection to the repeal of this Act.

Mr. FISHER. No, I would not do that.

Mr. SPROULE. Then I do not think the hon. gentleman is justified in repealing this Act, and I do not think he would do so if pressure of some kind had not been brought to bear upon him.

Mr. FISHER. Nothing of the kind. The hon. gentleman has no right to impute motives.

Mr. SPROULE. I am saying nothing that I have no right to say, and I will repeat it if the hon. gentleman desires. From what

I have heard I have reason to believe that some representations were made from sources that might be interested to have this Act repealed. That is the information I have; whether it is correct or not I do not know.

Mr. FISHER. I would like the hon. gentleman to state what sources they are and from whom the representations were made.

Mr. SPROULE. It may be from the very parties who have not disclosed their aim, and who, because of dread of the enforcement of this Act, dare not embark on the lines which they contemplate doing, and which they will be likely to do when this Act is repealed.

Mr. J. D. REID. Why did the hon. minister not repeal this Act last session?

Mr. FISHER. Because the matter was not then brought to my attention.

Mr. KEMP. In regard to the Canned Meats and Inspection Acts passed last session, has the minister had representations made to him by wholesale grocers in regard to private brands?

Mr. FISHER. As soon as this Bill is passed, I am going to take up an amendment to the other Act, when that whole question will come up.

Mr. KEMP. But the hon. gentleman has had representations made to him from reputable wholesale merchants?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, and I intend to bring up amendments to that Act.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to ask the minister if any representations have been made to him in regard to chapter 134 by any of the parties who put up canned meats or foods for the local market?

Mr. FISHER. Representations were made that the trade did not know which Act to follow in regard to the marks on the cans.

Mr. J. D. REID. Have these representations been made by people putting up canned meats or foods?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, the people who come under the provisions of the Act.

Mr. J. D. REID. By those engaged in the export trade or those engaged in the local trade?

Mr. FISHER. Both.

Mr. J. D. REID. These are the people who have made representations to the minister and have asked that this Act be repealed.

Mr. FISHER. They simply wanted to know what they should do—which Act they should follow. I could not see any advantage in having the two Acts, and I thought the simplest way was to repeal this Act and leave the other in force, and thus avoid confusion.

Mr. J. D. REID. If everything they put up that way is entirely for export, how could this interfere with it?

Mr. FISHER. The two Acts provide for two different markings, and they say they do not know what Act to follow when putting labels on their goods.

Mr. J. D. REID. Why not then have amended the old Act by simply making the markings the same?

Mr. FISHER. No doubt, that would have met that particular point. But there is no object in keeping the Act on the statutes, and I thought the simplest way was to repeal it.

Mr. SPROULE. The Act passed last year applied only to goods manufactured for export or inter-provincial trade and not to products put up for local consumption. If you repeal the first Act, you will have no law to control the goods put up for local consumption.

Mr. J. D. REID. The whole trouble was simply in the marking, and if the minister had simply amended the old Act so as to make the markings exactly the same for the local market as for export and inter-provincial trade, there would be no difficulty. Instead of doing that, he repeals the old Act entirely and leaves the people helpless in those provinces where there is no law now to protect them against the putting up of goods for local consumption unfit to be used. If that is the stand the minister and the government take, I make my protest, but so long as the people understand it, we have done our best.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

MEAT AND CANNED FOODS ACT—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 149) to amend the Meat and Canned Foods Act—Mr. Fisher—read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. LAKE. In the province of Saskatchewan, a number of hogs are slaughtered and sent by the carload to Winnipeg. That has been the custom in years past, but this year, under the regulations of the department, this export business has been knocked on the head, and the farmers have to practically ship the animals alive and take what prices they can get from what is supposed to be a combine in the Winnipeg market. Has the minister considered the possibility of providing some means by which farmers may be able to slaughter at home and have the animals inspected right on the spot and shipped in the old way? Winnipeg is the only large market they have to which they

can ship these products. I am told the regulations have been a source of considerable inconvenience and actual loss to them?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I do not remember having received any representations from the province of Saskatchewan, but the same question has come up in various parts of the country. The difficulty is one for which I have not yet found an adequate remedy. The inspection of the packing of meat is required to secure a reputation for our Canadian meat and canned meats. We know how important the export and the interprovincial trade is in bacon. Our export trade in bacon depends on the enforcement of just such regulations as are provided by the Act of 1907. Without such inspection as is required under that Act, we would in a short time be shut out to a considerable extent, if not entirely, from the English market. We require therefore such an examination of the carcasses as will enable the veterinary officers to declare honestly that the meat packed or put into the cans is healthy. The expert veterinary authorities universally agree that they cannot judge the health of a carcass unless the organs—especially the heart, liver and lungs—are open to their inspection, so that dressed hogs, or hogs shipped without those attachments, cannot be declared honestly by the inspectors free from disease. It is very difficult, if not impossible, to provide machinery by which the trade in carcasses can be safely carried on. I do not say that where those goods are being shipped to a factory not declared to be under the operation of certain clauses of this Act, those clauses would out apply. That meant that only factories dealing in the export trade would be brought under the operation of those clauses of the Act.

Mr. LAKE. Does the Act proscribe the export from one province to another of carcasses which are not intended to be packed, but simply intended for local sale?

Mr. FISHER. The Act does, but the regulations provide that it is only when the carcasses are shipped to a factory which is declared to be under the operation of those sections of the Act that the shipment is forbidden. We found great difficulty because there are more factories in what is called the export trade than we supposed before the passage of the Act, and the result is the change I am now proposing, requiring the exemption of certain factories from the operation of the Act instead of declaring certain factories to come under it. That will make the condition of affairs my hon. friend describes a little more acute, because heretofore farmers in Saskatchewan could ship dressed carcasses of hogs to a packer or to the market in Winnipeg, except to a few factories in Winnipeg declared to be under the operation of the Act. In future they cannot legally ship to any factory unless it has been declared exempt from the operation of those sections. But the farmers may ship to any place that is not a factory, to the local butcher or the market without being interfered with by the operation of those sections. Section 5 of the Act of last session provided for these shipments by farmers.

Mr. BLAIN. They could ship out of the province equally well under that provision?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. In Prince Edward Island there is no factory under the Act. Farmers, knowing that, slaughtered their hogs without meeting the requirements of the Act. When the buyers came down from Montreal last fall as usual to buy hogs, they could not buy them for their factories, they had to return without purchasing, and consequently there was virtually a monopoly among the few buyers on the island, and the price of pork went down with consequent loss to the farmers. There is something wrong in the Act when such a condition could exist under it. The minister should frame an amendment to avoid such a condition. The farmers lost money last year through its operation and the neglect of the government to inform them of the provisions of the law. In fact very little is known in the country of what the law really is. It is possible to find out from the department I suppose, but almost impossible to find out from the statute itself.

Mr. FISHER. When this difficulty in the island was brought to our attention we provided that hogs there could be inspected locally and shipped. It was unfortunate that the farmers there killed their hogs before the Quebec buyers came, as killing in that way they did not comply with the regulations which would have permitted them to ship to factories under the operation of the Act. My hon. friend is speaking a little harshly in saying that we created a monopoly. There was no monopoly ; it happened that certain buyers were not able to buy the hogs for shipment, but others were able to buy them for the local markets.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Is that not a monopoly ?

Mr. FISHER. It prevents outside competition by other buyers, but there is no monopoly in itself. The difficulty was overcome before the end of the season; we arranged to have them inspected locally and shipped. As soon as the situation was presented to us we hastened to meet the difficulty and overcame it in that way.

Mr. LAKE. It is a pity that information was not more widely circulated among the farmers in order to provide against such a contingency. I am also sorry the

minister does not seem to be able to improve the conditions in Saskatchewan.

Mr. FISHER. I am quite ready to do what I can.

Mr. LAKE. Could not an arrangement similar to that in the island by which there might be local inspection? I do not know how many inspectors there are in Saskatchewan, but it might be possible, by giving notice to the farmers in a particular district, to arrange for them to slaughter at the one time so that inspection would be possible and the carcasses could be shipped to these factories.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend will remember that there are two considerations in respect to Prince Edward Island which are peculiar. The first is that the buyers go to the island and buy, the formers ship only after the animals have been bought, and they, therefore, know the destination, they know that the carcasses are going to a factory which is under the operation of the Act. Then there are in the island practically only two shipping points through which trade passes to the places where factories are in operation. Consequently it is a very easy thing for us to make an arrangement for inspection at the point of shipment from the island, instead of on arrival at the factory. But my hon. friend seems to overlook the fact that it is only when the hogs are sent to a packing factory that they come under the operation of the Act. If a farmer is shipping a carload of hogs to the Winnipeg market, the Act will not operate on him at all. It will be difficult, if not impossible, to arrange to have inspectors at all the shipping points in the province of Saskatchewan so that the cargo may be inspected locally before it is shipped.

Mr. LAKE. How many inspectors are there?

Mr. FISHER. We only have inspectors at the factories. In the case I speak of in Prince Edward Island last fall, an extra man was sent there specially. I think the hogs were all shipped from Charlottetown, and the inspector saw them before they were shipped.

Mr. LAKE. It would be a great convenience to the farmers in Saskatchewan if they could be made aware of the extraordinary position in which they are placed. It will be impossible for them to ship carcasses—

Mr. FISHER. I am not taking that position.

Mr. LAKE. The organs have to be left in them if they are to be shipped to a factory. I think some provision should be made by which the carcasses may be shipped, as in the past; and further, that an intimation should be given to the farmers throughout those parts of the Northwest where hogs are raised for shipment. It ought to be a comparatively simple matter to spread the information so that the farmer who exports hogs will know all the conditions he has to comply with.

Mr. FISHER. My officers made a resumé of the provisions of this Act, which was sent to every newspaper in Saskatchewan, and throughout the whole of Canada.

Mr. KEMP. Will the minister explain the sections of this Act as they will affect the use of private brands? I understand some wholesale merchants who have been selling canned goods for many years, reputable merchants, work up and advertise a private brand. They object that they have to put the name of the packer on their can, and contend that their own guarantee in many cases is better than the guarantee of the packer, and that it destroys the value of their private brand when they have to put on the name of the packer. That complaint is made in certain parts of the country. I would like to know what position the minister is going to take in regard to that matter.

Mr. MACPHERSON. That point has been the subject of discussion between the wholesale merchants and the canners of Vancouver. It was brought before the minister, and he suggested when the Bill came before the House that an amendment might be moved to clause 12. Clause 12 of the Meat and Canned Foods Act reads:

> The initials of the Christian name, the full surname and address, or in the case of a firm or corporation, the firm or corporate name and address of the packer.

The point the hon. gentleman brings up is this, that a wholesale firm has been buying for some years the output of a factory. They place upon the can their label, Smith, Jones & Brown. The wholesale firm buy from Robinson; Robinson does not appear at all, but Smith, Jones & Brown are a first class reputable firm, and they have sold under their brand for years. Further, in the province of British Columbia nearly all the wholesale merchants purchase the output of some small cannery that is packing salmon. They will buy from one man this year his output, say he packs 4,000 cases, and they will put their own label upon it. Next year this man may have a small pack, he may be holding his salmon for a higher price. By this Act they would not be allowed to go into the market and buy from another small canner. That is the point that was brought up by the wholesale merchants of Vancouver. They wrote to me, and I suggested an amendment which I will make to section 12.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I had better read section 1 first.

Mr. J. D. REID. That does not touch the point I want to refer to. I want to

ask the minister a question about that Saskatchewan matter. I understand that the farmers of Saskatchewan are in this position: The Winnipeg packers can go to them and say, We cannot give you the full price of these hogs because there is not a demand for them in the home market, and therefore for the export trade we pay you a less price. Is that the position that the Saskatchewan farmers are in now? I also want to ask the minister if the packers of this country are allowed to bring in hogs in bond from the United States, pack them and ship them out again?

Mr. FISHER. That is a customs matter, but I think not. The question of bonding does not enter into this at all.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister knows that other manufacturing establishments have that privilege and if pork packing establishments have that privilege, it certainly would be a very serious thing for the farmers in Saskatchewan.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think that any factory in Canada is a bonded warehouse under the Customs Act.

Mr. J. D. REID. If the pork packing establishments in Winnipeg can force the farmers to take a less price than their product is worth by representing that there is an overproduction on the home market it would place the farmers of Saskatchewan in a very unfortunate position.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think the farmers are in that position.

Mr. J. D. REID. Does the minister not think that the very fact of them being subject to inspection puts them in that position ?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think it allows any person to force the farmers in any respect.

Mr. J. D. REID. Well, I disagree with the minister in that respect.

Mr. SPROULE. You repeal clauses 3 and 4 of this Act ?

Mr. FISHER. Up to the present time section 11 only applies to such factories as are declared by the minister to be under the operation of sections 3 and 4 and 6 to 10. We repeal that section and substitute this section which says that the Governor in Council may, upon application of the owner thereof, exempt any establishment from the operations of this Act. That is to say that the active operation in dealing with it is for the purpose of exemption. Before, the active operation in dealing with it was for the purpose of putting it under the Act.

Mr. SPROULE. A great many hogs are killed in our part of the country, they are shipped in carcasses to Toronto and sold to Park, Blackwell & Co., or Harris or anyone else. How does the individual who sells these carcasses know whether they are intended for export or not ? Do these carcasses come under this clause of the Act or do they not ?

Mr. FISHER. If they are bought to be taken to a factory that is under the operation of the Act, of course, they do. If they are bought and not brought into such a factory they do not.

Mr. SPROULE. They may be bought by any wholesale butcher who sells them again.

Mr. FISHER. Suppose that a wholesale butcher buys them from the farmer——

Mr. SPROULE. No, he buys them generally from a merchant.

Mr. FISHER. Well, supposing the merchant buys from the farmer, he can do that without this Act affecting him in any way whatever, but if the merchant sells a carcass to go to a factory which is under the operation of the Act he cannot do it unless the carcass has been inspected.

Mr. SPROULE. A merchant, for instance, in the town in which I live, purchases a number of hogs. A buyer comes from Park, Blackwell & Co. or Harris, and he purchases them ; is it the duty of the seller to ascertain whether these carcasses are going to be shipped to that factory for export, or what disposition is to be made of them ?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Surely it is not the duty of the seller and yet if they were going to a factory I take it that they would come under the operation of the Act.

Mr. FISHER. Before they went into the factory they would have to be inspected and the inspector would reject them if they had not complied with the provisions of the Act.

Mr. SPROULE. Who would be responsible for the inspection, the buyer or the seller ?

Mr. FISHER. That is something I cannot tell you ; it depends on the bargain between them. If I sell to a man who does not ask for a guarantee that the law had been complied with he is responsible. If I sell to him and say that these carcasses have been inspected and are all right to go into the factory he would hold me responsible. It is a matter of private arrangement.

Mr. SPROULE. If there is no understanding reached between them the seller would be exempt from any liability with regard to the inspection ?

Mr. FISHER. As far as I can tell.

Mr. LAKE. It seems to me that it is not absolutely clear in regard to this matter of export. The interpretation clause

says that 'export' means out of Canada or out of the province in which the establishment is situated. I imagine that the matter of exporting from one province to the other must have got mixed up with transactions in regard to carcasses which are bought simply for the local market. I do not think that is clear. In section 5 there is a clause which apparently makes it possible for a farmer to slaughter at home for the home market only, but I understand from the minister now that it is perfectly clear that the farmer may slaughter at home for the home market and he may export into another province provided the carcass does not go to an establishment that is packing for export.

Mr. FISHER. That is clear.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Is the minister quite clear in his own mind upon that point ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Absolutely and perfectly clear ? The reason I ask is that in the 5th section it is stated 'unless the minister otherwise orders.' What does that mean ? Have any regulations been made by the minister under the 5th section ? I have heard two different versions of the matter. It is said that hogs which are exported out of a province are liable to inspection under this 5th section, unless the minister otherwise orders. Has the minister made any order or are there any orders in council in force ?

Mr. FISHER. If carcasses are sold from one province to another by a farmer who has slaughtered them, or if they are sold on the ordinary markets or sold to a dealer and they do not go to a packing house for export they are not under the operation of the Act at the present time. If they are being sold to go to a factory which is under the operation of the Act then they have to comply with the regulations.

Mr. LAKE. That is to say that the organs have to accompany the carcass or else the animals have to be shipped alive.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. As a matter of fact, any person who ships hogs will have to comply with the regulations to be safe.

Mr. FISHER. If he is not pretty sure it is going into local consumption.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. As far as my province is concerned the regulations under this Act are not approved by anybody, because of the uncertainty of the market, the uncertainty of the inspection, and for many other reasons. I have condemnatory letters of all kinds.

Mr. FISHER. The arrangements which were made at the end of the season with regard to Prince Edward Island and which we expect to be able to continue will I think remove the difficulty my hon. friend mentions.

Mr. SPROULE. What were these arrangements ?

Mr. FISHER. In the case of Prince Edward Island the carcasses would be inspected and allowed to go forward and to be received by the factory they were shipped to.

Mr. J. D. REID. If an inspector would inspect a carload of hogs at Saskatchewan could they go to a packing house and be afterwards exported?

Mr. FISHER. Our inspectors are usually at the packing houses. If an inspector inspected carcasses in Saskatchewan which had the organs attached, and marked them as inspected they could go to the factory.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is it necessary that the carcasses should contain all the organs when they are inspected ?

Mr. FISHER. The veterinary experts inform me that any inspection without the organs attached to the carcasses is futile.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not see that provided for in the law.

Mr. FISHER. That is a regulation.

Mr. SPROULE. When animals are purchased is there an understanding between the buyer and the seller that they are to be subject to inspection before the buyer pays for them ?

Mr. FISHER. That is a matter between the buyer and seller.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose a carload is consigned to, say Harris, of Toronto, and they are to be paid for when delivered, but on inspection at Toronto it is found that some are diseased, could the buyer charge the loss to the seller ?

Mr. FISHER. That is not a matter for the department, whose duty is simply to see that no diseased hog is taken to the factory.

Mr. SPROULE. Supposing no understanding existed between the buyer and the seller, the buyer could not charge the loss back to the seller ?

Mr. FISHER. That would be a question for the courts to decide.

Mr. SPROULE. What establishments are at present under the operation of this Act ?

Mr. FISHER. I am told there are nearly thirty.

Mr. SPROULE. These will now be exempt ?

Mr. FISHER. No. Those already under the operation of the Act will remain under it and if the amendment is passed all other factories would come under the operation of the Act until an order in council exempted them.

On section 12,

Mr. MACPHERSON. I beg to move that the Bill be amended by adding thereto the following section :

Paragraph (a) of section 12 is amended by adding thereto after the word 'packer' the words:
Or of the first dealer obtaining it direct from the packer who sells or offers the same for sale. Such dealer shall upon the request of the inspector appointed under this Act give the name of the packer of such articles.

That will meet the wishes of the wholesale man who sells under his own brand the goods which he buys from the packer.

Mr. FISHER. I understand this amendment to be for the purpose of allowing the first purchaser from the packer, who has made arrangements with different packing houses, to put his name on the package instead of the original packer, he being then responsible for the character of the goods. I know that this is an amendment which the wholesale trade of Canada generally are very much in favour of. I think it is safeguarded by the second clause which requires, in case of a suit, that the name of the original packer shall be given to the inspector and therefore I would not object to the incorporation of this amendment in the present Bill. The object of the whole Act is to secure that the public shall be safeguarded by the name of a responsible person on the package, so that when a consumer buys the article he can know where it comes from. Originally the intention and idea of the Act was that he should know the actual packer; but representations have been made, reinforced by a considerable number of good names, that the name of the wholesaler is frequently as good a guarantee as the name of the original packer. As the law requires that in case of any suit or action arising out of an infraction of the Act the name of the original packer shall be given, which under this amendment shall be done, I think the general intent and principle of the Act is observed to a sufficient extent to justify this facility to the wholesale trade being granted.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended, agreed to.

Mr. J. D. REID. In the month of January I asked a question in regard to an article that appeared in one of the English papers on the subject of the importation of frozen meats into England. I would like to ask the minister if this Act will affect the export trade of frozen meats in boxes during the winter months.

Mr. FISHER. As I gathered the tenor of the article to which my hon. friend refers, the fact that we have this Act will preclude our meats being objected to in the English market, although we have not any official declaration to that effect. The English are no doubt jealous of imported food stuffs, and one of our objects in passing this Act last session was to throw all possible safeguards around our trade with England in those articles. My hon. friend will notice that in the article Canada is not mentioned as a country from which dangerous food of that character might come, which I think is attributable to the fact that we have this Act.

Mr. J. D. REID. I suppose any Act they might have would apply to all countries.

Mr. FISHER. That would depend, of course, on the provisions of any such Act; but we have the assurance from the authorities in England that compliance with the provisions of this Act will be sufficient to justify them in not applying any such exclusion to Canada.

Bill reported, and amendments read the first and the second time, and agreed to.

On the question, when shall the Bill be read the third time:

Mr. W. JACKSON. With reference to the clause ignoring the manufacturers' label with the name on the can, I would ask that this Bill do not receive its third reading now, as I wish to communicate with some of the canners in London in reference to it.

Bill reported.

INSPECTION AND SALE ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. FISHER moved second reading of Bill (No. 148) to amend the Inspection and Sale Act.

Mr. BERGERON. This Bill has not yet been translated into French. However, I do not object to going on with it.

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

Mr. FISHER. The Inspection and Sale Act, chapter 85 of the revised statutes, is a consolidation of a large number of Acts affecting different commercial products. That Act is divided into ten parts. Part 1 does not apply to grain, but is not otherwise limited. Part 2 applies exclusively to grain, part 3 to flour and meal, part 4 to beef and pork, part 5 to leather and raw hides, part 6 to pot ashes and pearl ashes, part 7 to fish and fish oils, part 8 to dairy products, part 9 to fruit and fruit marks, and part 10 to certain staple commodities. Under the Department of Agriculture's legislation, partly since I have been in office and partly before, there were a number of special Acts passed applying to dairy products and to fruits, and it is only to those parts of the Act which apply to dairy products and fruits that this Bill relates. I may say that the Act passed by this parliament a few years

ago now forms part 9 of the Inspection and Sale Act. Part 1 of the Inspection and Sale Act does not apply to grain but is otherwise not limited in its application, and I want to exclude from it dairy products, fruits or fruit marks.

Mr. SPROULE. A number of the members interested in dairy products and farming generally are absent, and I think it would be better if the minister would take up some other Bill so as to give them an opportunity of discussing this one.

Mr. FISHER. We might go over some of the amendments and get them passed and then let the committee rise and report progress, and get leave to sit again.

On section 2,

Mr. FISHER. This section repeals certain provisions of the Inspection and Sale Act which are practically obsolete. They were taken from the old General Inspection Act and have been replaced by a special Dairy Act passed some nine or ten years ago.

On section 3—adulterated cheese,

Mr. FISHER. This is to prevent any inferior curd being incorporated in the new cheese during the process of its manufacture and also to prevent the placing of any foreign substance in the cheese. There has been a little difficulty lately through careless cheese makers incorporating sour or inferior curd in their cheese.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there no Act to prevent this already ?

Mr. FISHER. The Justice Department say there is not. Then some foolish people have taken it into their head to put bottles and little cans into their cheese with their name or something of that kind in them. That is complained of seriously by the trade. It is a fraud because people are getting what they did not buy, and besides the quality of the cheese around the foreign substance is apt to deteriorate.

Mr. SPROULE. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is not a gallant or he would hesitate before doing what may be a great injustice. I remember reading not long ago of some young lady putting in a cheese a small bottle with a paper inside it, giving her name and address, and shortly afterwards she got an offer of marriage from the lucky purchaser of the cheese. It would be strange for a bachelor to make such an amendment to the law as would prevent the possibility of this occurring in the future. I would think he would be more chivalrous than to attempt to do so. Besides he might get a wife himself in that way.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would colouring matter be regarded as a foreign substance?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think so; I think that is part of the process of making the cheese and would not come under the section.

Mr. LENNOX. In the case mentioned by the minister, of a person innocently putting in a small bottle containing an advertisement it seems harsh to provide a penalty of as much as $500. It may be said that there is a graded system and that the fine may not exceed $25, but there is the possibility of it being $500. The difficulty in these cases always is that you group these offences and provide penalties which are not excessive in some cases but are in others. The case of colouring referred to by my hon. friend also occurred to me. If colouring was a necessary ingredient, it probably would not be considered a foreign substance, but in many cases it might be considered both foreign and injurious and $500 in such a case is a severe penalty.

Mr. FISHER. Of course the insertion of any such thing in the cheese must be deliberate, it cannot be an accident. There has been very serious complaint on the part of those engaged in the trade and it was thought necessary to stop the practice. I do not think a magistrate would impose the extreme penalty unless there were strong reasons, and $25 is not too high a penalty if it is desired to deter people from doing such acts.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would suggest that the minister might use some more definite form of expression which would include the cases he has mentioned but would not be broad enough to include colouring matter.

Mr. FISHER. This clause was submitted to the Minister of Justice, but as the Bill has to go back into committee I shall ask the Department of Justice whether colouring matter would come under it, and if so, we will see that it is provided against. I would not wish for a moment that colouring matter should be included under this section.

On section 5—making of regulations by Governor in Council.

Mr. FISHER. These two sections were in the special Act, but in the consolidation of the statutes, in consequence of the other sections that we are now repealing having been left in, these two were omitted. It is now necessary to reinsert them to enable us to appoint inspectors and make regulations.

Mr. LENNOX. These referred principally to milk?

Mr. FISHER. To dairy products.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not rather irregular to give authority to the Governor in Council to make regulations and to impose such large penalties for contravention of them?

Mr. FISHER. That has been in all the agricultural Acts.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is not a very good reason.

Mr. FISHER. And it has worked well.

Mr. HENDERSON. We are empowering the Governor in Council to authorize penalties of $50 for infringements of regulations of which we know nothing. They may be innocent and unimportant or they may be very important, and yet we are fixing a penalty of $50 for what may be a very trifling offence. Could not the minister so frame this as to afford better protection to all parties?

Mr. FISHER. The regulations must necessarily be in accordance with the provisions of the Act; you cannot make regulations contrary to the provisions of an Act. I do not think the penalty herein referred to is too high for infractions of regulations in consonance with the Act.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think the provisions of the Act control the regulations to any extent. We have not the slightest idea of these regulations or what crime the government may formulate by them.

Mr. FISHER. The regulations cannot enlarge the operation of the Act, they can only be consistent with it.

Mr. HENDERSON. When such an expression as this is used 'The Governor in Council may make such regulations as he considers necessary.'

Mr. FISHER. In accordance with the Act.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not see that it is limited in any other way.

In order to secure the efficient enforcement and operation of this Act, and may by such regulations impose penalties not exceeding $50.

I fail to perceive that the Act limits the power to make regulations at all.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, that is well understood in legislation.

Mr. LENNOX. The Governor in Council may make regulations for the efficient carrying out of the Act, and they have to relate to the subject matter of the Act. He makes a regulation, we will say, that certain facilities are to be afforded to the inspectors, and he may make other regulations as to other matters, some of them may be very trivial. For the non-observance of some of these regulations a penalty of $1 might be ample, and $5 might be an outrage. Now we are here making the law, and we are delegating to the Governor in Council, without knowing anything about the nature of the regulations, unlimited power to impose such penalties as they see fit up to $50, and they come into force by the mere fact of publication. The minister said a moment ago that this was merely a re-enactment of the sections that were left out when the revision was made. Perhaps he will tell us where we can find the statute as it was originally.

Mr. FISHER. I think 56 Vic. chapter 37, is the original Act. My hon. friend has pointed out that infractions of the different regulations would require different penalties. Now this clause empowers the Governor in Council to make regulations and to apply penalties suitable to the gravity of the infraction. It does not say that to every offence a fine of $50 may be applied; the Governor in Council is empowered to go as high as $50 when the offence is a serious one, but if it is a trivial one a smaller penalty would be applied. It would be impossible for the Act to fix penalties to be applied to regulations that are not in existence when the Act is passed. You have to leave it to the discretion of the Governor in Council when they make the regulations to attach a proper penalty for the infraction of a particular regulation.

Mr. SPROULE. Give us some idea of what the regulations are likely to be.

Mr. FISHER. We have regulations fixing the duties of inspectors, but we have not found occasion to make any regulations for offences. The penalties for offences provided in the Act itself apparently have been found insufficient. We have not had a great deal to do to enforce this Act, the Act is well known, and the dairymen have been living up to it pretty thoroughly. Once in a while we have had some serious cases, and we have dealt with them and imposed a penalty, but I think in every case where the offences were serious, the penalties provided for under a special clause of the Act were found sufficient.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister says they have found no need for regulations up to the present, then why propose to amend the Act?

Mr. FISHER. Because the need may arise at any moment. But we are not amending the Act, we are reinstating clauses that were in the Dairy Act which were taken out of it when the consolidation of the statutes was made last year; because there were some old clauses which seemed to apply to the Dairy Act as well as to other parts of the Inspection Act.

Mr. SPROULE. The revisers could not have done their duty properly.

Mr. FISHER. It was supposed that the general provisions under this Sale and Inspection Act would cover it, but that has not been found satisfactory.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister stated that the dairymen had been living up to the Act. It would seem almost a waste of time to

make enactments when there is no need of them.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend has misunderstood me or has not grasped the situation. There are clauses in the Act providing for certain offences and penalties. We have enforced these clauses without any difficulty. Only the other day in Quebec we had a man fined $300 and not long ago we had a Montreal man fined $200 and costs under this Act. There have been occasions when, if we had been fully convinced that we had the authority to proceed, we might have proceeded, but since the revised statutes have been in force we have not had that assurance; consequently, we have hesitated to proceed, and we want to be in a position to enforce the Act should occasion arise.

Mr. SPROULE. That is a different explanation now. If authority is needed it should be provided.

On section 6—'Culls' defined.

Mr. FISHER. We found it necessary to define culls.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is this an entirely new definition ?

Mr. FISHER. Entirely new. It is the best we could work out.

On section 7, false marking.

Mr. FISHER. The only difference here from the original Act is that we put in the words 'no culls.' If my hon. friend looks at the last part of the clause he will see that it provides that No. 2 quality shall contain 'not less than eighty per cent free from worm holes and such other defects as cause material waste.' We found that people were interpreting that to mean that the other twenty per cent might be pure culls. That was not the idea of the Act and now we say that this quality includes no culls.

On section 8, penalties respecting marking.

Mr. FISHER. This section increases the penalties under the Fruit Marks Act. We have found that the penalties were so small that people engaged in the trade seemed practically to ignore them. We took all the trouble and expense of prosecuting and upon securing the conviction of a man who shipped 100 or 1,000 barrels might be fined $3 or $4. We have had 168 convictions during the last season and I remember seeing not long ago the list of penalties imposed. Hardly any of them exceeded $10 and it seemed perfectly ridiculous.

Mr. BRODER. You raise the minimum ?

Mr. FISHER. We raise the minimum and maximum and make the penalties so severe that the people will be deterred from breaking the Act.

Mr. BRODER. In a case where a man sells a certain kind of apple and then ships other than the kind or quality sold a penalty should be provided.

Mr. FISHER. That is the intention of the Act.

Mr. BRODER. I know, and the law has been broken.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, we have taken out prosecutions to try and put a stop to that. It is false marking. But if a man takes an order for one kind of apple, ships another and marks the barrels with the name of what is in them we cannot deal with that.

Mr. BRODER. Of course, he is breaking his contract.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, but that is not a matter that we can deal with. It is only when he breaks the law that we can deal with him.

Mr. BRODER. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before leaving section 7 I desire to point out to the minister that it defines No. 2 quality as having not less than 80 per cent free from worm holes. My impression is that No. 1 quality must have 90 or 95 per cent free from worm holes.

Mr. FISHER. Ninety per cent.

Mr. HENDERSON. I notice you are not amending that clause. Consequently the same difficulty that the minister referred to before might occur with regard to culls ; the balance of the barrel might be made up with culls as well as in the case of No. 2 quality, and I was wondering why the minister had not amended that section as well as 321.

Mr. FISHER. We have not found such infractions in the case of No. 1. I suppose they might possibly occur and I would not object to amending the section by putting in the same words. It hardly seemed worth while for the packer to put in 10 per cent of culls in No. 1 quality, but when it came to 20 per cent he would do so.

Mr. HENDERSON. Ten per cent is a good profit.

Mr. FISHER. I do not see any objection to putting that into No 1. I will consider that before the Bill is finally taken out of committee.

On section 9, penalty for tampering with marks.

Mr. FISHER. Section 329 provides a penalty for defacing or changing the marks on a closed package. It is a deliberate fraud and we wish to increase the penalty. The penalty under the original section was $40 fine and we are making it $100 for the first offence and $200 for each subsequent of-

fence. That seems to be a very deliberate crime and I think it ought to be severely punished.

On section 10, penalties respecting apples and berries.

Mr. SPROULE. Some time ago I called the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to some of his inspectors in Nova Scotia whom it was thought were not in a position to deal fairly with the public because of their interference in municipal politics. The minister then did not seem to pay much attention to the matter but I would now ask him if he has decided to appoint inspectors under this Act who are not mixed up in public affairs. It was thought these inspectors could not be impartial owing to their environment and the minister was asked if he did not think it wise that such inspectors should refrain from taking part in such contests. Even supposing these men were doing their duty fairly it is in my opinion not desirable that the action they take in the direction I have indicated should lead to suspicion that they might treat those who support them with greater partiality than those who do not support them.

Mr. FISHER. I would say quite frankly to my hon. friend that if a complaint were made and proven that any inspector in consequence of any action of his in a municipal contest was guilty of discrimination, I would not hesitate at all to dismiss such an inspector. If an inspector made use of his position, by reason of personal spite in connection with any contest, whether municipal, political or personal, to discriminate between individuals I would look upon such an one as unworthy to be an inspector. But I do not think I would be justified in taking action on the mere supposition that an inspector might possibly do a thing of that kind. The particular inspector in this case is not engaged by the year, he only acts as such for six or seven months in the year and at the time of the municipal contest I am not sure that he was engaged as inspector.

Mr. SPROULE. My information is that he was.

Mr. FISHER. That may be, but at all events he is not a permanent officer on salary. I know of no complaint which has ever been made about him. The correspondence referred to by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) did not say that he had been guilty but simply that he might possibly be guilty. I do not think it would be fair for me to say to that gentleman that he should not take any part in municipal affairs because for a portion of the year he is inspector under the Act. While it is possible that a man might do something wrong under certain circumstances, I think my hon. friend will agree with me that just because of such a possibility it would be harsh and unfair on my part to interfere with him. If it were shown he had acted unfairly or had discriminated it would certainly be my duty to remove him from the opportunity of making such discrimination. Since I spoke last on the matter in the House I have no indication that this inspector has done anything unjust or unfair and if he had I think the information would have reached me by this time. I therefore think I was quite right in not taking any steps to remove him.

Mr. SPROULE. Does not the minister think it is desirable that in such a case even the possibility of suspicion should be removed from the public mind. Suppose a man who is engaged as a public weigher should himself be a purchaser of cattle and that he was called on to weigh his own cattle along with those of others, would there not be a feeling in the public mind that there was danger of his acting with partiality towards himself? I have a letter before me written to Mr. A. L. Davidson, of Nova Scotia, which says :

I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter of October 22, and note what you say in regard to Mr. Freeman Fitch and his duties under the Fruit Marks Act. Your statements require careful consideration which I shall certainly give them. I cannot say, however, speaking from memory and without investigation, that there is any law or rule in the public service that debars members from taking part in municipal affairs. I will see what the practice is in regard to such things and will act accordingly.

I do not know whether the minister has since communicated with this gentleman, but the letter upon which that was based is as follows :

I beg leave to call your attention to the following: Freeman Fitch, of Clarence, in the county of Annapolis, is at present employed by your department as inspector of fruit under the provisions of the Fruit Marks Act.

As such inspector his duties are to inspect apples packed by growers and dealers thereof and to ascertain if they are packed in accordance with the provisions of the said Act.

If, as such inspector, he finds apples fraudulently packed he is required to mark the package in which such apples are contained with the words 'falsely marked.' It is also a part of his duty to prosecute parties for violating the provisions of the said Act.

From the quasijudicial nature of the office of inspector it is possible for the occupant of the said office, to discriminate between those toward whom he is friendly disposed and those toward whom he is unfriendly disposed.

The ratepayers of polling district No. 3, in the county of Annapolis, are nearly all engaged in the pursuit of raising apples for sale, and it is a part of the duty of the said Freeman Fitch as said fruit inspector to inspect the apples as packed by the different ratepayers of the said polling district No. 3, in the said county of Annapolis.

The said Freeman Fitch is at present a candidate for the office of municipal councillor to represent the said polling district No. 3 in the municipal council of the municipality of the county of Annapolis. The election for the said office will be held upon the 19th day of November, 1907, when the ratepayers of the said polling district will elect their councillor by ballot.

As a candidate at such election the said Freeman Fitch is peculiarly open to the temptation of showing favouritism as an inspector to those of the said ratepayers of polling district No. 3 as may support the said Freeman Fitch at the said election and discrimination against such of said ratepayers as do not support him at said election. If elected as a councillor the said Freeman Fitch will be peculiarly tempted to refrain from enforcing the law against his supporters for the fear of estranging their support, and his usefulness as an inspector will in the nature of things be seriously impaired.

The time spent by the said Freeman Fitch in canvassing the said polling district as a candidate as aforesaid, coming as it does at the season of the year when his official duties are the most pressing, cannot but interfere with the proper discharge of his duties as an inspector as aforesaid, as will also his duties as a councillor should he be elected to that office.

All of which facts are respectfully submitted.

This is dated October 22, about the time the fruit is being put up, and therefore I take it that he was engaged in inspecting then.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, I think he was in that case.

Mr. SPROULE. It is apparent that he is running for municipal councillor at the very time his inspection must be done, and that he must of necessity have friends on one side and those who are not his friends on the other side, and he is inspecting for both alike. Would there not be an impression left in the minds of those carrying on a vigorous contest against him that they would hardly get hot justice, or at best more than very cold justice, whereas those canvassing and working for him would be more likely to get fair play ? Does the minister not think it would be a proper thing to ask his inspectors to refrain from running for such offices or to appoint others to these positions ?

Mr. FISHER. I think it is quite necessary that the people should feel that they are getting fair play ; but I have had no representations except that one letter to show that there was any feeling in regard to this gentleman. I have had no complaint that the inspector has shown any partiality or discrimination of any kind whatever, and I do not think it would be fair to judge him on the suspicion of one correspondent that he might possibly act unfairly. As to public officials taking part in municipal affairs, there is no law or rule against it, and I think it is a matter of judgment how far it should be allowed. I do not think public officials should take part in municipal affairs to an extent that would interfere with their official duties ; and if it could be shown that Mr. Fitch was not attending properly to his duties as an inspector because he was at the same time a municipal councillor, I would have no hesitation in saying to him that the two things were incompatible. But that is not suggested in this letter. The only suggestion is that if he happens to be a candidate for the municipal council, it is possible that he will exercise his powers as an inspector in favour of those who vote for him and against those who vote against him. Under these circumstances, I do not think it would be proper for me to say that Mr. Fitch should not be an inspector.

Mr. SPROULE. You think he could at the same time carry on an election and properly attend to his duties as an inspector ?

Mr. FISHER. It might be a little hard to do it.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister does not see any objection to his official doing the two things at the same time ?

Mr. FISHER. If the one interfered with the other, there would be.

Mr. SPROULE. It is plain to me that it is sufficient to destroy that confidence in the public mind which ought to exist, and in my judgment it would justify the minister in notifying his inspectors that they could not be regarded as eligible for that position if they were at the same time running for election either as municipal councillors or in any other capacity that would practically divide the public into two portions, one of whom would be friendly and the other unfriendly. It is not human nature for people to feel that they are likely to get fair play under such circumstances, and to my mind it is a good deal to have the people satisfied that they are getting fair play, whether they do or not.

Mr. FISHER. I again repeat that there is nothing whatever to indicate that anybody has the feeling expressed in that letter. This gentleman says they may have that feeling. He does not say that anybody has been hurt or feels that way.

Mr. SPROULE. If they had no suspicion would they write the letter ?

Mr. FISHER. Only one man wrote the letter.

Mr. SPROULE. The whole community is made up of units and one man has an equal right to another and an equal claim to have an abuse remedied.

Mr. FISHER. If only one man has a suspicion and writes a letter, I am not to take it for granted that he represents the whole community.

Mr. SPROULE. But you take it for granted that he misrepresents the facts and is not worthy of consideration because he is only one man. But this one man gives the circumstances which justify suspicion and cause public dissatisfaction, and the minister in his reply said that he would give the matter careful consideration. Has he given it any consideration?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, and I have explained the result of my consideration. I have said that I did not consider the statement of one individual that certain improper things might happen, which he does not say have happened, or that certain people might have a suspicion, which he does not say they have—I did not consider such vague statements required any action on my part.

Mr. SPROULE. Why then did this man write the letter he did instead of making a direct charge?

Mr. FISHER. Why did he not make a direct charge?

Mr. SPROULE. A good many know of wrong doing, but do not make direct charges ?

Mr. FISHER. Then I do not bother about them. If a man has not the courage to make a direct charge, I do not take any account of his suspicions.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman had better tell the apple raisers of that county that that is the way he uses the farmers.

Mr. FISHER. That is how I use that man.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would suggest the substitution of some other word for the word 'foreign.' I would suggest the word 'nonedible.'

Mr. FISHER. I would not like to see an oyster in the middle of a cheese.

Progress reported.

CONSTRUCTION OF DRY DOCKS.

Bill (No. 119) to encourage the construction of dry docks—Mr. Fielding—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. FIELDING. This Bill is founded on a resolution which was fully discussed and explained some time ago, and which I think commended itself to the general consideration of the House. This amendment is destined to adapt the machinery of the Act, which was put on the statute-book some years ago, to some difficulties which have been met in its administration. Under this general legislation a dry dock had been constructed at Halifax and another at Collingwood and an agreement was entered into for the construction of one at Vancouver. The latter, however, has not yet been constructed. The essential difference between the present law and the amendment touches two points. The limitation of the amount in the law is 3 per cent on $1,000,000, but in view of the increased size of steamers and the need of larger docks, it is proposed to increase the amount to $1,500,000, which, at 3 per cent, represents $45,000. The second point of importance is with respect to the method of payments. Under the Act payments are to be made for twenty years, subject to the condition that the dock shall be at all times kept in successful operation. Capitalists, however, take exception to that. They say that the men who advance the money might reasonably ask for a definite fixed assurance of payment and the government should provide other means for insuring the operation of the dock. The proposal now submitted provides that the twenty years' payment of the subsidy shall be fixed and definite and that, in the event of the company failing to operate the dock, the government shall take possession of it.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it intended to grant an additional subsidy to the Collingwood dry dock?

Mr. FIELDING. No, that dock was constructed under the present Act and that transaction is closed. Of course the dock might be enlarged, but we have no such proposal before us.

Mr. LENNOX. Would this cover the case of the enlargement of a dry dock and how would the basis be arrived at in the case of enlargement? Take the Collingwood dry dock. Suppose the company should spend an additional sum in order to enlarge it, on what would you base your additional subsidy?

Mr. FIELDING. If they propose to enlarge the dock, they would be entitled to an additional subsidy, but would have to come under the condition with respect to non-operation. Under the existing contract they are only entitled to a subsidy so long as the dock continues in operation. Under the new Act, the government would have the right to take over the dock. Should they extend the dock, they would come under the new Act both for the extension and the portion already built. You could not separate the two.

Mr. SPROULE. If for instance, the Collingwood Company desired to enlarge their dock and applied for an additional subsidy under this would the government then take over that dock ?

Mr. FIELDING. Only in the event of failure to operate.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose that after enlarging they proposed to operate the same as before, on what basis would you then grant an additional subsidy ?

Mr. FIELDING. They would have to receive an additional subsidy under the terms of this Act. They would get a subsidy for twenty years on the additional amount and that would be a fixed and definite subsidy under the provisions of this Act. In order to avail themselves of that subsidy, they would be obliged to give the government the right to take over not the new work alone but the whole dock, because there could not be any distinction between the two.

Mr. SPROULE. But if they desired to continue to own the dock ?

Mr. FIELDING. Then under the present law we do not interfere with them. Even if the government took it over they would not own it but would only operate it temporarily.

Mr. SPROULE. Would you base the additional subsidy on the cost of the extension or upon the valuation of your engineer of the works, including the site ?

Mr. FIELDING. The cost would have to have reference entirely to the proposed new work. The work of the past is disposed of. I understand the company to have received all the subsidy to which they are entitled. If they proposed additional work then only the cost of the additional work would be considered.

Mr. SPROULE. And that would be upon the basis of the valuation of the government's own engineer ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, the engineer would have to examine and report in order to fix the subsidy.

On section 2—interpretation,

Mr. FIELDING. I beg to move to amend this section by adding the words :

And 'dry dock' includes floating dock.

I do not think this is absolutely necessary but it is well to remove possible doubts. Marine docks are now being constructed largely under the system of floating docks, and we want to make it clear that if it is thought well to build a floating dock it will be included under the Act. It has been so interpreted now, but we want to make it clear beyond all doubt.

On section 3—basis of subsidy.

Mr. SPROULE. There seems to be no time limit. Suppose you make annual payments——

Mr. FIELDING. It is twenty years, the same as the old Act.

Mr. SPROULE. What do they receive for the Collingwood dry dock per annum ?

Mr. FIELDING. The figures were given in a previous discussion.

Mr. LENNOX. I think it is $15,000 a year.

Mr. FIELDING. I shall be pleased to get the figures before the Bill is disposed of.

Mr. SPROULE. It does not seem necessary for the parties who are enlarging to show any data as to the cost, it is all left to the judgment of the engineer.

Mr. FIELDING. Necessarily the engineer will have to receive the representations made by the company, with their plans, &c.; this would have to be submitted to the examination and inquiry of the engineer. I fancy it would require the co-operation of the company and the engineer.

Mr. SPROULE. The actual cost and an estimate are different things.

Mr. FIELDING. The actual cost could only be determined when the work is completed ; but in order to fix the cost for subsidy purposes it is necessary to come as near to it as possible in advance and that is the provision of the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. Would that be changed in the light of experience ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, the engineer in his report would have to be careful not to place the estimate too high, because you give a guarantee to the financial people of a certain amount at certain times. Difficulty arises from the necessity of fixing the subsidy in advance.

Mr. SPROULE. That would be the case if a company is investing money but with a few individuals building it on the strength of preliminary arrangements made with the government on the basis of a valuation with a condition that they be paid three per cent on the cost of it, then after the completion of the dock the actual cost could be obtained from data furnished during the construction and the payment could be made on that.

Mr. FIELDING. The very essence of this is that you shall be able to give financial people absolute certainty of so much money at certain times. If the government were to allow that payment to be fixed on an excessive valuation that would be improper; that would realize the danger which my hon. friend suggests. We would have to see that the report of the engineer was carefully made, and did not value the property in excess of its real value.

Mr. LENNOX. This does not seem to go on the same principle as the last Act. Reading subsection 2 of section 4, the basis of the subsidy would appear to be as the minister suggests, that the chief engineer of the department shall make a careful estimate, before the work is executed, as to the probable expense, and upon that the government shall base a subsidy that shall be final. That would appear to be in accordance with the wording of the

section. But I know as a matter of fact that under the old Act, after the work had been executed the government sent an engineer to value the work, and by the valuation of the engineer and by the examination of the accounts, the government ascertained what was the actual cost. I do not know whether there is any reason for changing the system. Take the case of Collingwood. After all the work was executed, Mr. Coste, I think it was, examined the work and determined that a certain amount must necessarily have been expended. Also certain accountants went into the matter and went over the books and papers so far as they could be obtained for the purpose of ascertaining where the money had been actually expended. I think that was in accordance with the old Act. Is there any reason for departing from that principle? Is not that a better principle than this merely preliminary estimate before the work is executed?

Mr. FIELDING. I rather think that the old system was the better one. But the difficulty has been that it leaves an element of uncertainty as to the payment of the subsidy. Although that did not avail against the Collingwood dock, it has been found to avail against other schemes of docks. The Collingwood people were willing to construct a dock under these terms. There was some discussion last year over the Collingwood dock. I am not familiar with the details, but I know that the essence of the old arrangement was that the cost was determined by a report of the engineer at the time of completion, and on that the subsidy was paid. Now it has been found that financial people who have been asked to assist another dock scheme, particularly the one at St. John, N.B., people who were disposed to put money into it, said, Well, we are financial people but we are not dock operators, and we do not want to be called upon to take the risk of this dock being operated to the satisfaction of the government; we think the government should make some arrangement for the operation of the dock. It is to meet that difficulty that this change has been made. Therefore we propose to have a report made by the engineer at the beginning, and in view of the facts suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite, we shall satisfy ourselves that the report is a very conservative report, and thereupon a valuation shall be fixed. Then we shall say to the financial people, We have satisfied ourselves that this dock will cost say a million dollars, and we will agree to give you 3 per cent upon that million dollars for twenty years, and we undertake by another method to look after the operation of the dock. It is to meet that condition that the change was made.

On section 6,

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I think the minister has made the time limit rather short when the purpose is to get new docks. I can understand that docks already in operation would take advantage of the time for enlarging them, but is there a sufficient inducement for capital to take hold of a new dock in a guarantee of twenty year bonds at 3 per cent? Unless the minister may have some information I have not got, I think it will be difficult to find capitalists willing to build docks with such a limited guarantee as twenty years.

Mr. FIELDING. I should not like to make the conditions too hard, because the object is to secure the construction of docks at appropriate places. On the other hand, I would not like to make the conditions so easy that people would be tempted to go into the enterprise as a pure speculation. It is well that people should look at the matter carefully, and be content with a moderate guarantee such as the government gives them, and look for a balance out of the operation of the dock itself. The subsidy originally allowed was only 2 per cent, we increased that some years ago to 3 per cent. A twenty-year subsidy of 3 per cent is a fairly strong inducement for people to put money into an enterprise where there is a commercial basis for it. They would have to look for the development of trade for their compensation over and above this twenty years. But unless there is that condition of trade which gives promise of some revenue to the dock, then it is not desirable that the dock should be constructed. We do not want to make it so easy for docks to be constructed that the construction shall be undertaken at numerous places where there is not really business for them.

Mr. SPROULE. And especially in view of the fact that the tendency of money is always downwards. Three per cent is not a bad interest on money, it is all the interest that banks will allow. Three per cent for twenty years would indemnify a company for going into the enterprise.

Mr. FIELDING. I think it is a fair inducement.

On section 13.—The Dry Docks Subsidies Act, chapter 116 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, is repealed.

Mr. LENNOX. If you repeal the Act how do you deal with those docks that are now in existence ?

Mr. FIELDING. I would think that the agreement that we have made, for example, with the Collingwood dock under the Act existing at the time would continue. But, if there is any doubt about the matter I would be glad to take the hon. gentleman's suggestion into consideration. We have no desire to prevent payment to existing docks. If my hon. friend really thinks that it is open to doubt I will let the Bill stand in committee. It is one of those questions with regard to which we should make assurance doubly sure and I should be very

glad to let the Bill stand and ask the Department of Justice to look into it.

Mr. LENNOX. The agreement depends upon the statute and usually in repealing a statute you substitute something in its place.

Mr. FIELDING. I am obliged to my hon. friend for the suggestion and I will have it considered.

Mr. SPROULE. It does not seem to me that clause 9 provides that you should be paid for any outlay besides operating expenses and maintenance. Suppose you have an initial outlay of $10,000 or $20,000 to put a dock in condition after you take it over; then you can only pay for the advances which have been made out of operating expenses and maintenance.

Mr. FIELDING. Read the last portion of section 9. It says that the government shall apply the balance first in repayment of the advances made under the next preceding section and secondly in payment of accrued interest on bonds. But the working expenses must be the first charge. In order to have the cow give milk, the cow must live. You must have working expenses in the first place and anything over and above that is applied to two things, first, to the payment of government advances and, next, to the payment of interest on bonds, if there are any outstanding.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. We will proceed with the adjourned debate on the motion for Supply and the amendment of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk).

Mr. SPROULE. I wish before the House adjourns to call attention to one fact. It seems to be unusual that the government should go on with any other work when a motion of want of confidence is still undisposed of. I think it is unheard of in the British parliament that any minister should attempt to carry on any work except to dispose of a motion of want of confidence so as to show parliament and the country that the government retained the confidence of the majority of the members of the House.

Mr. FIELDING. That only shows what a very obliging and accommodating government we have in Canada. When we proposed on the last sitting day to take up to-day the adjourned debate, the whip of the Conservative party, and who at that time was leading the opposition, asked the government as a special consideration not to proceed with the debate to-day because a number of hon. members on that side of the House could not find it convenient to be here and he asked that we should proceed with the Bills and let the debate stand over until to-morrow. I hope we did not create any violent convulsion to the constitution, and if we have done so it has been on account of our desire to accommodate hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. SPROULE. It is in keeping with the government's management of the House generally.

Mr. FIELDING. We had better not be so obliging.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, April 22, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

REMOVING ROCK AND CONSTRUCTING ICE PIERS IN ST. FRANCIS RIVER AT MELBOURNE.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

1. Was the work of removing the rock at a point situated on the west side of St. Francis river, in the village of Melbourne, county of Richmond, let by tender?
2. If so, who was awarded the contract, and what was the amount of the contract?
3. Were there any other tenders? If so, what were the amounts of the tenders?
4. What was the total cost of the seven ice-breakers placed in the River St. Francis near the iron bridge across said river which connects the town of Richmond with the village of Melbourne?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1, 2 and 3. No ; work was done by day's labour.

4. There are eight structures altogether, viz.: four ice piers below the dam and not far from the iron bridge and four ice piers above the dam. The cost of construction of the eight structures was $16,453.75.

PIERS AT RICHMOND, QUEBEC.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

1. What was the total cost of the building of piers in the St. Francis river below the town of Richmond?
2. What was the total cost of piers above the town?
3. What was the cost of repairing the piers below the town in 1907?
4. What was the cost of blasting rock and repairs to piers during the present year?
5. Was the work so done let after public tender?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. Total cost of four piers below Richmond dam : $12,076.80.

2. Total cost of four piers above Richmond dam : $4,376.95.

3. $634.95.

4. $737.37.

5. Construction of four piers was done by contract after public tenders had been called for. Four additional piers were built under agreement with same contractor. All subsequent work was done by day's labour.

PORT MAITLAND PIER.

Mr. LALOR—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has the patronage committee of the town of Dunnville nominated W. W. Krick for the position of inspector of the building of Port Maitland pier?

2. Has Colonel A. T. Thompson recommended the appointment of W. W. Krick as inspector?

3. Has the government made the appointment of an inspector for Port Maitland piers?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. No.

2. No.

3. No ; the department is not aware that an inspector is required at Port Maitland piers, at present.

INDIAN AFFAIRS—INVESTIGATION BY MRS. A. M. PAGET AND MISS FERGUSON.

Mr. W. WRIGHT asked :

1. Has any report been made by Mrs. A. M. Paget and Miss M. Ferguson, of their investigation in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, mentioned in page J—45, Indian Affairs Department?

2. If so, is the report printed and will it be laid on the table of the House?

3. What was the total amount paid to said parties, and the total cost of the trip?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. A report has been made.

2. The report has not yet been printed as it is intended that it should form part of a larger publication.

3. The total cost of the trip was $1,999.86. Salaries paid, Mrs. Paget, $664.50 ; Miss Ferguson, $150.

SUBSIDIES TO PACIFIC COAST SHIPPING COMPANIES.

Mr. RALPH SMITH asked :

1. How many shipping companies doing business on the Pacific coast are receiving subsidies from the government?

2. What are the amounts of such subsidies, and for what purpose are they given?

3. Do any of the companies receiving subsidies encourage the immigration of Orientals, contrary to the restrictive legislation of the government?

Mr. BLAIN.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) :

1. Six.

2. (a) Canada and Mexico, $5,000 per annum ; Victoria, Vancouver and Skagway and West Coast Vancouver Island, $17,500 per annum ; Victoria and San Francisco, $3,000 per annum ; Canada, China and Japan, $73,000 per annum ; Canada and New Zealand, $50,000 per annum ; Victoria, Naas River, Port Essington &c., $100 per round trip.

(b) For the purpose of assisting trade generally.

3. The government has no such information, but such a practice, if it existed, would be deemed by the government as compatible with the Subsidy Act.

THE SASKATOON PHOENIX.

Mr. LAKE asked :

Have any orders been given by the government for special numbers of the Saskatoon 'Phœnix' during the years 1906 and 1907, for immigration or other purposes? If so, what number of copies were purchased, and what was the sum paid for them in each case?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

5,000 copies special edition, Saskatoon Phoenix, at five cents per copy, $300, ordered October 15, 1906, and paid for November 23, 1906.

5,000 copies special edition at seven cents per copy, $350. This was a special number of about twenty pages printed on eight pound book paper, seven column quarto, illustrated with pictures of Saskatoon and district, with reports of the actual grain yield of all the farming districts east and west of Saskatoon. This account was paid January 11, 1908.

RAILWAY LAND GRANTS.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. What is the total acreage in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta in odd-numbered sections, of lands granted to railways to November 1, 1907, shown on map recently issued by the Department of the Interior?

2. What is the total acreage in even-numbered sections?

3. What is the acreage of odd-numbered sections otherwise disposed of?

4. What is the acreage of Indian reserves surrendered and sold?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. 29,550,179 acres.

2. 2,212,775 acres.

3. 12,027,599 acres.

4. 216,892·14 acres.

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. What was the total acreage in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta covered by home-

stead entries and pre-emptions, with cancellations deducted on November 1, 1907?

2. What was the acreage of even-numbered sections disposed of prior to November 1, 1907, otherwise than as homestead, with Hudson Bay Company land excluded?

3. What was the acreage covered up to November 1, 1907, by half-breed scrip?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. 31,513,990 acres.
2. 8,070,720 acres.
3. 2,488,710 acres.

IMMIGRANTS BY SS. MONTREAL.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. What proportion of the 1,782 immigrants reported to have arrived at St. John, New Brunswick, on the Canadian Pacific Railway steamer 'Montreal,' on the 5th April, have been passed by the inspection officers?

2. How many have been rejected, and how many ordered to be deported?

3. What is the nationality of said immigrants?

4. Upon how many of said immigrants is there a bonus payable to agents?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. 98⅞ per cent of the 1761 passengers arriving ex SS. 'Montreal,' on the 5th April, passed inspection.

2. 19 of those destined to Canada and 7 of those destined to the United States were detained. It is not yet known how many of this number will be deported.

	Immigrants for Canada.	Immigrants for United States.
Austrian N.E.S.	11	1
Buckowinian	443	1
Galician	971	4
Hungarian	1	2
Belgian	10	2
Dutch	1	2
French	1	2
German	25	7
Hebrew, N.E.S.	2	7
Hebrew, Russian	51	7
Hebrew, Austrian	2	7
Italian	32	7
Polish, N.E.S.	1	7
Polish, Russian	1	7
Roumanian	15	1
Russian, N.E.S.	31	32
Returned Canadians	116	..
Totals	1,714	47

	Immigrants for Canada detained.	Immigrants for United States detained.
Bukowinian	3	..
Galician	10	2
German	10	2
Hebrew Russian	4	2
Polish	1	2
Russian	1	3
Totals	19	7

4. None.

IMMIGRANTS DEPORTED.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked:

Upon whose authority or complaint from the city of Chatham, did the government take action in deporting five families recently from the city of Chatham?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Attention was drawn to these cases in a general way by Mr. F. J. Naftel, manager of the Bank of Montreal, Chatham, on behalf of the charity associations of that city. Immigration officer Robert Boston was then sent to investigate and the department acted on his report in each case.

MONTREAL POST OFFICE.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

1. Were tenders called for the construction of the new addition to the Montreal post office in the old 'Gazette' building?

2. Who were the tenderers, and the prices tendered?

3. Whose tender was accepted, and at what price?

4. What arrangement, if any, was made for the joining of the two buildings?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1. Yes.

2. Peter Lyall & Sons, Montreal, $487,537; James Ballantyne, Montreal, $499,000; George W. F. Nicholson, Montreal, $520,000.

3. Peter Lyall & Sons, $487,537.

4. By a bridge or connecting corridor over Fortification Lane.

IMMIGRATION FROM FRANCE AND BELGIUM.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

1. Does the government pay premiums to the agents in Europe who send emigrants to the province of Quebec?

2. If so, what is the amount of premium per head, and the total amount paid in 1907?

3. What are the names of the agents in France and Belgium who receive or have received such premiums, and what is the amount received by each of them in 1907?

4. Are the Reverend Abbé Gaire, parish priest in Manitoba, and Reverend Abbé le Floch, a parish priest in Saskatchewan, but now in France, carrying on a propaganda for Canada by recruiting colonists for the Northwest, paid by the government; do they receive salaries or are they given a premium per head?

5. If so, what amount of money has each of them received, as salary, premium, expenses and cost of travel, in 1907?

6. Has the government agents, lay or clerical, in France and Belgium, who carry on an exclusive propaganda for the province of Quebec, as do the Reverend Messrs. Gaire and le Floch for Manitoba and the Northwest?

7. If so, what are the names and what is the number of such agents, how much are they paid, what salaries do they receive, are their travelling expenses and cost of living paid, and do they receive a premium per head?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. The government pays a commission to booking agents in Europe on tickets sold to Canada including Quebec.

2. £1. sterling per head for adults, and 10s. for children. No separate account kept for immigrants to Quebec. Total amount paid on French and Belgian immigrants to Canada, £280.15.0.

3. In France:

Messrs. Currie & Co., amount received	£ 49. 5.
Messrs. Pitt & Scott, amount received	16.10.
Messrs. Hernu, Peron & Co., amount received	114.10.
	£180. 5.

In Belgium:

Messrs. Raydt & Bryunseels amount received	£ 4.
M. G. Frendberg, amount received	3. 5.
Fedor Berns, amount paid	43.10.
P. Canon, amount received	49.15.
G. Schyns	
	£100.10.

4. No. Not now. Reverend Abbé le Floch was formerly employed and was paid a premium per head.

5. $197 (paid to Abbé le Floch).

6. No.

Mr. P. DOYLE.

Mr. STANFIELD asked:

1. When and for what reasons was one P. Doyle, immigration agent at Quebec, superannuated?

2. Who has been appointed by the government in his stead, and what are the names of his assistants?

3. What was the date of the appointment of the new agent, and of his assistants, and what are their qualifications?

4. What are the respective salaries of each?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. It is proposed to superannuate Mr. Doyle on the 15th instant, on account of age, and consequent inability to discharge properly the duties of his office.

2, 3 and 4. The assistant agent, Dr. Joseph Lavoie, is being promoted to the position, his promotion taking effect on the date of Mr. Doyle's retirement. Dr. Lavoie's assistants will be the following:

Name.	Date of Appointment.	Salary.
J. J. O'Flaherty.	April 15, 1908.	$1,500 00
L. Stein.....	May 1, 1874.	1,500 00
J. P. Stafford...	Oct. 17, 1892.	1,000 00
Dr. Potvin.....	May 8, 1897.	1,200 00
Dr. Dobbin.....	April 1, 1907.	1,200 00
Dr. Lessard. ..	" 1, 1907.	1,200 00
G. Beaulieu.....	Feb. 24, 1906.	900 00
S. Morrisette...	April 15, 1898.	2 00 per day.
J. Byrne.....	Feb. 16, 1906.	2 00 "
E. J. O'Connell.	May 14, 1906.	2 00 "
D. Ed. Valin...	Dec. 1, 1899.	700 00
Geo. Martel.....	May 8, 1903.	1 50 per day.
E. Galarneau...	Mar. 2, 1897.	1 50 "
P. Charest.....	Feb. 23, 1903.	1 50 "
J. Fitzgerald...	Jan. 1, 1900.	1 50 "
Jean Rochette..	April 1, 1897.	1 50 "
E. Drouin ...	Oct. 23, 1902.	50 00 per month
W. Anderson...	April 24, 1868.	800 00
Mrs. E. Corneil.	May 1, 1888.	50 00 per month
Mrs. Tremblay..	May 25, 1901.	40 00 "
Geo. Hayden...	April 6, 1897.	800 00
Jos. Huek	July 1, 1904.	50 00 per month
N. Poulin..	Sept. 17, 1904.	1 75 per day.

They are considered to possess qualifications suitable to the work.

Dr. Lavoie's salary will be the same as that of his predecessor, viz., $1,800 per annum.

DUTIES ON COAL, ETC.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN asked:

1. Why is coke, which is a manufactured article, imported free, while coal from which coke is manufactured, and which is a raw material, is heavily taxed?

2. Does the government intend to refund to Canadian manufacturers of coke the duty on the coal from which it is made?

3. Why are makers of binder twine allowed to import coal free, while the same privilege is refused to producers of gas.

4. Why is coal tar, which is a manufactured article, imported free, while coal which is used by the Canadian manufacturer of coal tar, is subject to a heavy duty?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). With reference to these three questions all of which are asked by the hon. member for Hamilton, I desire to say that it is necessary to consider the tariff as a whole and it would be obviously inconvenient to discuss isolated items. My hon. friend will see that these are rather difficult questions to answer, dealing with isolated items alone.

QUEBEC BRIDGE COMMISSION REPORT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When may we expect the report of the Quebec Bridge Commission in printed form? It is a long time since it was first presented to the House.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I am afraid it will be

quite a long time yet. It was only yesterday that I presented to the House the last appendix to that report. It is a very elaborate report, there are a great many drawings attached and we are trying to include all in the report so that it will be complete.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask whether a report which can be presented by itself could not be printed by itself and placed upon the table of the House.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will make inquiry as to that. The report is not only of importance to the House but judging from the correspondence and the inquiries I have received it will be of vast importance to the engineering world and we are anxious to make it as complete as possible so that in connection with the catastrophe those interested in the scientific aspect may get what lessons there are to be derived from it. I will make inquiry to see whether a portion of the report, or the main report possibly cannot be procured for the information of the House.

THE TRENT CANAL.

Mr. LENNOX. When may we expect the report of the engineer who surveyed the line of the Trent canal from Kempenfeldt bay? I think the survey was made last year It will be remembered that there were two propositions as to the outlet of the canal, one by way of the Severn river and the other from Kempenfeldt bay which is part of Lake Simcoe, through, by way of the Nottawasaga river to the Georgian bay. The survey has been made and I would like to know when we may expect the report.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will look into it.

THE NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—MAJOR HODGINS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I renew the question which I addressed yesterday to the Prime Minister as to the intentions of the government respecting the letter of Major Hodgins respecting the construction of the National Transcontinental Railway?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This morning I again telephoned to ascertain whether Mr. Parent, the chairman of the commission, had returned. I was informed that he had not yet returned, but that he was expected to return to-day. If my hon. friend will renew his question to-morrow I shall be in a position to give him an answer.

THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Mr. BERGERON. I wish to ask the government if the translation of the report and evidence of the Royal Commission on the Civil Service is proceeding, and if instructions have been given to have it translated as soon as possible?

Mr. FIELDING. No instructions have been given. It was presumed that the usual course would be followed of translating all public documents promptly. I am not aware of any difficulty in the way, but it was not a matter about which we thought it necessary to give any instructions.

Mr. BERGERON. In case the work of translation is not going on, will my hon. friend be kind enough to see that it is proceeded with as soon as possible?

Mr. FIELDING. Now that the hon. gentleman has called attention to the matter, I have no doubt that the officers of the House will attend to it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I was informed the other day by one of the officers of the House that the translation was being proceeded with.

ANGLO-AMERICAN TREATY.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the government if any draft of the convention signed at Washington between the British government and the United States government was submitted to this government before it was signed?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes. The correspondence will be brought down as soon as we are in a position to bring it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask the Prime Minister whether he has received any reply to the telegram which was dispatched yesterday to the British embassy at Washington?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have received no answer yet.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—JUSTICE CASSELS.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to inquire if the Mr. Perron who has been appointed a counsel to appear before Mr. Justice Cassels in the investigation of the Department of Marine and Fisheries is the Mr. Perron who is a partner in the firm of Préfontaine, Archer, Perron & Taschereau, of which the late Mr. Préfontaine, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, was the head ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand that Mr. Perron was for a very short time in partnership with Mr. Préfontaine several years ago, before he became a minister.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Might I inquire if it has come under the consideration of the government that it might be advisable that some counsel should be appointed to appear before the commission on behalf of the people of Canada?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will take that into consideration, Mr. Speaker.

DREDGING CONTRACTS.

Mr. BENNETT. I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works if he will to-day lay on the table of the House the order in council he referred to about a week ago in reference to dredging contracts and also the report of the chief engineer which he also promised on that occasion to bring down?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I gave my hon. friend the information as to this yesterday. I stated that when the matter was previously before the House, I had said that the question of extending the time for the completion of certain contracts was under consideration. I also said that since the matter had come before the House I had come to the conclusion not to extend the time, but to ask for new tenders, and under these circumstances I did not think it was proper or at all material to lay on the table of the House an order in council which had been cancelled.

Mr. BENNETT. On that point I would appeal to the Speaker as to whether it is not clearly laid down in the rules of the House that, the minister having stated that there was an order in council and having based an argument upon it, that order in council must be laid on the table. The rule will be found at page 461 of Bourinot.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that rule should have been invoked at the time the discussion took place.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The rule was not quoted, but it was invoked, because the minister was asked in accordance with it to bring down the order in council.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that I will consider the matter. I did not think yesterday and do not think now that it is of any consequence to bring down this order or any other order that has been rescinded. But I will consider the matter until to-morrow.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule of course is plain. If a minister refers to a public document it should be laid on the table of the House. I do not now recall that the rule was invoked at the time of the discussion. If it had been, I would of course have stated that that was the effect of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. All I said about it was in answer to a question put by the hon. gentleman. He asked if an order in council had been passed, and I gave an explanation in answer to his question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As a matter of fact, the minister made a distinct promise to bring the order in council down. If he refers to 'Hansard' he will find that I am absolutely correct in that statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is quite right. But the discussion went on without waiting for the order in council, and since that time the order has been rescinded.

SUPPLY—IMMIGRATION.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply, and the proposed amendment of Mr. Monk thereto.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE (South Perth). Mr. Speaker, the debate on the question before the House has been so interrupted and broken by other matters intervening and by the Easter holidays that it may be appropriate to read the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). It is as follows:

> While recognizing the importance of legitimate, well directed efforts to encourage desirable immigration, this House declares that it is time to cease paying a bounty at so much per head to agents for immigrants coming to Canada.

It will be noticed, Sir, that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier favours immigration while desiring it to be of a good class. That is a very natural desire in a new country. It is a desire that has been shown in Canada at all times under all governments. We cannot expect any new country to make headway and prosper if it simply depends upon a natural increase. I can quite sympathize with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier in his desire that the immigrants to this country should be of a desirable class. With many of the arguments that he advanced I agree; with many of the desires he expressed I have the very strongest sympathy. With some of the statements made I do not find myself in agreement, and I will take the liberty of criticising them as I proceed. It is true, Sir, that we have a fine field to offer for immigration in this country. Probably no finer field exists throughout the world than Canada offers at the present time. In addition to that we have made an excellent start in this country, and if, with the fine field and the excellent start, we could gather from the world and bring into this country the strong, the clean, the moral, the intellectual, the active, there is no telling how fine a country we might make. There is every necessary feature in the circumstances to allow us to almost reach Utopia. What is it then that we may not accomplish? I think the real fact is this, that these choicest spirits whom we would like to bring into this country are not easily obtained. They are a class of fruit that does not grow on every tree, even in Canada. They are not particularly numerous in other lands and not easy to obtain, because in the countries where they exist they are too useful to be easily spared. Therefore when we view the matter in that way, we realize that we can only do the best we

can under the circumstances and not expect to secure the very finest people of all countries. We must realize that we have either to depend upon our natural increase or be satisfied with the best available material in other lands to help us to develop our own. Members of this House will agree on consideration, that in bringing immigration into Canada we are not likely immediately to improve the character of Canadian citizenship. We must face that as something to be accepted. If we have made progress, if we have improved on our original stock, if our environment, laws and customs have improved that stock, we are not going to immediately improve it still more by bringing in people from other countries, so that, granting the necessity of immigration, we have to accept it on the understanding that the newcomers are not going immediately to improve the character of our citizenship. I have often felt in favour of exclusiveness myself. One gets to like his own people. We feel that we have grown up with the country, that we belong to it and it to us, and we are inclined to resent the intrusion of others whose point of view is not exactly our own. But when we look at the circumstances, when we realize that the country requires immigrants, when we realize that every settler in our Northwest requires a neighbour to assist him in making roads, building schools, paying taxes, and increasing the value of property, when we recognize that every settler had a tacit agreement or understanding with this government when he took up land, that this government would do everything to provide him with neighbours, we are bound to admit that no effort should be spared to fill up the country. Every transportation company wants immigrants, so does every manufacturing establishment and wholesale merchant. All these combined influences are so naturally strong that they are almost, if not entirely, irresistible. I know that necessity does not make for quality. It is left perhaps for a few idealists, such as my hon. friends from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne), to raise the cry for quality rather than quantity; but if my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) were Minister of the Interior, he would no more be able to resist the cry for immigrants and for the filling up of our new country than is the present Minister of the Interior. But we ought all to welcome every plea made for the improvement of the class of immigrants coming to our country.

My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier has chosen as his point of attack on the government the question of bonuses. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) says that the bonus is not given to assist immigrants to come to this country but as a means of advertising this country and as a stimulus to the booking agents to forward a good class of settlers. I notice also that there is a difference between the amendment moved this session by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and that moved last session by my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne). The present amendment simply declares that the time has come when we should cease paying a bounty to agents for immigrants coming to Canada. No reason is given why these bounties should cease, but last session my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne) gave specific reasons why they should be discontinued. But though any specific reason is absent on the present occasion, the same reason which the hon. member for Montmagny urged last session appears all through the line of argument of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). So that we may take it for granted that the same reason exists this year in the mind of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) as existed last year in the mind of the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne). There is, however, a change of form, and sometimes a change from one season to another in the form of an amendment may indicate a change of mind. It may indicate that those who favour the cessation of the bounty system realize that the point of attack made last session was not effective. But while the argument of the mover of the amendment was along the same lines, I felt, as I listened to it, that the bounty itself, much as it occupied his time, does not represent the real strong reason for the position he took. It seemed to me that running through his argument there was an expression of doubt or fear with regard to our whole immigration policy. The bonus is simply one part of that policy, and I would not consider it a vital or essential part. It is only one feature and it may have its weaknesses. The real strong features of our immigration policy are the advertising of the country, the spreading of information, the offer of land to the immigrant, and the giving of that land on easy terms. These are the strong features of an immigration policy and the bonus, though important in a way, is merely incidental. It was shown last year how an immigration policy could really adapt itself to the necessities of the time and the varying circumstances in different countries. We had last year an effective speech from the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), and after listening to his argument and that of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) I was forced to the conclusion that the attack on our immigration policy, because of its bonusing feature, was not at all conclusive.

If you take the actual number of immigrants on whom bonuses were paid, you will find that in 1896 the total number of immigrants was 16,835 and that bonuses were paid on 4,384. The amount has gradually grown until in 1907-8, out of 235,328, bonuses were paid on 20,516. It will be seen that the bonus was paid on about one

in every twelve immigrants. On the face of it then, the bonus is not really so important a feature in our immigration policy as to demand more especially the attack of our opponents. It does not appear to me to be the vulnerable point in our immigration policy and I cannot understand why my hon. friend should have directed his attack on that particular feature.

If you look at the whole series of years in which 1,209,000 immigrants arrived and bonuses were paid to the amount of $1,248,000, you will see that we paid on only about one in five of these immigrants. The percentage since then has been decreasing, as, last year, we paid on only one in twelve. Now, if that circumstance were really widely known and understood by our people, I think there would be quite a change in their attitude, quite a changed feeling towards the immigration policy. That it is not widely known is perhaps partly our fault. I do not know how widely our friends of the opposition have endeavoured to disseminate such a thought, but I know that, in the ordinary political warfare, while a man of ability may be trusted to present his own side of the case in a favourable light, it is not always possible for him to present the opposing side in a light that will satisfy that side. Therefore, I have felt that the presentation in many of the newspaper articles has not quite done us justice. And I have heard many speakers tell of very striking cases of immigrants who were evidently undesirable, and, after dwelling on that subject for some time, with a wave of the hand declare that this is the class of people on whom we pay bonuses. The oratorical effect was there. But, as a matter of statistics, would it not be more accurate to say that on one of twelve of these we paid bonuses ? Yet my hon. friends did not take the trouble to do that. It is left for us to point out what the exact facts are.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I point out to my hon. friend (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) that the information to which he refers was elicited in response to a question put by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) on the 19th of March last.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. To that extent, we are indebted to the hon. member for Peel.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And to no one else.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. Yes, and, perhaps, somewhat unconsciously, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) has benefited us to that extent. Whether he did it intentionally or otherwise, we should thank him for eliciting that information. For the nine months ending December 31, 1907, we received 235,328 immigrants. We paid bonuses upon 20,516. It will be seen that this, again, is about one in twelve. Now, I have pointed out that, in the minds of the people, and in the speeches by most of the members on this subject, especially those who oppose the government there is a quiet assumption that the bonus is paid on all immigrants.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. No.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. My hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) does not agree. I do not charge it as a specific attempt to mislead the people or misstate the position, but the case as stated is : There are the immigrants and on immigrants of this class a bonus is paid.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. If my hon. friend (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) will allow me : I think we tried to make it clear that the bonus was paid to booking agents for advertising purposes, and that the advertising attracted a variety of people, but especially the more destitute—that is where the danger lies

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. But, proceeding along the line on which I was going, my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) who, I regret, is not in his place, is one of the fairest minded men in the House. He has spoken on this matter. I have a quotation or two from his address, which, to my mind, shows that he has rather failed to reach to that point of perfection where one places his opponent's arguments in a way that would strike that opponent as fair and just. The hon. gentleman was dealing with a case in which 8,500 immigrants who came into Canada within one year passed into the United States. He pointed out that of this number some 500 were rejected for various causes, this argument being used to show that the restrictions upon immigrants in the United States were more severe than in Canada and that we had allowed undesirable immigrants to come in. And, with regard to these 500 immigrants that were rejected, he said that we had these immigrants in Canada at the present time. But he accepted his information on the subject from the American returns. Who these 8,500 immigrants were he did not know, by what ships they came he did not know. He did not know in what part of Canada they had settled. And yet, when he is asked by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) whether we paid a bonus on these 500 immigrants that were rejected, his answer is 'No doubt we did. No doubt they came within the classes, so very extensive and comprehensive, upon which we pay bonuses.' Now, will he not, upon a little consideration, think that language rather strong ? If you gathered all the immigrants who came into Canada last year in one place, only one in twelve of them could be pointed out as immigrants for whom bonuses had been paid. If you choose out a single immigrant, the only thing you can say is that the chances

are eleven to one that no bonus was paid for him—the chances are against a bonus having been paid upon any particular person. Now, can the hon. member (Mr. Monk) say that 'no doubt' we paid a bonus on these 500 and more who were rejected? Nor does the hon. member stop there. Speaking of the 8,000 who were refused entry into the United States, but passed into that country, he said :

On these no doubt the government paid a bonus. Why should they not? If these people were booked from England or any other country in which we grant a bonus to immigrants of certain classes—very comprehensive classes—the booking agent got his bonus on them when they came here, and they afterwards went to the United States.

There is an entire assumption that the bonus was paid on every one of these 8,000 immigrants. I can read it in no other way. I cannot concede this as a fair statement of the case, nor is it putting our own statement in the light in which we think it should be placed. Again, touching on the same point —the presentation of our case (if I may call it our case) in the light in which we think it should be viewed—let me point out that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) in dealing with the matter of bonuses said :

When we spent from $20,000 to $100,000 on immigration, though the bonusing system may have existed, but it amounted to a negligible quantity. But to-day, when we spend over $1,000,000 on immigration, a large portion of it in bonuses, it becomes an important question.

'A large portion of it in bonuses.' Now, my hon. friend knows the use of English words. Now, what is the impression given by 'a large portion' of $1,000,000. Let me give the hon. gentleman's own figures as to what was paid. The table quoted by the hon. gentleman shows that for the nine months of 1907-8, the bonus paid on British immigrants was $84,495, on continental immigrants $34,619 and on United States immigrants $3,963, making a total of $123,077. Can that be said to be, under the circumstances, and using the argument as my hon. friend did, 'a large portion' of $1,000,000 ?

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Does that include payments to the North Atlantic Trading Company ?

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. These are the figures given by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier showing the amount of bonuses paid on immigrants for the period stated. I give the figures just as the hon. gentleman gave them.

Now, Sir, I realize that even these lapses —so I call them—from the class of statement we think would fairly present our case, are not as strong or as striking as we have sometimes heard. But we do not measure my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier by ordinary standards ; we give a special standard to a man of that class. I would tell the hon. gentleman that we give him a very high standard indeed and I believe that if he simply held to his own standard we would find in the revised version of 'Hansard,' a modification of some of these statements.

Again, Sir, touching on that same question, upon the presentation of your opponent's case in the light in which you think it ought to be viewed, I will take a statement of the hon. minister's which I find headed in large letters in the 'Hansard' :

Statement showing what proportion of our immigrants go upon the free lands of the Northwest.

Notice the heading, 'Statement showing what proportion of our immigrants go upon the free lands of the Northwest.' Evidencing his intent the sentence preceding it begins :

Let me give briefly a statement showing what proportion of our immigrants go upon the free lands of the Northwest, the increase in the number of homestead entries, the total immigration and the percentage of the homestead increase to the total immigration for each year from 1896 until the present.

How does the hon. gentleman ascertain that proportion or percentage? He has taken the total number of homestead entries in a year and the total number of immigrants and ascertained the percentage of the homesteads to the immigrants. Thus he shows in his last year's statement 25,281 homestead entries, 235,328 immigrants, percentage 11. Then by the heading of his statement we have 11 per cent of our immigrants of last year go upon the free lands of the Northwest. That is the statement my hon. friend has sent abroad through 'Hansard.' Is that, I ask my hon. friend, a really correct statement of the facts? Have only 11 per cent of our immigrants gone upon the free lands of the Northwest? Is it not a well known rule that a married man may take a homestead but that his wife or his children may not? Is it not a well known rule that you must count at least two and a half people on the land for every homestead? Does not the farmer's son, not yet of age to take a homestead, go upon the lands? I am inclined to believe that he feels he is very mush on the land, as he sweats in the eye of Phœbus and sleeps in Elysium. I think that far more have gone upon the lands than the figures of the hon. gentleman would indicate. I would eliminate the introductory sentence, I would eliminate from that statement the heading in large letters:

Statement showing what proportion of our immigrants go upon the free lands of the Northwest.

I think I would wipe out the whole statement, because for the purpose in view, the

figures are altogether misleading. Thus I think that in this case my hon. friend has scarcely done the minister that justice which the Minister of the Interior would have been able to do himself.

Touching on that question of the 8,500 immigrants who passed from Canada within a year to the United States I would like to present one thought. We have been told that the restrictions on immigration into the United States are more stringent than those on immigration into Canada. I may say that has been my own impression, but I know that the mere technical reading of a restriction does not decide the matter; it is the actual working out of the system that decides. However, if you grant that the restrictions into the United States are a little more stringent than ours, let us see how it has worked out in connection with these emigrants who went to the United States through Canada. The hon. member says that 8,500 passed in. Who were they? My hon. friend does not know. Who were they likely to be? Are the best immigrants who come into this land lying around idle. The best of them are at work. Is it not a fair inference that the 8,500 were not the best who came to this country? If, within a year, these 8,500 did not settle in this country, did not find work and do well, if they were of the class of people who could not fit in, we may fairly claim, without any straining of the argument, that they were of the less desirable of those who came in. And yet of these less desirables, facing the more stringent regulations of the United States if you will, 8,500 passed in without any question apparently, and only 500 of this class were rejected. I hold, in view of the possibility or the probability that these were the least desirable of our immigrants, that we may fairly congratulate the Minister of the Interior on the evidence shown by this that he has been fairly successful in getting us a good class of immigrants.

My hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne) has dwelt very strongly, more strongly possibly than my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), upon the fact that the bonus stimulates the undesirable rather than the desirable to come to this country. The bonus does stimulate the undesirables; it is unavoidable that in the very process of stimulating the desirable you will stimulate the undesirable. Every step you take to advertise your country stimulates the undesirable as well as the desirable to come here.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Hear, hear.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. You cannot give publicity without doing it, you cannot let your country be known without reaching the undesirable and stimulating him to come to you. It has been frequently said that the best immigration agent is the successful settler, but the successful settler stimulates the undesirable as well as the desirable. It is inevitable, the news cannot be concealed from the undesirable, he knows the advantage of Canada and everything that stimulates the desirable will attract the attention of the undesirable and stimulate him as well. That is a condition which we have to face, and there is where I think my hon. friends have failed to see the real danger in immigration, the real point to be safeguarded. If I were inclined to suggest that the thought in the mind of my hon. friend who is moving this amendment (Mr. Monk) is political gain, then his suggestion that the bonus is paid to everybody would perhaps be good politics, but I do not think that any one who carefully and calmly examines the question will find that the bonus is the serious matter, the serious matter is the restriction at the port of entry into Canada, the sieve through which you pass the immigrants, the test you make. You must expect that the undesirable in other lands will hear of this good land as rapidly as the desirable. Dealing with the bounty system and the effect of the bonus in stimulating the undesirable rather than the desirable, let me read to my hon. friend the opinion of a very hon. gentleman in this House who spoke on the matter. I may say that I agree entirely with the views expressed. The words are:

> It does not seem to me that the payment of bonuses in itself has any tendency to bring in a less rather than a more desirable class of people into this country; that would depend altogether upon the way you worked it out.

Mr. EMMERSON. Who was that?

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. The name is R. L. Borden. I know. Sir, that I cannot claim that the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne) should obey that hon. gentleman and I know further that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) in speaking in that way had not had the benefit of the argument of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). Neither at that time nor on this occasion did he hear that argument and he will be at liberty to act as he at present thinks right. But, I can tell my hon. friend from Montmagny that he had the opportunity to convince the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and in that case he failed. I agree entirely with the views expressed in a portion of his speech by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). I think those views were absolutely sound. Again, taking up that very matter of the payment of bonuses and applying it more strictly to the amendment here, I wish to point out that on that occasion the hon. leader of the opposition had not been converted—whether he is now or not I do not know—it is for him to say—to the view that the bonus system should not be used. The words that he used on that occasion were these:

In a word, I would be inclined to restrict our efforts so far as the system of bonusing is concerned to the people of the British Isles.

But, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier does not restrict it in that way. I am sorry that the hon. leader of the opposition has not had the benefit of his argument, but we will be able to see later on whether my hon. friend, as he will have the right to, and as he has had a year to think over the matter, has changed his views. But, I will say in regard to the amendment of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier that the time will come when all this House will agree with it. I believe the time will come when we will no longer have reason to pay bonuses to secure immigration. The question is: Has that time come now?

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. That is the opinion of the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. That is virtually the question at the present time and it is a question of judgment. The bonus is not a vital and essential part; it has been a very valuable part, and it has done its work, and in many ways good work. But while I have no particular prejudice for or against a bonus, except in so far as it aids our chances to do good work in the majority of cases, rather than take my hon. friend's view in favour of abolishing the bonus I think that we should improve the character of the immigration, that we should endeavour to get the finest of other lands to come to us and in order to do that I would not only retain the bonus but I would double and treble it. What are the results to-day? Have we suffered very much from the present system of immigration? While it is true that there have been cases of immigrants not behaving well, while there have been cases of suffering largely through people not understanding our country, perhaps coming out in the autumn when they should come in the spring, we are not really suffering in Ontario, Quebec or the maritime provinces. If I look then to what is the actual condition of affairs in the west, if I take the figures that were given us in 1906, in Alberta I find that it then had a population of 185,412. Of that 185,412, which was the beginning of the province, there were British born people to the number of 111,138. It was a matter of surprise to me when I first ascertained these figures. I could hardly think them correct. It had struck me that with the influx of population from all countries the proportion of British born would not have been so great as 111,138. In addition to that, of United States immigrants, there were 43,000, making a total of 154,138. The balance from all other countries numbered 31,274. That can only be considered as an excellent start for any province. It by no means gives cause for anxiety. If we take the figures which have in the past been given us in regard to the increase of population in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, taking the years 1901 to 1906, in which year a census was taken, we find that there was an increase of 389,351. Of that increase British born people numbered 239,044, or 62 per cent of the whole increase were British born. Of the remainder, 71,000 came from the United States, or 18 per cent, leaving only 20 per cent of an increase altogether from all other sources combined. There again, sir, I feel that there is no cause for anxiety.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Will my hon. friend allow me to read him this? The sentences were pronounced at the assizes in the city of Montreal yesterday, and I see by the Montreal 'Gazette' to-day that about four-fifths of those who were condemned were immigrants. I will read the names if my hon. friend desires me to do so.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. I will accept my hon. friend's word without his naming them. There can be no doubt that in the immigration which is coming to this country there will be found many undesirables, but my hon. friend must bear this in mind that at the present moment we are not so entirely considering the character of all the immigrants who come in as the effect of the bonusing system upon immigration.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Railway labouring men are bonused, most of them are Italians, and most of the immigrants condemned are Italians; therefore, I must say that the immigrants who are condemned are the bonused ones.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. In so far as Italian immigration is concerned we are paying no bonus on Italian immigrants as settlers. We are paying no bonus whatever on them, but from the very necessities of the case, in as much as we must open up our country and prepare means of transportation, we must get somebody to do that work. We apparently cannot get railway navvies from any other country than Italy. There was a time when railway companies were able to get railway navvies elsewhere, but that appears to be no longer possible. While my hon. friend may be perfectly correct in saying that in a particular lot of Italian railway navvies we will find they have been bonused; that is one of the exceptions to our rules, and it is because of the necessity that we are under of building railways. We do not expect these people to become settlers but the necessity of building railways makes it necessary that we shall make an exception in this case. We must bonus incomers of that kind to build our roads and to open up our country. We realize in doing that that we may be bringing in many who are not so desirable, but these people will not likely become permanent settlers in our country.

Mr. OLIVER. May I just correct my hon. friend on that point? I wish to say, in order to clear the point up, that the bonus

is paid on farmers, farm labourers and railway labourers, who are citizens of certain countries and who are of certain occupations in these countries. Italy is not one of these countries for whose citizens bonuses are paid.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I never said that these Italians came from Italy; they came from the slums of Liverpool and London.

Mr. BERGERON. Certainly.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. While many of our friends on the opposition side of the House can find instances in which immigrants have not behaved well, I feel satisfied that a fair examination of the conditions in Canada to-day does not show that the immigration population has been of such a character that this proposed change needs essentially to be adopted. Neither does it give cause to any one to make much of it, but unfortunately a case of this kind is likely to be much more prominent than that of the man who quietly settles down to work. But, up to the present time I repeat that we have no cause for anxiety. What are the probabilities for the future? My hon. friends have dealt strongly with that, and I suppose one man's guess may be as good as another's. It is a matter of conjecture. The danger will not come from the quantity, but the danger will come from the quality and the grouping and locating of these people. I would not in the least endeavour to belittle any words of warning in regard to the quality of the immigration that we are getting or of the danger that might come from the bringing in of undesirables. I accept all these words of warning, and I would treat them not with scorn, but with great care. Words of warning are frequently valuable. Taking the figures we find though that for the full calendar year 1907, Canada received 277,376 immigrants, and from Great Britain we received 132,060, or about 50 per cent of the whole amount of the immigration that came to Canada in the calendar year 1907. From the United States there came 56,690, leaving—and I am grouping it in that way for certain reasons which I think not unfair—leaving 88,000 from all other countries combined. Here again it will be seen, that there is not necessarily, from these figures, any fear that we are inundating our country with nationalities that may not be properly assimilated. I do not see that there is any danger of making of our country what my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne) called a 'mongrel nation.' It is true that among the immigrants there are some we may have some doubt about. I myself in looking over the list and noticing there were 14,626 from Galicia, wondered whether these would make good citizens or not. In my reading on this matter I have found, however, that a very fair character has been given these people by the leader of the opposition, and I am willing to receive his recommendation. He has stated that the children of these people will probably prove the equal of the children of other nationalities. I have found among the number coming in 1907, 6,206 Russian Jews, and again I feel that these are perhaps not the class of people I would like to see coming in great numbers. I have found there were 13,076 Italians, and if among them there are a great number of railroad navvies as I suppose there are, they are doing a very necessary work even if some of them are not very desirable. I have found there came in 7,808 Japanese, and this I understand is an immigration that is not likely to continue to any marked extent. I have noticed that the German immigration that year was about 2,500. I regret indeed that the number is not larger, and I hope it may be possible to obtain more German immigrants. The general result is that of the various nationalities that came to this country in 1907, Britain sent 50 per cent, the United States the proportion I have mentioned already, and consequently I have not been able to feel that alarm which some of my friends feel at the existing condition of affairs. But the fear is expressed, that with the incoming tide we will not be able to assimilate these new people. I do not belittle that fear. There is a fear expressed that the incoming tide will weaken our Canadian character or our Canadian institutions or our aspirations or our point of view. It may be fair to ask: What do my hon. friends mean by assimilation in such a case? I presume that the phrase will mean different things for different people. And what is the Canadian character or temperament of which we speak and which we fear may be injured? I think, Sir, that when our ancestors, the early immigrants came to this country, Englishmen and Frenchmen, and took up their work here 100 years or two ago, they were not Canadians in any sense that we may term them. They were simply Englishmen and Frenchmen transplanted from their natural home. That is all. In the process of time, however, living here, influenced I would judge by further immigration, influenced by their work, by their climate, by their environment, they did gather some characteristics which they transmitted to us, and this we call the Canadian temperament. I fancy that is what we mean when we speak of the Canadian character. If we have been able to acquire such a character, temperament, disposition, traits, it is the result mostly of our environment. Do we think that environment properly applied may not have a similar effect upon other immigrants who come here? I think we may fairly expect that it shall. The results up to the present time have been fairly satisfactory in the character of our people. I do not undervalue the desire on the part of any one to retain a certain identity of character, although we must recognize that nations like individuals

must grow, and from time to time change. But, Sir, we are far from being a homogeneous people. My hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne), and I probably look upon matters in a different light. We naturally speak a different language, although I must congratulate my hon. friend on having the language of the two nationalities as has also my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk).

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. So have you.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. To a limited extent. But if I were to say to my French Canadian compatriot : You are not a Canadian, you do not speak the language I do, your point of view is different, you cannot be assimilated; I think he would laugh at me and say: If there is a Canadian at all I am he; I am Canadian and Canadian only. I have no other land but Canada to look to: This is my own, my native land.

And, just in the same way my hon. friend might say to me: You are not entirely Canadian because you do not speak the language I do. But, is either of us not assimilated, are we not both Canadians, is the matter of language or of a certain difference in our point of view, in any way to be considered; are we not assimilated as Canadians ? Take again the races whence the British people have sprung—is Britain a thoroughly assimilated and homogeneous nation? Why, the British people are as complex as anything well could be; they are partly Saxon, partly Danish, partly Norman, and in many parts of the old country you find the old Celtic. The Scotchman from the North of Scotland is as different from the Englishman from the South of England as anything well could be, and the Irishman is different again. Will the Englishman say to the Scotchman: You are not assimilated because your language is somewhat different, your characteristics are different, your point of view is different from mine? The British nation is complex, it is made up of many races, but, notwithstanding, the people of Britain have the one national idea in many respects. They have certain ideas in common on the line of matters of government, on the line of individual liberty, but in other respects they are complex. Let me take also as an illustration one that has come very much under my own eye, when we speak of assimilation. We have in Western Ontario a large grouping of German settlers in a number of counties : in Waterloo, in Perth, in the Greys. There is no finer class of people in Western Ontario than the German people who went in there and there have been no more useful citizens. The same wisdom that led them to choose out the best land when they came to settle here in the early days has characterized them in all their work, and they have shown aptitude along commercial lines as well as along agricultural lines If any one goes to the town of Berlin he will be amazed at the growth of that town, and its multiplicity of manufacturing institutions, and it is essentially a German town. The same may be said of Preston, the same may be said of Hamburg, of Tavistock, of Hanover. In many ways the Germans have been the finest settlers we have had in the country, and I sincerely wish the Minister of the Interior could persuade more of them to come here. Shall I say to my German friend : You are not assimilated because you still cling largely to your own language, because your point of view on some questions is different from mine ? No, I would be ashamed to. It is association with the various nationalities which make up our country that makes me feel it is narrow and small in any man to think that Canada must be made up of his own particular stock and his own particular race. I do not fear in the least when I examine into matters of that kind and realize what we have achieved in the past. I feel that a man is really assimilated for all proper purposes in this country if he gains the lessons that come from our institutions, if he gains that self-reliance that our land will give him, if he gains self respect, if he becomes an honest, industrious and prosperous citizen, if he realizes the liberties that we have given him. And, Sir, if he feels all that and is loyal to this land, we may trust to it that no man can enjoy the liberties and privileges of Canada and enjoy the success which industry here will bring to him, without being contented with his lot and without being loyal to Canada to the core. There is no fear that his children when they grow up will be the least different from ours. Indeed, in many respects the descendants of these immigrants may be an improvement on ourselves. Every nationality who brings in its particular colouring here will bring in some virtue with it. There may be vices to check and there may be weaknesses to restrain, but you may depend upon it that the good sense of our people, the freedom of our laws, and the respect for the rights of the individual will cure the defects and that the virtues which these nationalities possess will be perpetuated and will be helpful to us all. I realize, Sir, that all immigrants will not be satisfactory, but I regret when I hear the sharpness of the criticism which is directed in many cases against the immigrants who come to this land and, who in my opinion should be received by us with a sympathetic spirit. When I listen to that sharp criticism which we sometimes hear I am inclined to ask the question: Who are we? Are we not the sons or the grandsons or the great grandsons of immigrants? I think we are. Who has come to this land because he had plenty of money and thought it a picnic to come to Canada ? Did not every one of our forefathers come here to better his condition? If we could with the eyes of to-day look

back and see our forefathers who landed in Canada, say a hundred years ago, would we, with our more fastidious taste, be impressed with their appearance? If we could see them—tradesmen, mechanics, clerks—labouring with the unaccustomed axe to cut down the forests, wouldn't we almost laugh at what we would regard as their feeble efforts?

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Does my hon. friend think that our forefathers ever looked like the Doukhobors?

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. My hon. friend has, I think, made a mistake. He has shown a narrowness of view that I think is rather unfortunate in a young man of his parts and his acquirements. I will not follow the argument further. To seek out a very striking and unusual exception, and endeavour to lay down a general rule upon it is very unwise. My hon. friend himself perhaps had forefathers who were immigrants to this country, and no matter how fortunate or favourable may have been their circumstances, I think he will realize the force of the argument I was endeavouring to make. that our forefathers who came to this country did not come because they were doing well in the old land. They came, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred because there was pressure behind them to send them here; and when they came they did not or could not the moment they landed make the kind of immigrants we would like to have. We must have patience with these immigrants; for, while we may not make a really good citizen out of every immigrant who comes to this country, you may depend upon it that his children will make good citizens. There are immigrant children running around the streets of this country to-day any one of whom may worthily fill the seat now occupied by my hon. friend from Montmagny. This has been shown time and again. There is not such a radical difference between the nations of Europe as to prevent such things coming about. Take the young children, bring them up properly, give them education, and class distinctions will disappear, and those of ability are bound to come to the front. The children of immigrants, who are now running around the streets, will yet share in the government of a prosperous country and be a credit to it. In regard also to the filling up of the Northwest, we should not forget that the really vital point there is to get in a sufficient number of native Canadians from the older provinces to give the colour, the example, the impetus, to the incoming tide of immigration. That we have most successfully done; and there is very little doubt that when you get a happy and contented people on the land, you will have a safe people.

I would like to refer to an example taken by way of illustration, by my hon. friend from Montmagny from the history of the United States. As he put it, it was not put unfairly; and if you look at it simply from the point of view he did, and accept the figures he gave, you might have some cause for anxiety and alarm. He stated that the United States had a population of fifty millions before it received as large a flow of immigration as ours of last year, that is, 300,000; and then he used the argument that on account of the incoming immigration the United States had become alarmed—that with its 80,000,000 people it was now receiving 1,000,000 immigrants a year, and was restricting its immigration; and he used the argument that with our population of 6,000,000 we could not afford to let 300,000 people annually come in. On the face of it that argument has some force and it should be carefully considered; but if you examine it, you will find that there are some very marked points which my hon. friend has either overlooked or has not emphasized. The United States have in the first place the unassimilated millions on millions of negro population. This makes for them a question intensely vital and extremely difficult. We have no such question to face. With them it is a most troublesome question, and the outcome of it no man can tell. Take again another feature. My hon. friend, in his figures of immigrants coming to Canada, spoke of so many thousands of them being foreign born. Now, the term foreign-born is correctly used; but does it mean for us what it means to the United States? There is a very marked difference indeed. Of the million immigrants who flow into the United States how many speak the same language as the predominant language of the country, the English? Comparatively few. The most of them are people who speak an alien language, who are unaccustomed to the individual liberties given to the people of the United States and who are unused to the form of government prevailing there. Does that condition compare at all with the condition in this country? Take our Canadian immigration of 300,000. The great bulk of these people speak the language of the majority in this country; we have not to assimilate them in that respect. Every British immigrant who comes to Canada is accustomed to parliamentary government; the mother of parliaments was created in the land from which he comes. Every immigrant who comes from the United States speaks the language of the majority in this country, and is trained in a form of government almost identical with our own. The term foreign-born does not mean in Canada, in any respect, what it does in the United States. And so. while I feel that the argument my hon. friend used is somewhat plausible as he used it, it requires only a little examination to show that it does not at all apply to the matter in hand. An Englishman who came to Canada a year ago is not foreign-born in any true sense of the term; he is a

part of the British empire in any case; he speaks one of our two languages; he has been trained to our system of government; and he has a sense of individual liberty and responsibility.

Again, there is this great difference in the immigration that comes to these two countries. In the United States, with their lands exhausted, there is a tendency on the part of immigrants to gather together in groups in large cities, speaking only their own language, and ruled by their own organizations. It is a very striking fact that in Greater New York there is to-day the largest Jewish community in the world. No such thing is possible in Canada. The more we send the immigrants to the free lands of the west, the less danger there will be, if they are settled, not in groups by themselves, but among others. I have no doubt of the result as long as proper care is taken.

While I have spoken in that way, and while I feel that the really bad immigrants are not numerous, although given great prominence, I do not in any way belittle the arguments used in favour of a good class of immigrants in this country. I desire it with all the force of my hon. friends who have spoken on this subject, and I feel that a very great responsibility is thrown on the Minister of the Interior. My hon. friend has received very hard knocks and much sharp criticism in this House, and I cannot say that he returns the soft answer; I think he invites the combat.

At the same time my hon. friend may be assured he has won the respect and confidence of both sides of the House in his good intent and sincerity, and that will prove to him a great assistance indeed in facing his work. No doubt he realizes the very great responsibility that is attached to his work. In this House at times we have to face conditions that are irrevocable, that we cannot change. Our immigration policy is not one of these. We could at any moment change that policy and put up the bars to stop immigration and it is my hon. friend who has the responsibility. He stands at the gate, he forms our immigration policy, and just as he devises and plans so he gives a colouring to the new nation. He, more than any other man in this House or country, is building up the nation, and I would earnestly impress on him the desirability of every effort to bring in the very finest class of immigrants and give us the best chance possible to make the Canadian nation of the best quality possible. The responsibility lies with him, and while I wish to impress on him more and more the sense of that great responsibility, at the same time, while the circumstances may give rise to some anxiety and concern, there is not at present any real necessity for alarm.

Mr. E. PAQUET (L'Islet). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. McIntyre) for the magnificent speech he has just delivered, and which is worthy of the attention of this House. I must also congratulate him for his unceasing efforts in mastering our language and his endeavours in getting better acquainted with the character and spirit of the French race in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, while the attention of the old impoverished nations of Europe is fastened upon the solution of the problem of emigration, the stronger and more valorous races of the new world are anxiously seeking to settle the social problem of immigration. In 1907, the United States got amended to a considerable extent its immigration legislation and appointed a commission to investigate the whole question. At that time, the first ministers of the British colonies were giving their attention to that question while in conference in London. The Canadian parliament also discussed in a remarkable manner the Asiatic immigration, that from the United States, from the British Isles and from continental Europe. The legislators in the House of Commons are to-day endeavouring to perform their duty toward the community in devoting a few hours to the discussion of this most important subject. In the course of my remarks I shall ask the government to abolish the bonus system, while at the same time extending a substantial and effective aid to desirable immigration. According to an economist, Canada with its wealth of agricultural, forest and mineral resources is man's last reserve, his furthermost boundary. Thanks to the two great races that live in this country, we are building up a vast national structure wherein people from the United States and Europe come to seek liberty and plenty.

The Canadian people must have common aspirations, but in order to reach that worthy object, we must exercise a special supervision over the class of immigrants coming into Canada. These should feel like us that they are bound to work for the material and moral welfare of Canada, and this object should be their bequest to their children in this new and hospitable land. In our task of selecting immigrants, we should live up to our great traditions; we must allow ourselves to be prompted by the teachings of our history: we must recall a glorious past and call to memory the lessons taught to posterity by the founders of Canada. Fustel de Coulanges has the following to say:

> There is no such a thing as a dead past for man. He may forget it, but it still lives in him. For, such as he may be at different periods of his life, he is the product and a diminutive of all former mental evolutions. If he goes down into his soul, he may trace back and distinguish those various periods by what each of them left within him.

These principles we must apply to our history and cast a retrospective look upon

our traditions. Immigrants for New France were selected with the most minute care. Our forefathers were of the most noble and most generous blood of France. Our ancestors came from the old provinces of Normandy, of Anjon, of Picardie, of Britany, those chivalrous and highly moral pioneers of the church, of freedom and of France. Those men who at the time of Louis the Great were governing the mother country, were actuated by the desire of creating a new France beyond the seas, something like an expanse of their native land. And they were very strict in the selection of the settlers. French Canada is the work of great patriots and able legislators. French Canada is the offspring of the best French peasantry; of men gifted with the highest moral and physical qualities and civic virtue; enterprising, industrious, brave and upright men. Historical documents are there to show how very scrupulously were selected the French women which were sent to New France by Richelieu, Colbert, Talon and de Laval. The most rigid moralists are forced to admire the work of the emigrated girls of the seventeenth century.

Historians as a whole are agreed upon the distinguished origin of the French Canadians. And they were able to grow, to prosper and to spread despite all their trials, and to devote the whole power of their national spirit, the whole strength of their powerful moral and physical organization to the development of Canada. Mr. Claudio Jannet wrote thus of the moral pre-eminence of the various elements which established the Canadian colony:

> Fom the time of Champlain down to the last day of the French domination, the different governments which ruled the colony have always made it a point to exclude from the country individuals of a doubtful moral character.

And an orator said:

> The reason of our glory and strength to-day is not simply because we are of French stock, but because we sprang from France at a time in her history when she was at the apex of glory and when the hand that rocked our cradle was still amenable to the word of God.

After the cession of Canada to England, the Anglo-Saxon race grew side by side with us. At the close of the war of American independence, in 1783, the United Empire Loyalists, who remained true to the British Crown during the rebellion, and who sustained the persecution of their revolted brethren, came by thousands to the Canadian province. According to an author: 'The United Empire Loyalists brought forth to Canada the richest blood that was up to then the pride of the thirteen American colonies.' These emigrants were the founders of the new British empire in America. Since then they have progressed steadily and they are worthy of admiration.

We also are proud of their success. Mr. Hall, in his work entitled 'Immigration,' says: 'We must not forget that New England's first settlers were selected with the utmost care.' We may say it is only a fancy, but I will answer No, it is our history, our glorious past. And when those records are filled with heroic deeds they should be placed before the people of this country.

I recognize, Mr. Speaker, the importance, the necessity for the government and parliament, to endeavour to develop a desirable class of immigration. There is no doubt but that the better suited classes to develop Canada's resources are the descendants of France and the descendants of Loyalists, or better, the Canadians. In order to follow up our great traditions, we must above all encourage farmers to come to Canada. Every province of this country has thousands upon thousands of acres of available agricultural lands which will eventually be the great purveyors of Europe as well as the east owing to their great producing power. We need settlers to develop our unoccupied lands in order to increase the production and the national wealth. We could get a great many desirable farmers in more than one country, and these will be able in the noble pursuits of agriculture to enhance the development of this country.

The provincial authorities of Quebec have adopted a very commendable policy on immigration. I will acquaint the House of it by reading a letter from Mr. René Dupont, which is addressed to the editors of newspapers in Canada, and which reads thus:

> Quebec, January 8, 1908.
>
> Mr. Editor,—In order to give an impetus to immigration in the province of Quebec, the Interior Department has just authorized the organization of an information bureau, relating to farm land under cultivation, and available, so as to inform all intended purchasers of such farms.
>
> So far such information were lacking altogether, although we had often received demands for the sale of settled farms. This branch of the department will be available to every one intending to acquire a farm in any part of the country, or to whoever wishes to sell his farm for some purpose or other.
>
> I include for your information a blank form which we send to all who intend disposing of their farm, and I would be very much pleased if you could give a word of encouragement to our countrymen about this new scheme in your valuable paper.
>
> Thanking you beforehand for the interest you display towards colonization, and for services which you are always ready to render to that cause, I have the honour to beg you to believe in the most distinguished sentiments of
>
> Your faithful servant,
>
> RENE DUPONT,
>
> Colonization agent.

A statement and classification of all available farms may have good results, especially

in those localities where emigration of our countrymen to the United States has caused untold injury to the farm industry. This policy may have a helpful effect in bringing back our citizens to Canada.

Farm hands and domestic servants are also a desirable class of immigration if only we take the trouble of selecting them. Allow me to quote the words of my colleague in the legislature, they are the expression of my own opinion:

'Agriculture suffers from a shortage of help on the farms. It is very difficult to get farm labourers and domestics, notwithstanding the high wages which are offered. It is a state of things which is an impediment to the cultivation of our farms and tends to discourage the agriculturists. The time has really come for the government to organize a movement to bring into Canada farm labourers, which could be easily found in France and Belgium if serious and persistent efforts were made. It is a very serious question. It exists in a very acute state in certain localities.'

In the province of Ontario the Minister of the Interior has under control a great many agents whose duties are to find employment for farm labourers. I was reading in 'La Patrie,' of the 9th of March.

Ottawa, March 9, 1908.

Special to 'La Patrie.'—As 'La Patrie' said a few days ago, that the Hon. Mr. Oliver, at the request of the French-speaking members of the cabinet, has decided to appoint in each county of the province of Quebec, one agent whose duty will be to find, free of charge, employment as farm labourers or domestics for the immigrants wishing to settle in the province. This decision will be of very great advantage to the farmers and to the emigration agents, who will be in position to communicate with the provincial agents and get exactly the class of immigrants which is necessary. Following that decision, the Minister of the Interior has just appointed twenty agents in the province of Quebec, and other denominations will soon follow.

Since that date, new agents have been appointed. There is a lack of the farm labourers in the province of Quebec. The president of the colonization and repatriation of Montreal stated in January, 1908: 'The decision which we have taken has had the good result of aiding the farmers in getting help and to secure servants for a good number of families. Our employment bureau have in this way found employment for a good many hundreds of farm labourers and servants and besides that, they have been the means by which individuals and industrials have been able to get the same advantage.'

In some localities our labourers will fear the competition of farm labourers coming from the outside. One of the most distinguished citizens of the county which I have the honour to represent was writing me last week: 'The hon. Mr. Oliver has decided to appoint in each county of the province of Quebec an agent whose duty will be to recruit farm labourers and servants so as to help our farmers. Would the result of this movement, whose object is noble, be to increase the exodus of our fellow-countrymen towards the cities and industrial centers of the United States? Would it not be the means of introducing in our parishes socialists and anti-clericals? Is there no danger of bringing in our country elements which will brake harmony between the clergy and the people?'

I put this letter before this House believing that it contains opinions worthy of consideration. The government must be very careful in selecting and appointing the agents. They should be allowed to introduce in the midst of our moral populations only emigrants whose character is well known.

On the 15th of April, 1907, I was urging upon the government to make the strongest and most generous efforts to bring in this country desirable French and Belgium immigrants. The government has adopted a more active policy towards France. Three new immigration agents have been appointed. It seems as if measures have been taken for a larger distribution of literature and information. The Minister of the Interior has secured the active co-operation of many French immigration agencies. These agencies will get commission on the immigrants belonging to certain classes which they will send to Canada.

In the past the government has thought that it was its duty to pay bonuses in order to aid and encourage immigration. Bonuses were offered to booking agents to encourage them to send immigrants from Great Britain. At that time New Zealand, Australia and Argentine Republic were spending very large amounts in assisting immigration by way of bonuses. But the booking agents have, unfortunately, no interests in looking to the character and the morality of the immigrants. They have no other care naturally than to send the greatest number possible of immigrants to Canada so as to get more premiums. What do they care about the character? What do they care about the morality of our population? I am almost sure of it the government will soon abandon this policy. There is a fear that during this financial and commercial stringency, the suspension of payments of bonuses on immigrants would bring a crisis, but I think the last commercial crisis has had the effect of consolidating our credit in the world.

During the fiscal year 1906-7, 34,647 immigrants came into the country from the United States. The premiums paid in the United States amounted to $4,743, and these American immigrants brought with them values amounting to some forty millions of dollars. During the nine months of the fiscal year 1906-7, 235,328 immigrants came

into Canada, on 20,492 of which a bonus was paid. Excellent results might be obtained in the United States, in Great Britain and in continental Europe without resorting to the bonus system. Indeed, economic conditions in Canada are changing for the better. The country is growing marvellously and becoming known among civilized nations. In several of these, the name of Canada may be said to be famous, and will soon attract emigrants, as does now that of the United States.

In every country with which we entertain agricultural, commercial or industrial relations, we should have emigration and commercial agents understanding our wants and our aims. Such agents might deliver lectures and give information to all classes. They should be educated men and well informed as to our laws, resources and economic conditions. They should be honest, progressive and capable of helping to develop social, commercial and industrial relations. A journalist remarked with great truth, on the 7th April last: 'A commission composed of men conversant with our commercial situation and making a study of the markets of the world with a view of finding an outlet for our manufactured articles and information for our importers, would help the rapid and profitable development of our foreign trade, which has shown of late years such prodigious powers of expansion. It would create a demand for our goods abroad, and by spreading the knowledge of the natural wealth we possess, would bring to us, in a continual and abundant stream, new capital and very desirable immigration.'

Special delegates might also be sent abroad—emigrants who have been successful here. They would speak of their success on their native soil and become the very best of emigrant agents. We should also invite here, more frequently than we do, members of the foreign press and of the Boards of Trade of the United States and of Europe. These distinguished visitors would admire and speak of our natural wealth, thus promoting desirable emigration.

The people of Britain and of the United States are pretty well acquainted with our resources and economic conditions. Yesterday, the Canadian press foreshadowed a great immigration movement to Canada from the American republic. Most American immigrants are farmers enjoying a certain amount of wealth. Among them may be found a certain number of Canadians. Canadians from Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota and Dakota are being attracted here by our agricultural development and progress.

French Canadians have crossed to the States seeking that intense industrial life which the country affords. The province of Quebec, thanks to technical education, to the development of its agricultural, forest and mining wealth, is bound to become a great industrial centre. The development of our industries will be exceedingly favourable to the work of repatriation. In the midst of the human throng massed in great American cities, in that great crucible where races are mixed, expatriated French Canadians have preserved the distinctive character of our national genius. Their ideas, feeling and ideals are not very far away from those which we ourselves entertain. Repatriated French Canadians are among our best immigrants.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) Very good, very good.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation.) English economists have made some very true remarks with respect to emigrants coming here from the British Isles. According to Gerald Adams, our emigration agents do not make any very serious effort in the rural districts of England. It is there that we should reach the English farmer. The exhibition of our products in rural districts produces very good results. The Franco-Canadian treaty will favour French emigration to a certain extent, if we take proper advantage of the conditions of that agreement. 'It is the duty of France to help her far off sons.'

The small birth rate of France may prevent her from sending many emigrants here, and the economic conditions obtaining in that country may render unnecessary the departure of her sons, but France should send us capital in order to develop transactions with France, especially in the province of Quebec.

We should have a consul or a commissioner in Belgium where agricultural emigrants of the best class may be recruited. This suggestion may perhaps appeal to the government.

Most classes in Belgium have as yet no knowledge of our resources. In that country which may be called a French land, we might secure good agricultural emigrants, excellent farm hands and intelligent and skilled workmen. This system might be expensive, but the solution of a national problem is here involved. The social question is more important than the financial. Remaining faithful to our traditions, I am ready to vote the necessary funds to advertise our wealth abroad.

Mr. Leroy Beaulieu finds that of all countries Canada is to-day the one offering the best inducements to emigrants and being the most rapidly developed, especially as regards agriculture.

After the exhibition of Liege, I read in 'La revue économique internationale':

The Canadian exhibit reveals to us or reminds us that there lies to the north of the vast American continent, territories of abundant natural wealth, inhabited by a population small in numbers, but energetic, enterprising and resolved to develop, with foreign help, the treasures of the soil. Overpopulated countries will find there an extensive field

for emigration, the more worthy of attention that the climate is healthy and temperate. Strangers are astonished at the actual condition and future prospects of Canada.

We can point out to them our progress in matters of transportation, construction of railways, telegraph and telephone lines, in the improvement of waterways, in thrift, in agricultural, forest and mining industries.

Our vast and fertile agricultural lands, our wealth in forest and minerals, in iron and coal especially, 'the muscle and blood of modern industry,' our developed industries. the religious and political liberty we enjoy, the advantages of Christian teaching, our satisfactory economic and social conditions; the harmony existing between Church and State, Capital and Labour, employer and employee, are all of a character to attract emigration to our shores.

The Canadian Emigration Act is sometimes biterly criticised. If it be properly applied, the Act would appear to answer to the economic and social requirements of the nation. It contains provisions for getting rid of bad emigrants. The medical examination has become more serious, at least at Quebec. According to Mr. Bryce's report (page 120) '1,422 emigrants were detained at the Quebec hospital in 1904-5; in 1906-7, 523 only were detained at that hospital. The examination in European ports is also more serious and this is to our advantage. The United States government fines Steamship Companies $100 for every person shipped without sufficient inspection or suffering from tuberculosis, epilepsy or any contageous disease. It is sometimes difficult to discover the true physical and mental condition of an emigrant at the time of his examination. But we can deport those who prove undesirable.

You will allow me to make a few remarks concerning the medical inspection of emigrants at Quebec. Dr. J. D. Pagé took charge of the emigrant hospital there in 1904. Before that there was no system of scientific medical inspection. Two inspecting physicians were appointed, but there was no place for sick emigrants or emigrants under observation. The government understood the necessity of efficient medical organization. Dr. Pagé was in consequence appointed, in addition to his hospital duties, medical officer of the port of Quebec. He has thoroughly organized the system of medical inspection at that place. I am in a position to state that the medical inspection of emigrants at Quebec, is in no wise inferior to that of any American port. Our emigration Act says: 'No weak minded, epileptic or insane emigrant shall be allowed to land in Canada.' Those having any experience in the practice of medicine know how difficult it sometimes is, to discover the symptoms of epilepsy. Certain patients are quite intelligent and the attacks infrequent. It is also known to be very difficult to locate tuberculosis in the first period. The physician is obliged to make long and repeated examinations and sometimes resort to a bacteriological test. As to madness and crime, all jurists know how difficult it is, in a criminal case, to clearly establish the mental state of the accused.

It would doubtless be more prudent to forbid access to this country of all emigrants whose antecedents cannot be discovered. Any person wishing to come here should be compelled to produce a certificate stating that he is guilty of no moral crime. Such a certificate might be delivered by a reputable magistrate, the clerk of a court of justice or a clergyman. But cases of personation might here be possible.

American laws restrictive of emigration are very often highly praised. It appears to me that the economic conditions of the two countries cannot be compared. Our emigration, as to character and morality, does not seem inferior to that of America. Formerly the strong and robust northern peoples emigrated in great numbers to the United States. Since 1890, things have changed and the northern emigrant, the most easily assimilated, no longer occupies the first place in American emigration statistics. People from southern and eastern Europe are flooding the States since 1890. As Leroy-Beaulieu says:

'The enormous increase of immigrants tends to introduce in this country elements far more heterogenous; more difficult to assimilate, poorer, less educated and at all points of view less progressive.' In 1907 the United States received:

From Italy	238,000
From Russia..	258,443
From Austria-Hungary..	338,452

We must notice that in 1907 the United States received only 56,637 immigrants from England. This is a very serious question, says Leroy Beaulieu. However, these new elements coming in since a few years have not yet had time to exert any sensible influence on the American people, and its population is now so numerous that the new comers will not have a very great effect upon its character in the future.

Our immigrants are coming in great numbers from the United States, Germany, France, Belgium and British Islands.

I do not wish to criticise too severely the immigrants from Russia, Italy, Hungary, Austria and Roumania, but in my humble opinion our immigration is more monogeneous than the one of our neighbours.

The problem of assimilating the races in our immense territory is of the greatest national importance. The Slavs, oriental and meridional, are slow to understand our institutions and aspirations, but the immigrants from the United States, British Islands, France and Belgium, having in their own country the representative institutions,

understand rapidly our political system. The English and French immigrants find here the old beloved language. They hear it in the churches, in the courts and in parliament.

In the great work of immigration, I fear the desire of making money, the passion of graft. Some speculators, who would like to make a fortune rapidly, naturally want the gates of Canada to be widely opened to every nation. These men exert in our country a nefarious influence. We do not want here those people who will not help to the progress of the country. I read the following lines in 'La Patrie,' of the 18th March, 1908:

The department of immigration at Ottawa has established a new rule by which, after the 15th of April next, the immigrants sent from England by the philanthropic societies will be immediately sent back if they have not with them a certificate from the Canadian office of immigration in London, stating that they are fit to become useful citizens.

If properly put in force these regulations might have the effect of preventing undesirable immigrants to enter in our country. The government must act wisely in this case. You have heard a few weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, the Lieutenant Governor of the province of Quebec saying: 'The increase of criminals in certain parts of the province, principally those parts where the immigrants come in greater numbers, has been the subject of serious consideration by my cabinet who is firmly decided to neglect no means possible to protect the lives and property of the people.' These alarming words, pronounced by a man of wide experience, by an old magistrate, should awake our attention.

Canada has immense resources. The sons of the soil and the immigrants having good morals, good health, and being able of supporting themselves can take advantage of our national wealth.

The new generations of immigrants growing stronger and more numerous will perhaps one day be masters of Canada. If our immigrants are Christians, we might be treated with justice. We deserve respect from those who come to settle into our country. As a matter of fact, we have always shown great generosity towards the new comers. In 1831, the legislative assembly of Lower Canada granted full rights of citizenship to the Jews, putting them on the same footing as the Canadians.

In 1847, thousands and thousands of Irish emigrants, leaving their country where there was starvation came to Canada. Illness brought many deaths. Our people gave to these Irish all the necessary care. They sacrificed their own lives to save them. We should entertain the same good sentiments, the same sympathy towards immigrants of good character. I wish to repeat it, I am in favour of giving our aid, small but generous, to help a desirable immigration, but I believe we have come to a sufficient degree of development that we can dispense of paying premiums on immigrants.

I welcome desirable immigrants; I welcome in our country all those people whose liberties have been abolished, whose rights have been violated and prayers ignored.

But, in the interest of our civilization, in the interest of Canada, we ask from this government to make a proper choice of the immigrants who want to become part of the Canadian family.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE (Strathcona). Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House for a few minutes while I make some brief remarks on the motion moved by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I think that hon. gentleman is to be congratulated on the presentation of the question, for it was a careful presentation and, in the course of it, the hon. gentleman put forward arguments that are agreed to by both sides of the House. That we require immigrants and require a desirable class of immigrants, it is a foregone conclusion. The hon. gentleman puts forward his views in the beginning of his speech in this way—I quote from page 6877 of unrevised 'Hansard':

We are, therefore, Sir, considering the vast extent of our territory, a small community numerically and our country could no doubt well support a far greater number of people. There is no congestion in Canada and all will and do, I am sure, agree that an increase of population in Canada is desirable. All must also readily agree that if an increase of population in this country is to accrue to us through immigration from other countries it is essential also that none but desirable persons should be admitted to Canadian citizenship and to the Canadian family.

With these sentiments we are in accord. But, in the course of his address, the hon. gentleman puts forward some rather peculiar arguments and draws some more peculiar conclusions. I have read the hon. gentleman's speech very carefully, and I find running through it two or three main ideas. One may be thus expressed: Cease operations of a selective nature and you will procure immigrants of a more select class. I cannot agree with any such deduction from any such premises. Another may be thus stated: Cease operations and the desirable classes of immigrants will increase. Which, applied to business, I take it, might be stated in this form: Do not endeavour to do business and you will do more business; do not earnestly desire to attain a certain object and you will attain it all the more surely and speedily. That seems to be absured on the face of it. Another idea in the hon. gentleman's speech may be thus expressed: Undesirable classes come here because a number of agencies are at work other than the bonus system, but, because these undesirable classes—or, more accurately, these undesirable persons—come

here, there can be only one reason why they come here, and that is the bonus system. That is the hon. gentleman's whole argument. As pointed out by my hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. G. H. McIntyre), that is the only point of the immigration policy that he aims at. Yet the bonus system exists purely and simply because it is of an essentially selective character. Now, what bonuses do we pay ? As I understand it, the first bonus that we paid in this country was begun in 1867, a bonus to certain charitable institutions for bringing our children of a certain class. Those children, it was understood, must not be institutional children—that is children who had been in a penitentiary or a home—in other words, they must be carefully-reared children. That bonus to these institutions is in existence to-day. The second bonus that I would speak about is the bonus on immigrants from the United States. At certain eligible points in the United States we have agents who are paid $3 for every man, $2 for every woman and $1 for every child who, through their influence, settles in Canada. These bonuses are paid for giving directions, for advertising, for getting location points and railway rates and issuing certificates in order that these immigrants may get a reduced rate to certain points of our country. There are more favourable points at which the bonus paid is only $2 per head for men, $1 for women and 50 cents for children. We have still another bonus, the bonus paid on British immigrants. This bonus is paid as specified in the order in council to certain agents at £1 per adult and 10 shillings for each person between 18 years and 1 year, for farmers, farm labourers, stablemen, gardeners, carters. railway service men, navvies, and domestic servants of one year's experience in each occupation. This bonus is applied to the continent of Europe for exactly the same classes, but is only applicable to these countries: Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, France, Belgium, Germany, Switzerland and Austria-Hungary. I would point out to my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) that Italy is excluded from the countries in which bonuses are paid for farm labourers or other classes.

Now, if there is one impression which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) would like to convey without stating it, it is that a bonus has hitherto been paid upon all classes and upon every one who comes here as an immigrant. That impression has been conveyed to the country. I believe such an idea was put forward in the days of the North Atlantic Trading Company, when our friends opposite declared that every man, woman and child cost the country $5. There never was a time when the North Atlantic Trading Company or all the companies operating, received bonuses on more than 30 per cent of the people from any country. A few figures will show how the commission operates at the present time. In the nine months of 1906-7, the total immigration from the United States was 36,659 and we paid bonuses on 2,561. That is, we paid bonuses on 7·04 per cent of the immigrants of that year. In the year 1907-8, we had 46,925. American immigrants, and paid bonuses on 2,425 or 5 per cent of our American immigrants. In Great Britain the operation of the bonus is slightly different from what it is in the United States. The question why we paid a bonus on British immigrants might well be taken up. You are well aware that the people to whom we pay the bonus are the booking agents. Their occupation is not solely as Canadian agents. They engage in some other occupation that takes them through the country and brings them in touch with other people and enables them to carry on a propaganda in advertising, just as if they were paid agents of the government. That is, the bonus paid on British and continental immigrants is simply a means of advertising.

These booking agents are not booking agents for Canadian ports alone ; they are booking agents for Australia, New Zealand, the Argentine Republic and other countries much farther away than Canada. It is important to remember that they receive a commission from the steamship companies and that that commission is a percentage on the amount of the ticket. Therefore, it would naturally follow that every booking agent would want every one purchasing a ticket from him to go to the most distant ports. Here is where the bonus operates: Our Immigration Department steps in and says: For certain classes of immigrants we will pay you $5 a head extra. You cannot imagine any more selective scheme. The person who is undesirable from our standpoint, who does not belong to the agricultural or labouring classes, as we have them specified here, will naturally be induced to go to other countries, whereas the farm labourer, the domestic servant and the farmer will be induced, owing to the bonus, to come to Canada. This must necessarily be the result.

There is a suspicion, and it was expressed here some time ago, that when a man goes to a booking agent he simply says he is a farmer and that is all there is about it, that no further certificate than his word is required. This is not the case. In the first place he has to sign a written statement of where he comes from, where he served and what experience he has had. That statement is kept by the booking agent. Now, as to the second check——

Mr. MONK. How does my hon. friend know that and since when did that rule exist?

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. My informant is the Commissioner of Immigration. When the farmer lands in this country he

himself need have no knowledge of whether that booking agent is receiving a bonus or not. When he comes to the Canadian side of the water he is received by the inspector who asks him whether he is a farmer or a farm labourer, and if he comes under these classes a different certificate is made out. These certificates of inspectors are preserved and are forwarded to the head office. The returns of the booking agents are also forwarded to the head office.

Mr. MONK. Does the hon. gentleman say that the examining officer makes out another certificate here?

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. He makes out another certificate.

Mr. MONK. I deny that; he never does.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. All I can say is that the person who has stated that to me is the Commissioner of Immigration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the information in writing or oral?

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. The information submitted to the head office is in the return.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the information from the Commissioner of Immigration to the hon. gentleman in writing or oral?

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. It is not in writing.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Simply an oral conversation?

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. Quite so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there anything in the published reports which substantiates that?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. I am not aware of that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is remarkable that the hon. gentleman should have information that no other hon. gentleman has.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. My method of securing the information was simply to ask the question, because it was stated here that there was no check and I was exceedingly anxious to ascertain if that was true.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not wish my hon. friend to misunderstand me. I was not criticising him. His action shows very great diligence and earnestness as a member of the House, but it would seem that if information of that kind is available and is valuable it should be in the possession of every member of this House in the shape of a report.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. As I understand, the report that is made out by the booking agent is sent in to the head office. He claims a bonus on the people so specified. There is no continuity of record so far as the immigrant is concerned, a different report is made out by the immigration officer at the receiving point and that record is forwarded to the head office here. When the booking agent applies to the commissioner here for a bonus on certain individuals, his report must tally with that of the inspector at the receiving port. Thus there are two checks on the individual, there is the check of the booking agent and the check of the receiving officer. I asked Mr. Scott, the commissioner, if any requests preferred by the booking agents were ever refused, and he assured me they were, because the report of the receiving officer did not agree with the report from the booking agent.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I thought Mr. Scott, the superintendent of immigration, said that they accepted the list from the purser of the steamer ?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. My hon. friend may be right there. My information is simply as I stated, that the inspecting officer at Halifax or other receiving ports makes out a list using a separate form for the farmers, farm labourers and domestic servants, those who come under the bonus system.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How does the inspecting officer at Halifax know that these domestic servants or farmers or whatever they may be fulfil what is expected of them ? Are they followed to their employment as farm labourers or domestic servants ?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. I know of no system; I am not aware that such a system is in vogue of following the individual, but the authorities are perfectly conversant with all those who go on the farms.

Mr. MONK. Is it not a matter of fact that the inspector makes no list, but has a duplicate or triplicate of the ship's manifest and he checks the crowd as they go past him and then sends the manifest to Ottawa ?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. My information is quite different. My information is that it is the duty of the inspector to find out if the man is subject to bonus. and if so to make out a separate certificate and have that forwarded to the head office.

Mr. MONK. We will see it all in the committee before long.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. As to the claim that the bonus is necessarily the cause of all the undesirable immigrants coming to this country you must remember that there are certain charitable institutions in Great Britain who consider it their duty to pick up certain people who wish to be placed in different environments, supply them with means and have them brought as independ-

ent travellers to Canada. You will also recognize that certain governments, such as the Ontario government, from whom, by the way, we have received a good deal of abuse in reference to this matter, give bonuses annually to these charities. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) read the report of the inspector of public charities for Ontario, and if I remember the inspector's words correctly he said: Let us put the trouble at the door where it belongs, the Dominion immigration authorities. Sir, I have in my hands this year's estimates of the Ontario government and I find that for colonization and immigration the government of Ontario have subscribed $58,000 this year. From the public accounts of last year I find that they gave somewhere in the neighbourhood of $38,000. Is there any retraction on their part? I find last year they gave $7,000 to aid the Salvation Army and this year they have increased that amount to $10,000. The people who are operating in this way are very desirable people, those who wish to place a man in a different environment, to change the whole tenor of his life and give him a fair chance, must be lauded for so doing. But with these various indigent agencies at work is my hon. friend quite fair when he says that the undesirable people are brought here by the bonus system? Is the inspector for public charities for Ontario fair when he says: Let us put the blame at the door where it belongs. Had he not better take into account the system of immigration carried on in Ontario? Had he not better take into account certain charitable institutions? These people are dealing with people who have no independence, who have come down to the particular status where they have to throw themselves upon public charity and when they come to this country and the circumstances are a little adverse they naturally go back to their old surroundings the population centres, and to those population centres they say: We deserve your care. I do not think the evil is as great as it has been represented by many members of this House but if it be as great do not lay all the blame on the bonus system, but rather think how very largely these public charities that send these people to this country may be responsible for the whole trouble. The government in the past have not interfered with people who came to this country. To a man who came independently, to a man who was not a criminal and who was physically capable the government have said: We will put no restriction upon you; but, this evil has worked to such an extent in our population centres that now the government have found it necessary to inquire of these public charities and ask that immigrants coming through them even must be examined to ascertain if they are capable of carrying on such work as may fall to their lot in this country. As I reflect upon this particular phase of the question I cannot help but think of how often we find our friends on the other side of the House getting up and reading the remarks of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior when he was a private member of this House.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Hear, hear.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. 'Hear, hear says the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton. They reiterate it and reiterate it. When the hon. minister was a private member of this House he was opposed to indiscriminate immigration and when he took the position of Minister of the Interior he proceeded to crystallize into legislation the ideas that he had put on 'Hansard' in those days. If you will examine the restrictions that the minister has placed upon immigration you will find the justification in every particular of what the minister said in those days. There seems to be a difference of opinion on this question. Some say that the west and the east differ, some say that the west wants a great deal of immigration and I am perfectly willing to admit that, but before proceeding further let me give you some statistics as to how the system works out in Great Britain and on the continent. In nine months of the year 1907-8 we received 55,781 British immigrants and we paid bonus on 8,861, or 15·8 per cent. In 1907-8 we received 111,238 British immigrants and we paid bonus on 14,710 or 13·02 per cent. Now, it is frequently argued—and the whole question came up some time ago—that we pay bonus on the undesirable and that we get only the undesirable with that bonus. Let us examine into the figures for a moment. We paid bonus on 14,710 immigrants from Great Britain and we had 5,208 homestead entries from English, Irish and Scotch alone. The average family of the homesteader consists of 2·5 persons. In that way we placed on the land 13,020 persons and this is only one of the designated classes on which we were paying bonuses. Of continental immigration we paid a bonus on 2,093 in 1907-8 and we had homestead entries to the number of 4,609, or a total by the same computation, of 11,517 persons who were placed on farms. We paid bonus on 2,093 to secure eight selected classes and we received of one class alone five times as much as we paid for all classes.

There is another idea in the minds of a great many people and that is that all the people who come over on the ships are classified as immigrants. I might give you some figures in that particular. On the steamers landing in Canada from foreign ports during nine months in 1906-7 there were 148,818 passengers. Of these 124,669 were immigrants, 9,293 were returned Canadians, 2,414 were tourists and 12,444 were saloon passengers. During the year 1907-8, there were 266,317 passengers of whom 235,-

328 were immigrants, 14,094 returned Canadians, 4,688 tourists and 12,207 saloon passengers. This is the result of a most careful examination of the statistics. Statistics are compiled to designate exactly who are immigrants and who are not. With regard to continental bonused immigration our statistics are even better than they are from Great Britain or the United States. During nine months of 1906-7 the total immigration from continental countries was 34,217 and we paid bonus on 1,198 or 3·5 per cent. In the year 1907-8 we paid bonus on 2,093 out of a total immigration of 77,165 or 2·71 per cent. I would sum the matter up in this way: Last year we paid bonus on 13·02 per cent of the British immigration, on 5 per cent of the American immigration and on 2·71 per cent of the continental immigration. It seems to me that I have fairly well satisfied the House regarding the question of whether we pay bonus on all the people coming in. We pay the bonus for a definite purpose and I think I may say that we have fulfilled that purpose. We pay the bonus to get certain desirable classes and while we pay a bonus to receive eight different classes we have received in one class more people than we paid a bonus for in all classes. Our only absolutely incontestable statistics regarding these immigrants are the homestead entries during the time of making which the officers find the birth places of the immigrants. There can be no doubt of any kind that these figures give an absolute record that we pay a bonus on certain classes of individuals and that we get more of that class than we pay a bonus on. Yet, our friends on the other side of the House would try to leave the impression that the people that we pay the bonus on are the undesirable class. If we were to discontinue the bonus system we have just two other ways in which we can operate in so far as I can see. One is to pay agents to do the work that is being done by the bonused agents to-day. We have paid agents in a certain peculiar way to do a peculiar work and I have given the statistics to show that that work has been well done. Now, if we are to pay agents it is a self evident fact that we cannot have any inspection or any method whereby to tell that the peculiar classes we desire are coming to this country. The other alternative would be to cease immigration operations altogether and that is not even suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) who moved the resolution. But I would go further than that and I would say that not only is immigration desirable but that we should use every legitimate means within our power to secure a desirable class of immigrants.

I would ask the House to reflect for a few moments on what we have to do in this country and the field that lies before us if we are to pay any reasonable regard to the development of our resources. According to the census of 1906 we have only 8,407,927 acres of land under cultivation in the three prairie provinces and 30,502,927 acres were occupied by farms and ranches. There was a surveyed area at that time of 120,488,455 acres. Do we need people to till the soil ; do we need immigrants in view of the fact that only a mere fraction of the fertile lands in that country is at present under cultivation ? If you examine the statistics you will find that in the same census of 1906 we have 357,016,788 acres of land in these three provinces, and that only 8,000,000 acres are cultivated, leaving 350,000,000 acres uncultivated. Now, certain hon. gentlemen who oppose immigration say : You have brought in great numbers of people, you have had the lands tilled, you have built up villages and towns, you have done very well, now stop. But, Mr. Speaker, we are only beginning. As I have said, we have only 8,000,000 acres out of 120,000,000 acres of surveyed land under cultivation. Let us remember that only those portions that are reasonably adjacent to a railway are surveyed, and that it is only on application to the department that certain townships are surveyed. Therefore, the great mass of the land in these new provinces is still unsurveyed and it is only a few favoured persons who know of its enormous natural resources. Why, the other day I saw a photograph of a crude asphalt deposit that was 250 feet high and that would cover 10,000 acres. That asphalt was the ooze of immense oil deposits underneath. A photograph was also submitted of a bubbling salt well where the salt was crystallized to a height of 20 feet. Those of us who are familiar with the northern country know that the soil is underlaid with lignite coal, that bituminous coal is to be found in great quantities, and that practically all the streams are gold bearing. Are we going to stop immigration and allow these vast natural resources to remain dormant ? We can support a farming population alone equal to the total population of the United States, and in addition to our wealth of farming land look at the immense natural resources we have and the vast industrial operations that will ensue on the development of these resources because of their proximity to fuel and the possession of other facilities for their development. According to authentic statistics we have 100,000,000 acres of land north and west of the Athabaska river and lake, and I need only mention that the nearest point of the Athabaska river is 100 miles distant from the city of Edmonton. I may also point out that in that 100,000,000 acres of good agricultural land there is practically not any part of it that has been surveyed. There are of course two or three isolated spots where the Hudson Bay Company have built their posts, but I am correct in my general statement that no part of that vast area is

surveyed to any appreciable extent. I have confined my remarks to the new provinces and I have not referred to that great province of British Columbia which is known to contain enormous mineral, agricultural and forest wealth. We have vast untold resources ; we have vast areas of the most fertile land, and if we can only get transportation facilities and if we can only get people to develop them there is indeed a great future in store for the west. We have had in recent years an opportunity to get more people than formerly and what has been the effect of that on eastern Canada ? You can explain the immense industrial expansion in eastern Canada and you can explain the tremenduous increase in the wealth there in no other way than by pointing to the development of the west. You can talk about the budget and you can talk about your tariffs, but the solution of no problem is so important to us to-day as the development of the great natural resources of the west.

Let me now speak for a moment on the financial side of the immigration question. A considerable sum of money has been spent on immigration and we have had the North Atlantic Trading Company and the fact that it received upwards of half a million dollars dragged before the House time and again. It would seem indeed that certain members cannot rise to discuss any subject without talking of the money that this government has paid to the North Atlantic Trading Company and other companies which were organized for the attraction of immigrants to Canada.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the hon. member commend the North Atlantic Trading Company?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. I can tell the hon. gentleman that the North Atlantic Trading Company had its place in the development of the country.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What was that place?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. I can tell the hon. gentleman that it succeeded in bringing in more immigration than any other organization.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Nothing of the kind; it did not bring in a man.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. I cannot help the hon. gentleman forming any opinion he pleases.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I will prove it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He will prove it to his own satisfaction, no doubt.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. It was shown during the course of another debate that the immigrants into the west this year had brought in settler's effects alone to the value of $52,000,000. There is another unestimated asset that comes into that country which we have no similar means of ascertaining, because the settlers' effects all pass through the customs and we can get the statistics concerning them. But remember that our American friends who come to the west are generally farmers who sell their farms at from $50 to $100 an acre, and there is no method of determining what any particular immigrant has at his credit in the bank or is carrying with him when he reaches the western country. But there were 46,925 immigrants from the United States. Among these there were probably 10,000 farmers. They sold their farms at an average, we will say of $50 an acre. Taking each farm at 100 acres, these 10,000 farmers would realize for their farms $8,000 each, or a total of $80,000,000. That added to $52,000,000 makes $132,000,000. But there is another side to the question. The average homesteader has a family of 2·5 This would represent 25,000 souls of the immigration, and we have still 21,925 left to be accounted for otherwise. Suppose these had an average of $100 each, that would enrich us by $2,192,500. By the whole immigration from Britain, continental Europe and the United States, on the basis given above, we are enriched by $86,903,575 ; and we have not allowed one dollar for settlers' effects. Some hon. gentlemen during the budget debate were puzzling regarding the excess of imports over exports, or the balance of trade. Here is an estimate which on its face shows that we have had brought into this country about $90,000,000 of which no account is taken. I believe that the greatest asset we have received directly in the way of ready money is that money which the settler brings into the country.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier said that we are bringing more people into the country than we can assimilate. The same statement was made by my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne). My hon. friend from Montmagny is always afraid that we are getting in too many people of a certain class. In that respect he was exceedingly moderate in this debate as compared with the debate of last year. I think the hon. member for Montmagny is learning a very wholesome lesson, and the day may come when he will find that it is an unhealthy thing to stand up in this House and appeal to race and creed. The hon. gentleman has no business to stand up in this House of mixed races and drag in the question of whether we are Frenchified or not.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I did not drag in that question. It was dragged in by the officials of the government, Mr. Smart, the deputy minister, and Mr. Preston, the government immigration agent, who

said that the government did not want the country to be Frenchified.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. Then it would have been policy on the part of the hon. gentleman to have left the remark to the men who made it, and not drag it into this debate and revivify it.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise again to a question of privilege. Those who are responsible for the words uttered by Mr. Preston and Mr. Smart are the government, and as they have never disavowed them, they are responsible for what these gentlemen say.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. The hon. gentleman is not aware, any more than from a newspaper report, that the officers of the government did say that. It was brought in before, and it is brought in again. It is brought in with the very evident intention of stirring up race feeling. As long as we are a people made up of different races and different religions, it does not become any man to stand up here as the champion of any particular race, whether French or German or otherwise. What we want in this country is good, loyal Canadians. I tell the hon. gentleman that the men he has been attacking as hooligans and ex-convicts are building up a nation west of the great lakes that will have a national sentiment and that will not stand for the kind of thing he brings forward in this House so frequently.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Mr. Speaker, I again rise to a question of privilege. I never called those men hooligans or drunkards. but the report of the Department of the Interior called them that.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. These are the hon. gentleman's words:

> If we look at the report of the Interior Department we find that his immigration agents, the Church Army, were eager to bring to this country hooligans, scamps, ex-convicts, loafers and drunkards, but were not very eager to bring in Belgians or Frenchmen.

I asked the hon. gentleman on that occasion to define hooligan. He did not seem to be conversant with that kind of person, and asked to have the term defined by the Minister of the Interior. I would warn the hon. gentleman that when he stands up and talks in that way against a number of people, the greater portion of whom go to the western provinces, he can have only one object, and that is to insult those people.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Mr. Speaked, I rise again to a question of privilege. The hon. gentleman is again putting words in my mouth which I never uttered. I read the report of Mr. Bruce Walker, of the Department of the Interior, saying this:

> This organization is of a many-sided character, embracing the reclamation of the drunkard, the reception of the discharged prisoner, the shelter and food of the homeless and an asylum for the unemployed.

I read then the advertisement of the Church Army, asking for drunkards and hooligans. I do not know if there are drunkards and hooligans in the west, although the government has done its best to bring them there.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. There is no doubt what the hon. gentleman's intention was, whatever he said. He has not been as frank on this occasion with regard to what he means as he has been on other occasions. He is a great deal more frank when he talks in the country about the class of people who are going to the west. I want to tell him that we have a people there who are not concerned about the kind of religion a man professes or the tongue he speaks. We are all glad to have these people speak English. I consider it an honour and a privilege to speak the English language. I would like to be able to speak the language of the hon. member for Montmagny as fluently as he does; there is no object I would aim at more readily than that; but at the same time I cannot see why that is any qualification for citizenship in this country. The hon. gentleman simply drags this matter in, in order that he may use it as a catch-ball in his own province. I have no quarrel with that province. I know that the men who come from it to this House are as liberal as I am. But I am very much afraid that my hon. friend is not dealing with men who are as broad-minded or as well informed as the members of this House, and he thinks that by dint of making certain statements he can convince them that certain ideas are well founded. Well, in my opinion, it ill becomes any member of this House to stand up in his place and give utterance to such ideas. When I spoke to the hon. gentleman regarding the British immigrants who came to this country, he said they were the worst people who came to our shores.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I did not say that.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. That is not in 'Hansard,' but I leave it to a dozen hon. members who heard him whether he did not say so.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I never said anything of the kind. What I did say was that the immigration policy of this government had the effect of making what ought to be the best immigration, the British immigration, the worst that comes to us. Any one who knows anything about it, or who reads the papers, knows that what I say is the case.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. So far as we are concerned in the west, we are not dealing with race questions and raising race difficulties.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. We saw that in the school question.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. The hon. gentleman seems to have that question troubling him even yet.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Yes.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. Now we have the statement made that the immigration which we are bringing in is alien in ideas and is changing the sentiment of the people of this country. We are confronted with the statement that these people whom we are bringing in are lowering the moral tone of this country. We are told that we are bringing in too many people who have been accustomed to different institutions and who naturally favour the institutions to which they have been accustomed. Well, I listened to some of the statistics given us by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and I was pleased to notice that, as compared with the United States, we occupy in this respect a very advantageous position. Let us compare the percentage of foreign population in this country as compared with that in the United States. For that purpose I have chosen three groups, the eastern, western and central states, and selected five states out of each group. Here are the statistics which I have been able to obtain of the proportion of foreign born population to the native born population in each group :

Foreign born.

Eastern group—	1890.	1900.
Massachusetts	29·4	30·2
Rhode Island	30·8	31·4
Connecticut	24·6	26·2
New Jersey	22·8	22·9
New York	26·2	26·1
Of the central division the five following show :		
Minnesota	35·7	28·9
Wisconsin	30·7	24·9
North Dakota	42·7	35·4
South Dakota	26·1	22·0
Michigan	26·	22·4
Of the five western states :		
Utah	25·2	19·4
Washington	25·2	21·5
California	30·2	24·7
Nevada	31·1	23·8
Montana	30·2	27·4

And of the whole United States I find that in 1890 the foreign born population was 14·8 of the whole population and in 1900 it was 13·7 of the whole population.

Now, as to western Canada, where our population is increasing most rapidly and the new comers go in largest numbers. Take the province of Alberta. I have the census of 1906, and I have added to it the report of 1907, and I find the percentage of foreign population——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. You are not counting the British as foreign ?

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. No, nor even the United States, because they have the same language and the same aspirations.

Mr. BERGERON. Are you counting the French as foreign ?

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Certainly.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. The French are counted as foreign. All born outside the British dominions are counted as foreign.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. What about the United States? Are they in the British dominions?

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. My hon. friend (Mr. Lavergne) attempted to give statistics of the foreign born immigration, and he went so far as to call the British immigration foreign.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Certainly.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. And when I challenged his statement he said the British was the worst class of immigrants we received.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I deny that again.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. I find by the census of 1906, added to the distribution of population of 1907, that the percentage of foreign population necessary to assimilate—excluding the United States immigration—is as follows :

	Per cent.
Alberta, foreign born population	15
Saskatchewan	20·6
Manitoba	12·3
Average of foreign population in the three provinces	18·7

I have not the statistics of the province of British Columbia, but from the census of 1901 I have selected the foreign population percentages for the five eastern provinces, and I find as follows :

	Per cent.
Ontario	3·4
Quebec	2·5
New Brunswick	2
Nova Scotia	1·4
Prince Edward Island	0·7

In the whole Dominion of Canada the percentage of foreign born population in 1901 was only 5·5 per cent as compared with 13·7 per cent in the United States in the year 1900. It seems to me, therefore, that, as regards the percentage of foreign born population, our position compares very favourably with that of the United States.

The argument is also put forward—I think it was put forward by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Chisholm) that we should keep our lands for our natural increase in population. He said, Leave that land there for our children and our child-

ren's children. Well, the hon. gentleman must imagine that our people are very much against competition. Any one who talks like that must claim that competition is a bad thing for the people, because the question must naturally arise as to whether we would prefer to have our country cultivated, its conditions improved, its schools and railroads and other public utilities increased rather than have our broad plains remain unpeopled or sparsely populated and in many places an unprofitable waste. To talk of the possibility of populating Canada by natural increase within any reasonable period is to talk of something practically unattainable. Take the increase of population as shown by our census returns. From 1891 to 1901 the increase was 538,076, of which 223,321 was foreign born. That is to say, the natural increase was 315,753. You can go back, and you will find practically the same natural increase every decade of about one-third of a million. I have attempted to show that we can support a population in our western provinces equal to that of the United States or 80,000,000. We have at present about 800,000 people up there, and we have under cultivation only 8,000,000 acres of land. Thus we have one man to every ten acres, and we are cultivating per capita far out of proportion compared with the older provinces. If we had the 120,000,000 acres that are surveyed alone under cultivation, that would support 12,000,000 people on the present average of one man to each 10 acres. Then if we take into consideration the natural industries that must necessarily grow up as the result of our natural resources being cultivated, we could support a very much greater population per acre. But with a natural increase at the rate of one-third of a million in ten years, it would take us centuries to increase our population to such an extent that we could develop as they ought to be developed the natural resources of that country. Why, we in that country are handicapped in every way, we are held back in every way for lack of help. Within 150 miles of Edmonton we have one of the largest bituminous coal fields of the west—coal that is equal, by assay, to that found in southern Alberta or in the Pittsburg region. And yet the Canadian Northern to-day is drawing its bituminous coal all the way from Pittsburg to Edmonton to supply its engines. Why? Because our resources have not been developed; we have not gone ahead fast enough.

A great deal has been said about the enormous annual expenditure of this country. In my opinion, when this government, or any other government, ceases to spend liberally for the development of the natural resources of this country, it should no longer have the support of loyal Canadians. For we have enormous resources, and we must have large expenditures in order that those resources may be developed. The money that we spend in immigration, according to the figures I have given, is shown to be wisely spent by the one fact of the great amount of money brought into the country by immigrants. It is the duty of this government or any other government to use every means within its power to bring the people in. We have the fertile fields by the millions of acres, and all that is required is cultivation in order that they may produce and the country develop. We have begun to produce, we have brought immense wealth to eastern Canada by our production resulting from the cultivation of these wide acres. One part of Canada cannot develop without another part. We are all the same family; we are practically all the same workshop. When we have a failure of crop in the west, nobody feels it more acutely—not even the homesteader—than the eastern manufacturer and the labour depending upon him. I say, then, it is our duty to fill up that country—to bring in desirable classes, it is true.

I know I shall be accused of somewhat representing the western idea. Well, now, let me read a short quotation that will show you the mandate of the west—though 'mandate' may not be just the word to use. I have here a resolution submitted to the Liberal convention of the province of Alberta, assembled in the city of Calgary. These people in Alberta should know, if anybody in Canada knows, how this immigration policy is operating. I do not care to take as a criterion of Canadian sentiment the view of the crowded cities of the east, where you have brought in farm labourers for the surrounding counties and these people have filtered back into the cities. Those cities naturally object to this surplus labour. But our people in the west, who are dealing with these immigrants, who are homesteading with them, who are living and working with them—these people should know whether this policy is wise or not. We had delegates at that convention from every part of the province, from 700 miles north of Edmonton to the international boundary, and from the summit of the Rocky Mountains to the fourth meridian, which is our boundary on the east. And the sentiment of every part of that great province of Alberta, is expressed in this resolution which was received as heartily as any resolution could be:

> Resolved, that this provincial Liberal convention expresses its approval of the wise and progressive immigration policy of the Laurier government.

That is the mandate of the west; that is the estimate that the people out west have; and I may tell you that the Liberals in western Canada, if there are evils, are not at all backward in exposing them. By this resolution the immigration policy of the government received the unanimous endorsation of that convention.

But in the east it is a different matter. When the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden)—and I am sorry he is not in his place at the moment—was on his campaign tour he spoke in the east, and, of course, learned the sentiment there. And when he visited my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) in his county, the sentiments attributed to him by the Montreal 'Gazette' of September 2, were the following:

The immigration question he considered of extreme importance, as it constituted one of the most potent influences in moulding the destiny of the country. We were beginning to develop a great national spirit, he said, but this development was rendered difficult because the population of Canada was made up of scattered communities, heterogeneous in race and creed. Between the east and west there was a vast stretch of territory that could not be peopled and there was danger of the two sections of the country becoming antagonistic to each other. Under these circumstances, he thought it most unwise to crowd into the west, as the government was doing, a class of undesirable immigrants—Galicians, Bohemians, Doukhobors, &c.—who did not understand our customs and did not readily assimilate either with the French or English elements of Canada.

That was spoken in the province of Quebec. But, when the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) reached the western country, the opinion of his friends up there had its influence upon him. It would almost appear as if the hon. gentleman had been cautioned that it would be unwise to give expression to any such sentiments in that country. This is what he said:

While I am in the west, I wish to say that in respect to the question of immigration, the report which represents me as referring to certain nationalities as undesirable is quite inaccurate. I have never made any such references during my present tour. In the House of Commons I have frequently referred to the Galicians as desirable settlers, basing my opinion on what I saw of the west during my tour of 1902.

There is the one side and there is the other; which are you going to accept? Is it 'while I am in the west' or 'while I am in the east'? Is it the sentiment of Quebec or is it the sentiment of the west?

Mr. BERGERON. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilbert McIntyre) will allow me—that is not fair. What the leader of the opposition said in the west is the best answer to what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilbert McIntyre) read. It is not a case of Mr. Borden in the west against Mr. Borden in the east. It is Mr. Borden speaking personally against the report in the newspaper which is a different thing entirely. He should take the version of Mr. Borden himself instead of a newspaper report that Mr. Borden has declared to be inaccurate.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) chooses to champion the leader of the opposition along these lines. But I happen to know from certain reports I read, that the hon. member for Beauharnois, when in Quebec, expresses some such sentiments as these. I want to tell the hon. member (Mr. Bergeron) that when he was in the west he gave expression to no such sentiment.

Mr. BERGERON. I want to tell my hon. friend that the member for Beauharnois always uses the same language whether he is in the west or in the east. The hon. gentleman can take the career of the member of Beauharnois during the last 30 years and he will find that such is the case.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. I will say this: that in looking through the reports of the hon. member's speeches throughout the west, I found he was absolutely silent on the immigration policy of the government. It is a very easy matter to talk in a certain vein in one part of the country and then talk vehemently in the very opposite vein in another part, but the hon. gentleman was absolutely silent on this question in the West. He said nothing.

Mr. BERGERON. I must have great talent if I spoke for an hour and a half without saying anything.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. Well, it was pretty nearly that.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman did not hear me, because if he did he would not say what he is saying now.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. The hon. gentleman used the time of the people in the west and he used his own time entertaining them about the 'Arctic' and about the 'Montcalm' and other such matters as to which they had no opportunity of obtaining the real facts. But in that storm center of the immigration question he was absolutely silent because the people knew that the sentiments he commonly expressed in Quebec on that question were not the sentiments of the west.

Now, this immigration question largely resolves itself into a business question, and in looking at it from a business point of view we should consider what other countries similarly situated to ours have been doing to secure population. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) took the comparison of the United States with Canada, but he must know that most of the natural resources and fertile land of the great American republic have already been exploited with their eighty millions of population. If to-day we had 80,000,000 people in Canada I would hold up both my hands for the resolution of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MONK. Why?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. Because our natural resources are undeveloped and we must use every legitimate means to develop them.

Mr. MONK. Is it a proper way to bring in the wrong people?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. The hon. gentleman has not proved to the slightest degree that this method of bonusing brought in the wrong people, but on the contrary, I have endeavoured to show that it brought in the right people.

Mr. MONK. You must have all the good people in the west because we have a bad lot in Montreal.

Mr. W. McINTYRE. Let us see how other colonies, situated as we are have endeavoured to get population. I find that Australia very materially assists immigration.

Mr. BERGERON. Any North Atlantic Trading Company there?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. If the hon. gentleman will permit me we will see. I quote from the London Times of January 31st, 1907:

Sydney, New South Wales.—In consequence of the general prosperity of the country and the scarcity of labour the premier has recently extended the immigration regulations. The government is using every endeavour to secure a good flow of the right type of rural settlers and now invites artisans, general labourers and domestic servants of a desirable class to come to the country. Agricultural labourers and general servants may travel from London to Sydney at a nominal cost. Liberal railway concessions will be made to agricultural immigrants and capital qualifications are abolished.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Is there any bonus?

Mr. W. McINTYRE. If my hon. friend has patience I will show him what they do in Australia. I quote from the London Times of February 11th, 1907:

Brisbane.—Mr. Kitson, the new premier of Queensland, in making a declaration of policy said that the government had an agreement with a steamship company to bring immigrants from Great Britain. The government would pay a portion of the passage money, the immigrants paying only £3 to £5. Free grants of lands of 160 acres would be given to these to pay their own passage and free passages would be given to agricultural labourers.

My hon. friend asks me whether there is a bonus or not, but here you have the case of direct assisted immigration which the policy of this government has repudiated. The Minister of the Interior has asked that only certain desirable classes be brought into this country, and unless the agents discriminate they cannot get the bonus. As a matter of fact the agents are only a means of advertising the resources of the country and for the purpose of selecting a certain desirable class of immigration. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, I have taken up too much of the time of the House discussing this question, but my object has been to get a few facts together to show that it would be most undesirable that we should in any way relax our efforts to bring people to this country. With the enormous undeveloped natural resources in the west we must keep pushing forward. I am at one with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) in the demand for the selection of immigrants and if I were not in favour of the selection of immigrants I would do as he has suggested, simply open the door and let them come as they choose, giving no special inducements for bringing any special class —for really that is all I can read into his argument. He says: If we stop this system, we will increase our immigration. I cannot see but that is one point in his argument that he has not proven or attempted to prove; that to relax your efforts means a greater influx seems to me to be paradoxical. I am deeply interested in the immigration policy for it affects us in this western country largely, and I as a young Canadian would have desirable settlers enter the country in great numbers; as to their loyalty, as to their becoming good Canadians, if any hon. gentleman in this House will take the trouble to visit Western Canada during the coming summer, he will find there as loyal, as industrious, and as good a class of citizens as can be found in any other part of this great Dominion.

Mr. L. ROBITAILLE (Quebec County). I have listened with intense interest to the able remarks of the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. W. McIntyre). He seems, however, to be under a false impression in trying to make this House believe that we are against the development of the west. Such an idea would be far from our minds. We are delighted at the magnificent figures which have been given to show the development of the west, not only from a financial standpoint, but from the standpoint of national development as well. What we are against is the bringing to Canada by a system of bonus premiums of people who are undesirable not only for the west but for the east or any portion of Canada where they may establish themselves. The figures of development which he has just given to the House are not the basic argument upon which he should rely to prove the advisability of the bonus system, because from my observation during certain trips I have made to the west, we have there a large number of American citizens who have sold their lands in their own country and have come to Canada from the two Dakotas and Minnesota, bringing their children and their money and have planted themselves in the west, making in my estimation as high class citizens as any immigrants we could get by a bonus system. No bonus has been paid by the goverment on these immigrants and still we are glad to include in the statistics of our western development the magnificent result of their enterprise and skill.

The hon. member was very paternal in some remarks he made concerning my friend (Mr. Armand Lavergne), trying to teach him what broadmindedness was. It is very well to offer suggestions, but I think the best thing for the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. W. McIntyre) and others to remember is that they should be broad-minded first and that the west is not the only portion of the Dominion to be considered. Personally, I think if that broadmindedness in theory of which he spoke had been put into practice last year we would not have had the position we have had of the promulgation of the English statute before the promulgation of the French statute. There are many other instances which I could cite in political history where that same broadmindedness has not been shown.

We demand the abolition of the bonus system because it is one of the most potent causes of the introduction into Canada of the undesirable element which it is generally admitted we have in Canada. Perhaps my words may not have much weight with the House, so I shall quote a statement given in 1902 by the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) who said:

> We have made an error in the past in paying large sums of money as premiums to navigation companies for the transportation of immigrants, because we transform there and then the navigation companies into immigration agents, and the character of the immigrant, as well as his origin, is of no account so long as they obtain the premium. This system seems to me very undesirable and I would demand its abolition. Leaving to navigation companies the task of inciting immigrants, means that a premium is given on the bad quality of immigrants rather than on the good.

That is exactly what we are asking. We claim that the system of premiums to-day, far from inducing the good and desirable class, forces on us the undesirable immigrant. Further on in 1903, the same gentleman stated :

> Reference has been made, I believe, to the premium as a means of inducing immigration In my opinion, if ever that system has been necessary it is no longer necessary. The payment of premiums or commission tends to bring to us a class of people not the most desirable.

Mr. BENNETT. Was he minister then ?

Mr. ROBITAILLE. No, he had no ministerial function. That probably is the reason why he could speak his own opinion.

The chief argument which has been advanced in favour of the bonus system is that we need farm labourers and that the bonus was paid practically on farm labourers. The hon. member for Strathcona even stated that he had inside information from the Superintendent of Immigration that this system was, as far as possible followed, but I think I have as much information from the Superintendent of Immigration in his testimony made in 1907, before the committee. He was examined by Dr. Sproule as follows :

> Q. If I understand correctly you simply ask the immigrants if they propose to be farm labourers in coming here?—A. That is what we do when they disembark.
>
> Q. Is that all the information that you have as to the class to which they belong?—A. Yes, we ask their age and their occupation.
>
> Q. What occupation they have followed before coming to Canada?—A. What occupation they were in in the old country. The manifest, I believe, is prepared by the purser of the steamer, who is in no way an official of the government, and is certified by the captain.
>
> Q. I would have thought that an officer of the government would have occupied himself with this work and would have seen that only certain classes of immigrants were sent to us? —A. Whoever has the money can buy a ticket.
>
> Q. But if he has the money will he get the premium?—A. No, but I say that anybody may buy a ticket in the old country.
>
> Q. If I ask you that it is because I know several immigrants like that. It was said that they were farm labourers and had come here to take up farming. I took the trouble to inquire and I discovered that out of six or seven there was not one who had worked one hour on a farm.—A. That may be very true.
>
> Q. And nevertheless they are sent to us as farm labourers?—A. No, they are not so called. They are sent to us as intending to take up agriculture. In England the day labourer receives on the farm as high a wage as in Canada.

The point that the hon. member for Strathcona was trying to make a few minutes ago was that it was only on farm hands that the premium was paid and that a statement is simply exacted from the newcomer to the effect that he intends to come as a farm labourer. In the present debate the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) read a letter from the Salvation Army which points out that the premium should be paid only on farm labourers and suggests that a certain party, not a farm labourer, but a skilled mechanic, should accept a position on a farm for the first six months, at the expiration of which time an opportunity might be offered for work in his own trade. That is where the difficulty lies. What opportunity has the government of discriminating between the farm labourer and the skilled mechanic or other person when he arrives at the port of landing especially in view of the suggestion which is contained in this letter that a man should at the outset represent himself to be a farm labourer? It is on people of this class that $5 per capita is paid. If the theory, as advanced by several hon. members of this House were correct, that this bonus is going to be paid to secure desirable immigrants, I would be the first one to support it, but I say that there is not a man in this Dominion that can put this system into practical operation and apply

it to the right people. The fact is that many people who come to this country as farm labourers are not in reality farm labourers, and we have to pay out our good money without getting the results which we have in view. The object attained may be good in some respects, but it is not the desired one. It seems to me that there are other directions in which the money of this country can be more profitably expended than by devoting it to this purpose. Another answer which was given by Mr. Scott was this :

The agricultural population of Great Britain is but a very small percentage and you must naturally address yourself to working men and day labourers. Besides whoever has the wherewithal to pay his passage may come to this country.

There is a long deposition that I shall not continue to read because it might weary the House. I think that I have quoted sufficiently upon this subject to establish my point. It being six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I desire to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

At six o'clock the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, April 23, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. HONORE GERVAIS (St. James, Montreal) presented the second report of the select standing committee appointed to supervise the official reports of the debates of this House during the present session, as follows:

That the salary of $2,000 per annum, at present paid to each member of the staff of official reporters of the debates, be increased to $2,500.

That the salary of $1,200 per annum, now paid Mr. C. W. Boyce, assistant to the chief reporter, be increased to $1,500.

That the above mentioned increases date from the 15th May, 1906.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Sgd.) HONORE GERVAIS,
Chairman.

Mr. HONORE GERVAIS (St. James, Montreal) presented the third report of the select standing committee appointed to supervise the official reports of the debates of this House during the present session, as follows :

Your committee have had under consideration the question of the improvement of the system which has prevailed with respect to what is considered an unnecessary delay or interval of from eight to ten days between the date of publication of the daily (unrevised) and the issue of the French edition of the official report of the debates due to the system in vogue of publishing a revised English edition which, upon examination, has been found to contain such extensive changes, in the majority of cases are alterations, not corrections, that it cannot be considered an accurate record of what has really transpired in the House.

Your committee with a view of remedying the existing deficiencies recommend that hereafter the debates be translated into French from the daily (unrevised) edition, and that members in revising their speeches be limited to the correction of clerical errors only which may appear therein.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Sgd.) HONORE GERVAIS,
Chairman.

QUESTIONS.

IMPORTS OF GLUCOSE.

Mr. GANONG asked :

How many pounds of glucose were imported from Great Britain between March 31, 1907, and March 31, 1908, and what was the value of the same?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The imports of glucose from Great Britain during the year ending March 31, 1908, amounted to 3,538,501 pounds, valued at $72,583.

RIVER JESUS DREDGING.

Mr. DESJARDINS asked :

1. Is the government still indebted to Mr. E. A. D. Morgan, contractor, for the dredging of the River Jésus, during the summer of 1907? If so, what is the amount?

2. If not, at what date was he paid, and what amount was paid him?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. No.

2. Last payment was made 23rd December last. Total payments for season of 1907, $13,064.05.

CUSTOMS OFFICERS AT NIAGARA FALLS, FORT ERIE, SARNIA AND WINDSOR.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. What officers are now employed in the Customs Department at the ports of Niagara Falls, Fort Erie, Sarnia and Windsor?

2. What ranks do these officers hold, what are the duties of their respective appointment, and what were their salaries at the time of appointment?

3. What is the rank at present of each of these officers?

4. What increase of salary has each of these officers received since date of appointment?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). This is rather a long question to answer, but I suppose there is now no

opportunity for a notice of motion. I would ask that the question stand. There is no objection to it. I will have the information prepared ; it will take a little time ; perhaps I shall be allowed to hand it to 'Hansard.'

EDMONTON DOMINION LANDS AGENT.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. Has Mr. K. W. McKenzie been recently appointed to the position of Dominion Lands Agent at Edmonton?
2. If so, what position did Mr. McKenzie hold previous to his appointment, and what were his special qualifications?
3. Is it the practice of the Department of the Interior to make promotions to the higher appointments from among the permanent officials of the department?
4. If so, are promotions made by seniority when other qualifications are equal, and are the private political opinions of an official any bar or any assistance to his promotion?
5. Were there no senior officials in the Edmonton or other land offices fully qualified for the appointment of agent there?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.
2. He was in business in Edmonton. He had been mayor of the city and before that principal of the High School.
3. The practice is to take the best men that can be got at the time and place.
4. Political opinions do not debar an official from promotion.
5. In the opinion of the minister. No.

DISTRIBUTION OF SEED GRAIN.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. Has an order in council been passed amending the regulations governing the distribution of seed grain in the west by authorizing the furnishing of grain to persons who had not sown grain in the season of 1907?
2. Do the amended regulations apply to Alberta and Saskatchewan?
3. On what authority does the Governor in Council purport to divert the appropriation for said grain from the purpose for which it was voted?
4. Have the agreements between this government and the governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan been varied? If so, when, how, and to what extent?
5. Will the government bring down and lay upon the table of the House the order in council above referred to?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. The appropriation has not been diverted from the purpose for which it was voted.
4. Yes, to the extent provided for by the order in council of the 17th March, 1908.
5 Copy of order in council of the 17th March, 1908, herewith.

Certified copy of a report of the Committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General on the 17th March, 1908.

The Committee of the Privy Council have had under consideration a report, dated 14th March, 1908, from the Minister of the Interior stating that under clause 15 of the regulations approved by order in council of the 6th of February, 1908, respecting the purchase, sale and distribution of grain to homestead settlers in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, it is provided that no seed grain shall be supplied to homestead settlers who had sown no crop in the season of 1907. According to the reports received from the officers of the Department of the Interior who have been at work in the west in connection with the distribution, it would appear that the number of applications that are being received for advances of seed grain under the provisions of the regulations is not as large as had been anticipated, and that in consequence that appropriation lately made by parliament to cover this expenditure is likely to be in excess of the requirements.

The minister recommends, inasmuch as numerous applications have been received from farmers in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan who, although they had sown no crop in 1907, are urgently in need of seed grain during the coming season, and as the machinery for the purchase, distribution and taking of security for advances of seed grain now in operation is well fitted and sufficient to deal with such applications and as the seed grain needed as above stated, is not available in the provinces mentioned, and therefore cannot well be secured by the individual action of those who require it, that clause 15 of the regulations, approved by order in council of the 6th February, 1908, be amended so as to permit of advances to be made to settlers who had sown no crop in the season of 1907, under the same terms and conditions as set forth in such regulations.

The Committee submit the same for approval.

(Sgd.) RODOLPHE BOUDREAU,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

THE MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPARTMENT.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Who are at present performing the duties of Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries Department, commissioner of lights and Quebec agent of the department, and what positions have they heretofore held?
2. What was the date of first and each subsequent appointment and promotion of the late commissioner of lights, with salary attached?

Hon. JACQUES BUREAU (for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Mr. G. J. Desbarats, heretofore director of the government shipyard at Sorel, province of Quebec, is acting Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Mr. Cecil Doutre, heretofore superintendent of the wireless telegraph service, is acting accountant. Mr. J. G. MacPhail, heretofore technical assistant to the Commissioner of Lights, is in temporary charge of that branch. Mr. P.

J. Mailloux, heretofore chief clerk and accountant in the Quebec agency, is acting agent at Quebec.

2. Mr. J. F. Fraser, late Commissioner of Lights, was first appointed temporarily on the Hydrographic Survey at $600 per annum in October, 1893. Appointed permanently at $625 per annum in September, 1894. Received $50 annual increments until 1901 when his salary was $1,000. By order in council of the 20th May, 1902, Mr. Fraser was appointed technical officer in charge of Aids to Navigation between Montreal and Kingston at $1,500 per annum. Appointed Commissioner of Lights by order in council of the 31st October, 1903 and in November, 1903 his salary was raised to $2,000.

THE FRENCH REVISED STATUTES.

Mr. ROBITAILLE asked:

1. When will the last volume of the French version of the Revised Statutes of 1906 be printed for distribution?

2. Is the government aware that French-speaking lawyers of Montreal and Quebec are said to be handicapped by their English colleagues in facility of indexing, &c.?

3. Is it constitutional that both languages be treated on an unequal footing?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1. The King's Printer states in about five weeks.

2. No intimation of this character has been made to the government.

3. The requirement of the constitution is that both languages be used in the Records and Journals of both Houses of parliament.

PARDON OF DOUKHOBORS.

Mr. LAKE asked:

1. Have the following telegrams been sent by the Department of Justice to Magistrate Palling, of Fort William:

'The Minister of Justice requests that you will be good enough to send immediately report upon case of ten male and nine female Doukhobors committed by you to Port Arthur jail.'

'Please report pardon for Doukhobors now in Port Arthur jail preparatory to their being shipped back to Saskatchewan, where they came from.'

2. Is it true that the government have pardoned or contemplate pardoning these Doukhobors committed to prison for an aggravatetd offence against public decency?

3. Is it true that they contemplate sending these people to the province of Saskatchewan? If so, on what grounds, under what authority and at whose expense?

4. Will they undertake the responsibility for the good behaviour of these people by guaranteeing the province of Saskatchewan against any expenses that may be incurred should they commit the same offence?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1. On 14th April inst., the Inspector of Prisons and Public Charities for the province of Ontario and the Inspector of Hospitals and Public Charities for the same province saw me, bringing a letter from the Deputy Attorney General of the province which stated that a number of Doukhobors had come from Saskatoon to Port Arthur, Ontario, and that some of them had been sentenced, for indecent exposure, to the Central Prison and Mercer Reformatory repectively. The letter added that there was no room, either at the Central Prison or in the jail at Port Arthur, and that it was thought the best course would be to have these persons pardoned and let them be removed to the part of the country from which they came where they would be amongst their own people.

The inspectors stated that there were nineteen Doukhobors detained in the jail at Port Arthur and over fifty others living in Fort William—that all of them, both those at large and those in jail, desired to return to their homes in Saskatchewan, or were willing to do so, but that those who were at large would not go leaving behind those who were in jail, and in these circumstances the inspectors asked that those in jail should be pardoned at once.

I stated that it would be necessary to inquire the views of the convicting magistrate. The inspectors asked me to do so by telegraph and I directed that to be done.

A telegram was accordingly sent in the words following:

April 14, 1908.

Mr. Police Magistrate Palling,
Fort William.

The Minister of Justice requests you will be good enough to send immediately report upon cases of ten male and nine female Doukhobors committed to you to Port Arthur jail.

A. POWER,
For Deputy Minister of Justice.

No other telegram or message of any kind relating to the matter was sent by or from the Department of Justice to Mr. Magistrate Palling, or to anybody. I have no knowledge whatever of the other telegram which is quoted in the question put by the hon. gentleman. The newspaper statements that it was sent by me, or from Mr. Power, or any one in the Department of Justice, are entirely without foundation.

The report of the convicting magistrate was received by mail on the 16th April instant, and the case was submitted to His Excellency the Administrator of the government on the 18th instant.

2. The release of the prisoners has been directed.

3. It is not true that the government has, or has had, it in contemplation to send these people to the province of Saskatchewan, or to any other place, or to take any step whatever in the matter except to release the nineteen prisoners and leave them at liberty to come or go where they will,

as any other residents of the country might, if the laws of the country are observed.

4. The government does not undertake, or recognize, any responsibility in the premises except for the recommendation to release the prisoners. If a Doukhobor offends against any law, he is in exactly the same position as any other resident of the country who may so offend, and the administration of justice in the province is matter wholly for the authorities of such province.

THE NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the question that was asked yesterday and the day before yesterday by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition concerning certain charges made by Major Hodgins as to the manner in which the work of construction of the Transcontinental Railway is carried on, I had this morning an interview with Mr. Parent. I should say that the correspondence which led to the dismissal of Major Hodgins as an engineer of the Transcontinental Railway has been before the public five or six weeks. With reference to the charges of Major Hodgins affecting the manner in which the construction of the Transcontinental Railway is carried on, I have asked Mr. Parent for, and he has promised me, a statement which I intend to place on the table of the House as soon as it is received. I do not expect that I can have it in time to lay it before the House to-day, but hope to have it to-morrow, when I shall give a further statement regarding any action to be taken thereupon should any be needed.

TREATY BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the right hon. gentleman any further news with regard to the proposed treaty between Great Britain and the United States ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, I received this morning a telegram from the British Ambassador, Mr. Bryce, informing us that he had sent the treaty to the colonial office for transmission to this government in the ordinary routine, but that in the meantime, if we desired, he would have it sent directly to us. I answered in the affirmative.

MR. WILLIAM MACKENZIE.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I notice an item in the Toronto 'Globe' headed 'A Diplomatic Matter' announcing that Mr. William Mackenzie, one of the press gallery representatives, has been appointed by the First Minister to establish a new central bureau for handling the correspondence relating to imperial and foreign affairs. The 'Globe' goes on to say that it will be his duty to keep the correspondence in this connection properly centralized and attended to in an adequate and diplomatic manner. Then it mentions that there are some treaties at present under way, in connection with which Mr. Mackenzie will be found very useful. What are the duties and functions of this diplomat, if I may properly call him so? Is he invested with diplomatic functions? Is this a new office? Will he come under the Civil Service Act? How will his salary be paid? Under what department is he to carry on the work ? At present I understand the foreign correspondence is carried on through the Department of the Secretary of State or the Prime Minister's Department. Are these two to be combined in this new office? Is the work now being done by the Secretary of State and the First Minister to be centered in one individual and under what authority will he come?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In order to answer more categorically I shall to-morrow lay before the House the order in council which was passed appointing Mr. Mackenzie. In the meantime I may say that he has been appointed a clerk in the office of the Privy Council. His duties will be to classify and keep track of the correspondence, which is now accumulating very fast, from the imperial authorities and colonial and foreign governments. He will have no functions other than those of a clerk and is to be under the orders of the head of the department. His salary will be $2,800 per year, which will involve an appropriation of only $800 by this parliament, because the salary of Mr. Foley, who has been promoted to be Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, will be available for that purpose.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not ask the question with any view of objecting to the individual, because, so far as I know, he is a suitable man for the position.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The question is quite proper.

ACCIDENT ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to a letter I have received regarding an accident on the Intercolonial Railway between St. Hyacinthe and Quebec, where there have been two accidents lately. The letter is as follows :

I lost a whole day, thanks entirely to the rotten state of the Intercolonial Railway which caused a bad accident to our train, but thanks to a merciful Providence no lives were lost. You ought to bring the matter to the notice of the minister. The line as it is now,

is quite unfit to carry troops or in fact for any heavy traffic. Within two miles of the same place where the run off occurred last Thursday, where the line is perfectly level and so straight that you can see as far as the eye can reach, the weight of the engine caused the spikes in the absolutely rotten ties to give out and let the tender in between the rails. It caught the 90 pound rails and bent them up double. It rolled the baggage car and smashed the baggage and ditched all the rest on their side except the parlour car, which only had the front truck off, and the sleeping car behind. We examined the line carefully and there is no doubt that the accident occurred owing to the rotten ties and want of ballast. The track at that part is in the most disgraceful and unsafe condition.

Is it the intention of the minister to repair the line and has he heard anything about this accident?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I have heard about the accident and very much regret it, but the best conducted railways have their accidents, and as they are somewhat scarce on the Intercolonial Railway, when one does occur particular attention is drawn to it. The fact is that a part of that portion of the line is considered to have a roadbed equal to any on the continent of America. Just what the particular causes of that accident were I do not know. They are not only being inquired into, but the road has been repaired and the line is running, I presume, as usual. If my hon. friend will give me the name of the individual who has written him, I may be better able to judge the value of his complaint.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. When I make any statement in this House I assume the full responsibility, and my name will carry as much weight in this country as that of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham).

FLOODING AT STE. BARBE, HUNTINGDON.

Mr. R. N. WALSH (Huntingdon). Has the Minister of Railways received any report from his engineer with regard to the river St. Lawrence breaking through the embankment at Ste. Barbe in the county of Huntingdon and damaging a lot of property there? And has the government taken any action in the matter?

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot tell that personally I have received any such communication. I presume the chief engineer has, and if any damage has been done the matter will be attended to at once.

AGREEMENTS BETWEEN MUNICIPALITIES AND RAILWAYS.

Mr. HENDERSON. Some time ago I moved an amendment to the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company's charter providing that the company be penalized in the event of its failing to carry out certain agreements made between it and the municipalities. The Minister of Railways advised me not to press my amendment and promised that he would subsequently introduce a clause in the Railway Act which would compel a specific performance of these agreements. The session is passing away and I have heard nothing about the amendment. Has the minister forgotten it?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Bill has been introduced and explained and stands for a second reading.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have analysed that Bill and I do not find in it anything explicitly carrying out what the minister promised.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will find a clause there if he will refer to it.

TRENT CANAL—SURVEYS.

Mr. LENNOX. Has the minister had an opportunity of ascertaining when we may expect the report of the survey made between Georgian bay and Kempenfeldt bay in connection with the Trent valley waterway?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have that among my many other notes, but have been so busy to-day I did not get that far on the list.

ALLEGED IRREGULARITIES AT SOREL

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) is not in his place, but I would like to put a question which, perhaps, some of his colleagues will be good enough to convey to him. I wish to know if Mr. Gaudet, who was appointed to make an investigation into some irregularities in Sorel, has made a report. The gentleman has received his pay, and I should imagine that his report must be nearly ready, or ready. Perhaps the colleagues of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will call his attention to this point. It will facilitate the consideration of the estimates of the department.

THE WOOLLEN INDUSTRY.

Mr. C. L. OWEN (East Northumberland). I would like to ask the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if it is the intention of the government to come to the rescue of the woollen manufacturers in the near future with a specific duty?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I am sorry to say that I cannot to-day give any specific answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Owen).

SUPPLY—IMMIGRATION.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding: That

Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply, and the proposed amendment of Mr. Monk thereto.

Mr. L. ROBITAILLE (Quebec County). Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned at six o'clock last evening, I was endeavouring to answer some of the arguments of the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Wilbert McIntyre). I stated then that the arguments brought forward showing the development of the west are not entirely creditable to the system of bonusing immigrants. I stated that a majority of the people in at least a good portion of our western country were American citizens whose entry into our country was easy because of the contiguity of some of the American states to these portions of Alberta and Saskatchewan. I have here an article entitled 'Building a new nation,' and very cleverly written, which seems to corroborate the opinion I enunciated last night. It is a very lengthy article and I have no intention to force it all on the attention of hon. members, but there are certain passages that I desire to read. The author tells of a trip he made in 1901 to that western country and notes the changes which he found in a trip made in 1906. He says:

I travelled westward to the edge of the Rocky mountains and northward in Alberta through plains which, when I first visited them in 1901, were almost peopleless, but which are now thickly settled and more thoroughly American than the state of New York. I travelled through most of these regions in an immigrant car; talked with some who were seeking new homes, ate with them—in fact, inasmuch as I could, I became an immigrant myself, and tried to look at conditions and the country from the viewpoint of the thousands of Americans who are now flocking into the vast fertile regions of the Dominion. . . . . .

I could not have received a more vivid impression of the effects of the so-called 'American invasion of Canada,' than in this comparison of my first trip with my last. Four out of five of the homes that I looked upon were the homes of American farmers; the great majority of the people I met and talked with were Americans. For 1,000 miles westward from Winnipeg along the line of the Canadian Pacific the population of the country and towns to-day is, as I have said, more generally American than is that of the state of New York, and Alberta, especially from the border northward to Edmonton might be regarded as a typical American state.

It goes on to show that the west is so very much Americanized——

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Robitaille) allow me? The quotation he has read and his comments upon it would give one the impression that the province of Alberta is more American than the state of New York. Now it so happens that at the time this party visited the west, in the year 1906, the census of that province was taken. There can be no doubt, therefore, of the exact condition of affairs. The population of Alberta in 1906 was 185,412 people and the number of Americans was 43,251, or 23·3 per cent.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. Does the hon. member (Mr. Wilbert McIntyre) admit that there are 400,000 or 500,000 Americans in western Canada who have come in since 1901? The statistics——

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. I can only say that the statistics are incorrect.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. What guarantee have I that the hon. gentleman's own figures are more correct than mine? It is a question of good faith. Following the main columns of this army of immigration back to their beginnings, the real reasons of its existence are soon discovered. The momentum is given at the source, and we find men pushing each other up the gangplanks of departing emigrant steamers to make their escape from incredible political and economic wrongs. There is another reason, based upon the first, but none the less potent. The traffic in ocean passages has reached a stage of fierce competition, unscrupulousness and even inhumanity, inconceivable to those not familiar with its details. Men who profit by the march of these millions of people have a drag-net out over continental Europe so fine in its meshes as to let no man, woman or child escape who has the price and the desire or need to go. Several cases of unscrupulousness have been brought to light. This summer, I met two families of French people who had come to Canada via London. One of these people had had some wealth which he had lost in certain mining ventures in Russia and he was coming to Canada to recuperate his lost fortune. He states that whilst in London, the immigration agent—a pretty foxy fellow—succeeded in learning what amount of money he had with him intended for investment in Canada, and, by a series of objections and delays, prevented him from getting on the steamer. The man was practically forced to stay in London for a period of at least three weeks in certain hotels recommended by the immigration men. I do not say these were directly immigration department officials, but booking agents. But it shows that the system affords opportunities for those who try to extract or extort money from intending immigrants on the other side of the water, and that these opportunities have been taken advantage of. It seems to me that it would be well for the government to have a close watch put upon such people through its own immigration officials, and to take every reasonable means to cause the bona fide immigrant to depend upon

the immigration offices for information, for booking and even for steamship tickets, rather than leave them in the hands of these men who are but too eager to exploit them in every way. Also, a few days ago, we had what I may call the Doctor Dickey incident concerning which the following appears in a London despatch:

London, March 11.—The trial of Maikeal Lurkis, Charles Harnson and Arshay Atonia, charged with conspiring to defraud emigrants, began at Liverpool yesterday. N. Cockshutt watched the case on behalf of the Canadian government. When Atonia was arrested a large number of letters was found in his possession. Counsel said these letters showed that Atonia was on terms of very intimate relationship with the authorities who had to pass the emigrants on the other side. One of the letters found on him was from a man who described himself as Hugh L. Dickey, M.D., Halifax. A letter from Halifax, signed W. Dodds, said:

Your eleven people were all passed. Be a little more particular next time with Montreal cases. Do not let them make any signs whatever. If you describe something that they will wear it will be enough. I felt quite nervous when they all made signs with their hands on their ties.

This clipping shows that the immigration officials do not thoroughly enforce the regulations regarding newcomers when they disembark in Canadian ports. The proof of that is the fact that, in order to procure entry, they have only to put their two hands to their neckties, which is considered a sort of password. It shows further that these men are sent over by unscrupulous parties, probably the booking agents at the other end, in collusion with certain officials of the department who allow these undesirable elements to pass, and if there was no bonus given for each immigrant coming to this country these officials would not be so eager to force immigrants upon us. That bonus is an inducement to fraud and unscrupulousness, and it ought to be condemned on that ground.

Where do our immigrants come from? From the British isles. London absorbs into her mighty heart thousands of feeble human beings, talking a gibberish of tongues, and quickly becoming public charges. Last year I believe it was stated in this House that there were 1,200 immigration agents in the British isles. The other day certain people took offence at the remarks of my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) relative to the Salvation Army. Now I am free to say that the work which the Salvation Army has done in trying to elevate the depressed element of humanity is a most creditable one from a religious standpoint. But when we come to consider the class of people which the Salvation Army deal with we find that men who are broken down financially, men who are demoralized physically, morally and religiously, are brought into the barracks of the Salvation Army who try to do all in their power to make them good citizens. Moreover, we are told that there are certain political evils in England, such as Socialism and collectivism, which imperil the present order of things, not only the monarchy, but also the lords and the ruling classes. Naturally these ruling classes, being the moneyed people, are eager to foster any movement with their advice and patronage, and even with their financial assistance, which will diminish the number of these undesirable classes which the Salvation Army are taking away. The ruling class are all too eager to support the work of the Salvation Army in thrusting upon Canada some of the scum of the population. I do not say that all the English immigrants are undesirable, but I am speaking of the work which the Salvation Army is doing in taking hold of this low grade of people, and trying to elevate them in the scale of citizenship, and that is the class of people which the Salvation Army is sending over to Canada. We also receive immigrants from continental Europe, particularly from Italy, Austria-Hungary and Russia. These are countries where the majority of people are low in the social scale, and where the percentage of illiteracy is discreditable to the twentieth century. These people are directed to channels of emigration made easy by those seeking cargoes for their ships.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since it has been demonstrated that the bonus system has forced upon us a certain class of undesirable immigrants, what are the consequences that we have to contemplate? We find first of all an evil effect from a municipal standpoint. The Toronto, Winnipeg and Montreal newspapers report frequent attacks upon citizens Who are these sinister bandits, and what do they want? Look up the criminal records, and you will find that 95 per cent of the convicts are penniless immigrants who want to eat, and more especially to drink The charity organizations claim that there are thousands of people who lack the necessities of life. On Bleury street, Montreal, where a charitable institution is located, demands for help are made daily in the shape of food and fuel, In Winnipeg also if we are to believe newspaper reports, there is a large number of penniless and destitute people walking the streets, and armed attacks are made daily upon citizens. In Toronto matters are still worse. The 'Globe,' the 'World,' the 'Star,' the 'Mail,' and several other newspapers give us information regarding this class of people. It is not my intention to weary the House with statistics, but it may be well to give a concrete case where a too large number of immigrants have been forced upon the community. Several char-

itable organizations assembled in an extraordinary meeting at Mr. Goldwin Smith's residence, about the beginning of December, 1907, and adopted the following resolution :

1. That employees of labour are urged, in the name of fraternal spirit, to provide work for the greatest possible number, even if it were necessary to reduce every one's task to a half day's work—

2. That the municipal authorities are begged to give employment to the greatest possible number even if it is necessary to reduce the day's work to every one—

3. That for public works that have not been awarded, the city should exact from the contractors that they employ by day work people of all nationalities—

4. That all those who have projected work should endeavor to hasten their operations.

5. A delegation should wait upon the Board of Control asking to press the starting of projected public works—

6. That the government is requested to give without delay work on the Grand Trunk Pacific to as great a number as possible of immigrants—

7. That publicity be given that Toronto is congested with idlers, in order to prevent their increase in number—

8. That the Ontario government is requested to establish, without delay, an employment bureau—

I may also say that this memorandum, of which I have just given the substance to the House, shows what a burden upon local charities these immigrants have become, and what a tax they are upon citizens from a financial standpoint. I read the other day a very able article in the 'Globe,' covering about the same point I have been elucidating. The title of the article is 'Carefully selected immigrants.' The article deals with the economic aspect of the immigration question, and I will take the liberty of quoting a certain portion :

Indeed, the Canadian government have appointed over one hundred employment agents in the agricultural district of the province of Ontario, and are paying them out of public funds for the very purpose of obviating the necessity of a further influx to the large cities of those immigrants who claim that they are going on the land.

That is taken from a letter written by Mr. J. Obed Smith, Assistant Superintendent of Immigration for Canada in London, in reply to a gentleman named Hamilton, of the Church Army, and transmitting to him the new regulations which the government is trying to put into force to prevent the entry into Canada of immigrants thrust upon us by charitable institutions. To give the House an idea of how these people become a charge upon the community I will just glance for a moment at a report prepared by the House of Industry of Toronto in which it is stated that they have furnished relief to 2,387 families during last year of whom 484 were recorded as being native-born. If Toronto has to provide for the relief of 2,387 families how many others are there who are in need, but who have not made applicaion for assistance ? The report continues:

Despite the large arrivals of immigrants from southern Europe, comparatively few of them applied for assistance.

Another point that I wish to call the attention of the House to is one that has been brought forward by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, and it is one in regard to which the hon. Minister of the Interior has not given any answer. How can the government explain that from 1901 to 1906 the settlers reported by the department as having been located in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta are 200,000 to 250,000 short of the number which the immigration returns are supposed to have shown? That is a point that the minister has not touched.

Now, I wish to call the attention of the House to the objection which can be raised to this forced immigration system from the provincial standpoint. The immigration policy, as carried out by this government, results in increasing the population of the western provinces and in enhancing the value of land retained by the railway companies as well as by companies of the stamp of the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company. It also increases the population of the province of Ontario who are supposed to take care of immigrants as soon as they arrive in the country and try to establish them on farms or secure positions for them in other walks of life. In Quebec, only a few years ago, we succeeded in getting one single agent appointed who was supposed, not to work for Quebec, but to try to augment the population of the eastern townships. I shall refer at greater length to this gentleman in a few moments. I do not enunciate this opinion in any unwarranted manner. A few days ago my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) enquired of the government to what religious denominations different people holding offices under the government belonged. If we could rely on our English friends generally sharing the sentiment which was expressed in reply to that question by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) we, in Quebec, would entertain no fears that our prestige would suffer as a result of the policy of the immigration branch of the Department of the Interior. The idea of the preponderance of any one race in Canada is contrary to the spirit of the constitution which was framed for the purpose of maintaining the equilibrium between the different races inhabiting this country. The question is brought up, not in a spirit of aggressiveness, but as a matter of self-defence, and it is a result of such racial appeals as that to which I shall now call the attention of the House. The Hon. Mr. Weir, who happens to hold an official position in the local government of Quebec,

speaking on the 18th July, 1907, before a Protestant synod, described the English depopulation of the province of Quebec as a national peril and suggested the establishment of an organization which would prevent rural property from passing out of English hands. Protestant ministers would, he said, advise this organization of the departure of an English farmer in order that he might be replaced by one of the same nationality. This could only be effected by immigration. Why not, Mr. Weir asked, direct towards the province of Quebec, a portion of that large English immigration wave bound for the west. What was the effect of this speech? The first practical result of this suggested policy for the English population of the eastern townships was the nomination of Mr. E. W. Brewster, the only immigration agent who performs duties corresponding to those of the 199 agents in Ontario. That shows you how fairly Quebec has been treated on this immigration question. When we pay 40 per cent of the money that the government collect in revenue we ought, at least, to get our fair share of the expenditure not only in public works but with regard to this question of immigration the object of which, according to certain officials, seems to be to maintain the preponderance of one nationality. One and a half years' work by Mr. Brewster resulted in the location of about 1,500 immigrants in the eastern part of the province of Quebec, known as the eastern townships. That is the figure as given by the Minister of the Interior on April 15, 1907, in answer to an inquiry. The basic policy is to strengthen the British element. This policy has already borne its fruit in as much as within the space of one year it has added 16 English ridings to confederation. In fifteen years we, of the province of Quebec, shall form one-tenth of the whole population of this country, in twenty years this policy if carried out, will have caused the placing of 1,000,000 English immigrants in the northern part of Quebec, and in twenty-five years the English element will have conquered the eastern townships. Our premier himself sees no difficulty in admitting that in a quarter of a century Canada will have a population of 30,000,000. Sandwiched between the English of the far west, the English of the eastern provinces, between the Americans massed to the south of us and the English established in the north all along the Transcontinental route what influence will we have on the destinies of the nation? They say that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Let us put this into practice. Now is the time to act. To-morrow it may be too late. What effect has this undesirable immigration upon us from a national standpoint? It will be necessary to notice the influence of immigration on the growth of population and to follow the ethnic changes which are being wrought thereby. Equally important is it to observe the effect of immigration on the economic condition of the labouring classes in this country, whether it is made better or worse. In the same way it is advisable to study the influence of the newcomers on the ethical consciousness of the community, whether there is a gain or a loss to us. In short, we must set up our standard of what we desire this nation to be and then consider whether the policy we hitherto pursued in regard to immigration is calculated to maintain that standard or to endanger it. As to the character of the immigration I shall quote expressions of opinion from prominent Canadians, men who hold high position in the land and who can impartially view this question. I quote from Judge McMahon, who believes in securing immigrants that will be a credit to the country.

Mr. Justice McMahon, at the opening of the spring assizes yesterday, expressed his satisfaction that the duties of the grand jury would not be unusually onerous. But there was one matter which he brought to the jurymen's attention.

Dr. Clarke, superintendent of Toronto asylum, the judge said, stated recently: 'Of 362 admissions of lunatics last year 136 were foreign born, the majority recent arrivals. Those that the province will never get rid of amount to about 40. Each patient retained will cost the province $6,000.'

Sixty-five per cent of these weak-minded foreigners were afflicted with dementia praecox, the same form of insanity accredited to Harry K. Thaw. They were the failures sent from the old country by immigration companies to try and make good in Canada.'

The judge stated that the disease was usually contracted in early life and that 60 per cent of the cases became evident before the age of 25 years. 'We pay for immigration; then why not secure those who will be a credit to the country rather than a detriment to its progress?'

Here is another quotation from a newspaper:

M. Regimbal, assistant agent of immigration for the district of Montreal, left for Portland last evening having in his charge 21 English immigrants who came from the west and who are to be deported. One of these is a lunatic, and the others have refused to do any work, and so are sent back to their country.

I do not mean to have it inferred by these quotations that by any means the entire immigration from England is undesirable, but I read them simply as a basis for my statement that no matter from what country people come they should be of a class calculated to advance the interests of Canada. I quote from Mr. Justice Lavergne who was at one time a law partner of the right hon. the Prime Minister, and who said:

For the last year or so crime seems to have become epidemic among Italians of the lower classes. Men with the worst of records in

the old country invade our shores and lead here a life of crime.

Mr. Bruce Smith, inspector of prisons for Ontario, in his last annual report to the government, says :

Although the year closes with the largest number that have been in confinement in the jails of Ontario within the past twenty years, this increase is not due to any increase in crime in the province, but is largely due to Canada, and especially Ontario, being made the dumping ground during the past year of some most undesirable immigrants. Every jail I have visited within the past six months has had among its prisoners persons who have been only a few months in this country. Some of them have spent most of their lives in English prisons. Several have admitted that they had been discharged by English magistrates on condition that they would emigrate to Canada. There must be something radically wrong with our immigration regulations that will permit such apparent neglect in the inspection of persons seeking and obtaining passage as immigrants to this country. The whole system of encouraging such people to seek a home in Canada is wrong, and the sooner the conditions complained of are recognized and changed the better.

These statements from men who are in a position to know show that undesirable immigrants are coming to our shores and that for the sake of gaining a few paltry dollars the immigrant agents are sending them here.

Let us look at this question from the economic standpoint. Economic well-being is a difficult thing for a nation to acquire, and once acquired is too precious to give up without a struggle—once lost it may require generations to attain again even if the economic conditions are favourable. The standard of living in this country should be jealously guarded, so that our working classes should not either consciously or unconsciously lose it. It may be lowered in either of two ways. Excessive immigration may overstock the labour market and reduce wages ; or immigrants accustomed to fewer of the comforts of life may supplant the native workman. In either case we have brought undue pressure to bear on the mass of the people and have forced them down to a lower level. We have substituted the lower for the higher and preferred that which is inferior. On this point I quote the following from the Toronto 'Globe' of April the 17th :

If there is a great demand for men in Toronto when the seductive steamship agent is talking to the intending emigrant in London, it is no assurance that there will be any demand when the same emigrant reaches this city. Such instances go to show how widely the impression has been spread abroad and accepted that Canada is a country in which the laws of political economy have no existence.

Now, let us look at the question from the electoral standpoint. The continued addition to our electorate of hundreds of thousands of persons who have had no training in self-government, who have other and quite different state of action—will this not tend to weaken our political capacity and self-reliance ? Will it not also effect the adjustment of our institutions to our people, an adjustment which is so necessary if the institutions are to work successfully ?

If the new beam of our political life have neither the aspirations which our ancestors cherished, nor the experience which we have cherished, will not the homogeneousness of our social organizations be seriously imperilled ? A free ballot which was safe in the hands of our intelligent and self-respecting democracy is no longer safe in those of an ignorant and degraded proletariat. Will these alien races rule at the ballot box ? Will they govern our great cities ? What will be their rule ? Will their be the dominant church life ? What will be their faith ? Will their children determine our social and industrial conditions ? What will be their ideals and standards ? We must answer for all this. These immigrants are our raw material out of which we make our to-morrow. Canada welcomes the self-supporting, intelligent and healthy foreigners ; but unfortunately for the peace and safety of well governed communities in this promising country of ours, a very large proportion of these now on the move cannot, even by courtesy or true sympathy, be placed under this classification. Patriotism, loyalty and other civic virtues are by the present immigration policy sinking to a low ebb. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk)—1. Because the premiums are paid to other parties than for those intended by the regulations ; 2. Because a bonus incites greed of graft and thereby has forced upon us undesirable immigrants which inevitably shall lower our standard of ideals. To these immigrants I would apply the words of the poet :

Canada, charge not thy fate to these;
The power is ours to mold them or to mar,
But freedom's voice, far down the centuries,
Shall sound our choice from blazing star to star.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford). Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in supporting the resolution which has been brought forward by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). The question of immigration is one that is attracting and should receive more attention from this House and this country than probably any other question that can be discussed. When this House met in November last I took the

earliest opportunity of placing on the Order Paper a resolution dealing with this very matter. As that resolution has not been and probably will not be again reached, I take this opportunity of making the few remarks which I otherwise would have made in closing the debate on that resolution.

The hon. Minister of the Interior the other day made the broad statement that there were ten men out of work in 1896 to one who is out of work in 1908 ; I think those were about his words. So far as my observation goes, if he had reversed that statement and said that there were ten out of work to-day for every one who was out of work in 1896, he would have been much nearer the mark. I think every hon. member of this House who has anything to do with labour will corroborate my statement. I deplore the fact of the hon. minister sending out broadcast the statement he made, when everybody knows that there are hundreds and thousands without employment in our towns and cities to-day. I have been found fault with because I have drawn attention to this state of affairs. There are two ways of meeting a difficulty : one is to say that it does not exist ; the other is to recognize it and endeavour to get a remedy for it. I have taken the latter course, but the hon. minister says no difficulty exists. It is true, the hon. Minister of the Interior and the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Wilbert McIntyre) say that we are quite out of touch with western conditions, and that the immigration policy must entirely hinge on what the west wants. I think we might retort that these hon. gentlemen know very little about the requirements of the east if they make the statement that there is room in this country for many others seeking employment, and requiring to get work almost the day they land. The Minister of the Interior makes the statement that the bonus is doing a public good and has been adopted in order that we might have a selected class of immigrants. I do not find that it works that way at all. I think the minister, long before he became a minister, took the ground that the bonus was the means of bringing in those who were not desirable. That statement was made yesterday, and I did not hear the minister contradict it. Whether that is the case or not, in my opinion the offering of a bonus for immigrants is the most approved way of getting an undesirable class. There are other weaknesses in the immigration policy of the government, but none so great as the bonus. See how it works. A man who may be dissatisfied with his position in the country to which he owes his birth, or who may be out of work, makes up his mind to go abroad. He goes to a ticket office to make inquiries with regard to South Africa, Australia, the Argentine Republic, the West Indies or some other country, many or all of which are not offering a bonus at all. But the ticket agent, knowing that a bonus is offered by the Canadian government, at once sees an opportunity of turning an honest five dollars, and he endeavours to persuade the immigrant that Canada is the country to go to. The man may have felt that Canada was unsuitable for him, on account of climate or for some other reason, but he is deflected from the course he had intended to take by the ticket agent, and is induced to come to Canada. The minister will say : 'That is good policy ; I approve of that ; we are getting lots of people.' There are many other things to be taken into account in order to judge whether this great influx of immigrants is a public advantage. I can easily conceive of a situation in which a large immigration is a source of weakness rather than a source of strength especially if a large proportion of those we are getting belong to an undesirable class ; and that we are getting many of that class goes without saying—the fact is too well known. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Robitaille) has read a long list of pronouncements by judges and others. These men are not biassed, and yet they point out that we are receiving large numbers of the undesirable class, which is largely attributable to the bonus system.

I notice that some Liberal papers are taking the ground that people who oppose the bonus system do so because they do not understand it, they being under the impression that the immigrant gets the bonus, and not the booking agent. I think very few indeed are under that impression. That is simply drawing a red herring across the track. There might be a good deal said in favour of the poor immigrant getting the five dollars, because it would help him to pay his way for a little while after he lands in this country. But it is the booking agent who gets the five dollars. Though we are paying hundreds of thousands of dollars every year in this way, the money is a small matter compared with the wrong done to the country in getting here so many of the undesirable class—people who are not able to maintain themselves on the soil after they get here.

I was much interested and to some extent pleased with the speech which my hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) delivered in this House yesterday. We have several members of this House who may be said to be independent members. Their independence is not always evident ; yet on this occasion we have had three of the so-called independent members speaking, and all of them have condemned the bonus system. But our hon. friend from South Perth, who I am sorry to see is not in the House at the present time, delivered a long oration on this question. When that hon. gentleman was elected he

posed as an independent; but of all the questionable policies that he could very well have called in question, he went so far as to endorse the bonus system as at present carried on by this government, although he said that the day was near at hand when it must go. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the bonus system has been retained very much too long. If there ever was any excuse for it, that time has long since passed away. It should have been abolished years ago. The hon. member for South Perth put the Minister of the Interior away up on a pedestal. He said that he stood as the one man who had more to say about what Canada was and what it should be in the future than any other man in the Dominion of Canada.

I am not willing to place the minister on quite so high a pedestal. I hold him responsible to a certain extent for this policy, but it is the government, which is paying out the money to enable him to carry out that policy, that the people will hold responsible. The hon. gentleman told us that we require people in this country and are not afraid to pay for them. He says that the west is badly in need of people and that the bonus system is approved of by the large majority of our population. Well, I have been in the west two or three times recently but did not have an opportunity of discussing the bonus question at any great length with our friends there; but I can speak for the province of Ontario, with which I am familiar, and I am satisfied that if to-day a plebiscite were taken in that province as to whether or not a bonus should be paid for immigrants from any country in Europe, 75 per cent would say no. And what I say with regard to Ontario, I believe, would apply with almost equal force to Quebec and the maritime provinces. I do not believe that the west would be unanimous on this question, but admitting that 50 per cent would be in favour of continuing the bonus system, if you take the whole country through you will find that 75 per cent of our people, if asked by a plebiscite, would say that we should pay no more bonuses for immigrants. Why should we? We have the best country under the sun. We give 160 acres of No. 1 land to every man who will take up a homestead. We have the freest and best institutions of any country almost under the sun and a country with a climate and opportunities second to none. Why then should we go beyond these natural resources? After we have given a man 160 acres of land, after we have offered him all this country has to give, why should we pay $5 a head to a booking agent to send him here? Is there any good reason for our doing this especially when the United States is charging $4 per head on immigrants going into that country? The Americans charge $4 a head for permission to enter the United States, and we pay $5 per head to get people to come to Canada, making a difference of $9 between the two countries. And besides we have more to offer intending settlers than has the United States. Let me point out a danger which is menacing, and which I have not heard any one discussing. According to the American papers there are between 4,500,000 and 5,000,000 people in the towns and cities of the United States to-day without employment. Those people are in many instances within twenty-four hours of our border and can cross at any moment. That is a fact which should receive the serious attention of the government. We are too close to our neighbours in the south not to feel every breeze that blows on them. When financial conditions are bad there, they are bad here, when the labour market is not good there it is not good here. To-day there are in the United States between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000 people who are walking in the streets without anything to do. That is a serious problem. It is one which should cause us to pause in our policy of paying men to come to this country, who have no profession and in many instances are undesirable.

The hon. minister said that we had the right to deport undesirable immigrants within two years. If any municipality has undesirable citizens all it had to do was to deport them. But that must be done within two years of their arrival, and the minister throws the burden of doing it on the municipalities. The government brings them in at $5 per head and then unloads them on the municipalities and saddles on the municipalities the whole onus of the transaction. Why should the onus be thrown on the municipalities? If any deporting is to be done, it should be done by the government which brought in these undesirables and not saddle that expense on the municipalities. Let me point out the attitude of the government with regard to the Doukhobors, we have heard so much about. We had a long discussion the other day about the invasion of Ontario by these Doukhobors from the Northwest Territories. The Minister of the Interior then told us that these people could not be deported because they had been here eight years and were free citizens of Canada. Under that ruling of the Minister of the Interior, confirmed by the Minister of Justice, there is no man under the sun who could not come into this country and free himself from the risk of deportation. On landing he could go to some of the unsettled districts in the north, and we have lots of such districts in Ontario and Quebec and the other provinces. He could, as the Doukhobors did, settle outside the pale of civilization and remain there until the two years were up. That is what the Doukhobors did, and now we have them marching back into the heart of the country, and the Minister of Justice

said that those men have been given the freedom of the country and can come and go as they please the same as any other citizen in Canada. But we are told by the Minister of the Interior that we are all equally responsible for their coming. Well, I do not hold myself in the slightest degree responsible, and there are dozens of others in this House who can equally say that they cannot be held responsible. We were not in this House ten years ago when the immigration of these Doukhobors was started; and no man who has been elected to this House since that time can be charged with any responsibility in this matter. These people were brought out at heavy cost. It cost the country $7.50 per head to bring them here, and if we could get rid of them at $50 a head we would be doing a great stroke of business in the interests of this country. But the Minister of the Interior says that they have been here eight years and are consequently free to go or stay as they like. I refer to this in order to show that, under our deportation law, we have no control over these people. Undesirable people may come into this country and settle in the northern part of Ontario and after they have been there two years, they are free to settle in any of our towns or cities or in any other centre of population in this country they please. If they went immediately to any city in Ontario, they would no doubt be deported at once. But they do not. What they are advised to do is to go into some remote district and remain there two years. Then they have perfect freedom to come and go and violate by their eccentricities the decencies of life, and there is no means by which we can rid ourselves of them. This government boasts of the great things it has done. Well, this country has not yet fully realized what this government has done with regard to immigration. They have inflicted on us a burden that it will take the toil and the strain of one to two generations to remove.

The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. G. H. McIntyre), who spoke very feelingly and very properly with regard to immigration in the old days, touched a theme he might very well have enlarged upon. Look at the immigration that flowed into the provinces of Ontario and Quebec when this country was being settled. Go back a hundred years when this territory in the midst of which we assemble was one vast wilderness. There came into this province and the province adjoining it a little band of sturdy citizens driven out of Great Britain by the stern law of famine. No bonus was paid to these men to come here. They came here and hewed out their homes in what were then the wilds. They settled in the forest and for forty or fifty years they lived almost shut out from civilization and humanity, but all the time hewing out places for themselves and building strong and true the foundations of the citizenship that we have enjoyed for fifty years. We owe to these people a debt of gratitude we never can repay. But we can show that at least we feel the gratitude we would like to express by preserving unsullied and undimmed the citizenship they handed down to us when they passed to their reward. But are we doing that under the policy of this government? I think not. We have thrown all that to the winds; we have no regard for it to-day but we are going on simply looking to numbers, as the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has stated—it is simply a matter of numbers to be brought in regardless of whether their coming will or will not be a lasting good to the country.

With regard to that particular point I wish to draw attention to the fact that the older provinces of Canada have been, thus far, mainly responsible for the settlement of the west. That is a statement that, I believe, neither the Minister of the Interior nor any other hon. gentleman on that side will gainsay—that the large proportion of the settlement of the West has been effected from the provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Probably 50 per cent of the people in the West to-day are Canadian by birth. I have not the figures at hand, but I know that, at least, within recent times, that proportion would hold good. These people have been drawn from the older provinces very largely within the last ten years and so great has been the drain upon us, especially upon our farming community, that we have parted with almost every farmer's son that the older provinces could possibly spare—I fear far more than they should have spared—and to-day we have in the older provinces scarcely enough men to man our own farms. I am pointing this out to show that this element that has gone from the older provinces and that has become the backbone of the Northwest has been drawn upon to its limits—we can go no further; we have not the men to spare. The older provinces can no longer afford the population necessary to assimilate the incoming hordes of Europe. If that be the case, are we nevertheless to go on receiving a great immigration from Europe without mixing with it the representative Canadian citizenship to make these people good citizens? The colonization of any part of the West by a particular nation is bound to be a failure. It has always been a failure in every sense of the word. We must have only one citizenship in the Dominion of Canada, and that the citizenship of broad Canadianism; but this we can never have if we are going to keep together in one settlement the immigrants coming from any section of Europe, whether they be Doukhobors or any other. They will never get over the evils that they have brought in. The only way is to have population go in

that will spread out to all the provinces of Canada and that will become Canadian in the broad sense.

Now, I have said that this is not a matter simply of the growth of the country, nor of the labour of the country. But I would point out that organized labour, I believe, without any exception, is utterly opposed to the bonus system. The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville), who spoke the other day upon this question, the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) and the hon. member for Quebec County (Mr. Robitaille), representing as they do, large elements of labour, have all been against it. We know that almost every trade and labour council in Canada has passed resolutions opposing the proposition of this government to pay further bonuses. In considering this matter, we must not neglect the interests of labour for they are a factor of our population of which we should take the greatest care. They have been in this country many of them all their lives and others for many years. Is it right or just to bring in from the countries of Europe a lower class of citizenship to displace and supplant the men who, with their wives and families, are dependent upon getting work in the places in which they have lived so long? The common cause of humanity would declare this unjust and say that it should immediately cease. The Minister of the Interior seems to have the idea that he can force prosperity in this country by bringing in a vast influx of people. I take the opposite view. I say that if we have a stringency to-day or if our trade is at all depressed at this time, that stringency and that depression can be materially increased and the burdens of the people multiplied by bringing in more people, who, instead of being a help at this time will become an encumbrance and will add still further to our difficulties by their calls for charity. But this is what we have seen in Ontario. Yet the Minister of the Interior has the hardihood to rise in his place and tell us that there were ten men out of work in 1896 for one man out of work to-day. The hon. gentleman was entirely astray in his facts. There is no doubt that this bonus question is receiving, as it should, the very earnest attention of the citizens of the Dominion of Canada. And our hon. friends opposite seem to be disposed to continue this policy. If I were looking at this from a political point of view, I should not find fault with their taking that course, because the more they advocate this policy the worse will they stand in the opinion of the country. I could ask no better campaign literature than reprints of their arguments in support of this policy. I could ask no better campaign speech in favour of my election than to have the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) come down to Brantford and advocate the bonus system as carried on by this government. I would welcome the hon. gentleman as a worker in my interest. Nothing could be more detrimental to the interests of the government in the towns and cities of the Dominion than the continuation of this bonus on immigrants coming to this country. You may say: 'Why give away your tricks?' It is bad politics I admit. But the minister has charged me with keeping politics in view in everything I do. I admit that what I am doing is bad politics, but I feel compelled, in the interests of Canada, to declare that the government is pursuing a suicidal policy in regard to immigration. This system should have been stopped not this year merely but several years ago. There may have been a time when it was safe, when the immigration brought in was a negligible quantity as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has said. But that time has gone by. Our immigration has increased by leaps and bounds. And we need not fear that it will unduly decrease. This country is so well known, its resources have been so widely advertised, its capability of producing a living for additional millions of people is so widely appreciated, that it should not require a single dollar, either for advertising or for bonuses, to bring into Canada every man who can possibly be employed or planted upon the soil to advantage.

Take the history of the United States, our great neighbours to the south, and you will find the same facts I have pointed out with regard to Canada. Two or three hundred years ago that country was almost unknown. Look back to the days when the Pilgrim Fathers moored their barks on the wild New England shores, and laid broad and deep the foundations of the great citizenship of the United States. Look at the class of men that come out in those days and planted the flag, and started in to hew out a home in the wilderness where they could worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. That little band, under the providence of God, multiplied and increased until it was able to furnish a leaven that has made a nation to the south of us second to none, in intelligence and civilization, on the face of the earth. We have to some extent in the older provinces of Canada a like leaven that we seem disposed to part with very lightly. We cannot assimilate all the people that these gentlemen wish to bring in to the extent they have been bringing them in, without doing great injustice to Canada. I say it, and I feel it, Mr. Speaker, that we have to-day within the confines of this Dominion all the people of the classes that have been coming in lately, that can possibly be taken care of and given a good home, and become good citizens in the territory where they have chosen to settle. That applies, I think, to all the eastern sections of Canada. It is

true that our friends in the west are desirous of growing, they want to bring in the settlers, and they say that we want to put a clog on their growth. Not at all. As I have shown, we have already furnished nearly 50 per cent of the people in the west from the older provinces. Surely it cannot be said that we do not desire the success of our sons in the west. We desire their highest success, but we want to point out that there are other elements that must enter into the formation of a great nation than the mere element of numbers, so that we may say at the end of the year we have brought in 250,000, or 300,000, or 400,000 from Europe and the United States. That is not what we should consider. It is far better to bring in one man who does well, who is a credit to himself and to the country where he takes his abode, than to bring in ten who will become a burden, who will be ne'er-do-wells in the country where they settle. There can be no gainsaying that fact. The bonus system is responsible more than anything else in the immigration policy of this government for the undesirables we have in Canada to-day. It is opposed by the workingmen of Canada almost universally, and I think very rightly. They say : Why take our money to bring out men to this country to dispossess us of the work we have to-day and that we are entitled to ? The minister responds : We are only bringing them out to settle upon the land. I have shown in a previous speech that many of these so-called farm immigrants remain scarcely any time upon the lands, they go back within a month or two into the cities and towns, to the detriment of the men that are there, and thereby they become burdens to those cities and towns. The workingmen of our cities and towns in Ontario have discussed this question time and again during the past winter, and I tell you they have discussed it feelingly, because their bread and butter is at stake. Speaking as I do for a community largely made up of workingmen, I cannot protest too strongly against the bonus system as it is at present pursued by this government. I sincerely trust that the Minister of the Interior will in the very near future see the evil of his ways in this respect, that he will amend his course, and announce that an order in council has been passed recalling any bonus to anybody to come into Canada to settle in the great and good country we have to offer to all people from every land so long as they come prepared to contribute to our good citizenship.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Nanaimo). I always listen attentively to my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), and especially do I listen to him with interest when he speaks on the question of immigration. I remember the speeches that hon. gentleman made in this House just twelve months ago, I read the correspondence which he had with the Minister of the Interior in favour of immigration into his own city just two years ago, and it is now a tremendous surprise to listen to the extreme denunciations of that same policy by my hon. friend. I remember that the member for Hamilton just one year ago presented to this House a petition from the manufacturing interests of Hamilton, calling upon the Minister of the Interior to provide men for mechanical labour of every kind. I remember that just a year ago my hon. friend from St. John, N.B., complained in this House, and especially to the Minister of the Interior, that in all the processes of immigration to this country New Brunswick was being passed by, that no interest was taken in the lower provinces, that immigrants were all sent out west. When I remember that just two years ago the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat repeated all these complaints and requests, I am utterly surprised at his inconsistency to-day. I think it is worth while to read to the House the correspondence of that hon. gentleman with the minister. This is an important question, and no doubt he thinks it is of tremendous political importance in his constituency. He seems to have committed himself this afternoon to the task of working up this question of immigration in view of its political importance in the district he represents. Well, let us read the letter which the hon. gentleman sent to the Minister of the Interior on May 9, 1905, in favour of this class of immigration which he denounces to-day :

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of the inclosed correspondence from the proprietor of the Employment and Information Bureau of Brantford, in which he makes a special request to me to endeavour to forward to our city the various classes of help that are at present urgently needed in that city and district. Would you oblige me by kindly noting the matter and advising me at your earliest convenience as to what method, if any, we can pursue to attain the required ends.

What end? That of getting all classes of labour sent to Brantford.

The letter, I believe, contains fairly correct information, and Mr. Hall, the proprietor, furnishes several letters of reference as to his standing and ability to place the various classes of labour required.

Hoping to receive an answer from you at an early date, or if convenient to wait upon you in connection with the matter, I beg to remain.

Yours very truly,
W. F. COCKSHUTT,

My hon. friend who, one or two years ago, was advocating a stimulation of immigration to this country, forgot that it was utterly impossible to carry on a national policy of immigration for any length of time without such immigration receiving a momentum that it would be impossible to stop all at once. If my hon. friend's requests are being answered to-day by the

influx of the very people that he insisted upon getting two years ago, and one year ago, he ought now to remember that he has lent his influence to bringing about the very condition he complains of, and the very facts which he represents as existing.

Now here is the document; it is a long document and I do not desire to read it because it would take up too much of the time of the House. It impresses upon the Minister of the Interior the necessity of encouraging the immigration of these different classes, not of agriculturists, but of mechanics and artisans to the city of Brantford and yet the hon. member from that city, within two years of that very same period after lending his influence to the propagation of a national system for the encouragement of immigration of this class and which, after it receives a certain degree of momentum cannot very well be stopped at a moment's notice like a clock, refuses to-day, because there is a different industrial condition in Canada, to take his share of the responsibility for any condition that may or may not exist as a consequence of his own advocacy in this House. This was two years ago. But, my hon. friend spoke in this House one year ago—eleven months from the very period at which he made his speech and this is what he said:

> The farmers of Ontario, I believe, are in a very prosperous condition. They are suffering more perhaps, from lack of help upon the farm than from any other one cause. That I know is the main factor in our part of Ontario. I think it is the duty of the immigration department—

This was on November 30, 1906:

> —while they are bringing out the vast number of stalwart men from the old country that they do, to see to it that Old Ontario is not entirely passed by. They have taken from us our very best young men for the west. And with all our hearts we wish those young men well. Our sympathy is with them and our best wishes for their prosperity. I believe, that nearly fifty per cent of the settlers in the west come from the province of Ontario and Quebec. Having lost our young men, the farmers of Ontario have none to fall back upon except the immigrants. But the immigrants are going right through—

It was in this way that my hon. friend declaimed in this House a year ago. The burden of his speech was that by a system of bonuses certain classes of immigrants were brought to this country, that they were suffering in the industrial centres of eastern Canada for want of help, and he stated in this House that the immigrants were going right through and leaving the farmers without help.

> —and so the farmer is without help and has not been able to take advantage of the prices that are going so much as he would have done if he had been able to hire others to help him produce large quantities of goods.

I have a great deal of respect for my hon. friend in a personal way and in every other way, but I must declare to him that I do not know of any instance on record where any single man has manifested, on any single subject, such a degree of inconsistency as the hon. member for Brantford has on this question.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Did he find in the speech that he has just read any suggestion that artisans or labourers or any one else should be brought to the towns or cities? It was entirely to farm labourers that I referred.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Well, if it is any consolation for my hon. friend I will just need to go back one year and read that letter again. Will he stand up in this House and say that he did not, two years ago write this letter to the Minister of the Interior calling upon him to initiate a system of industrial immigration on behalf of the operators in Brantford?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. No, I deny that entirely. I never recommended any such course. I simply encouraged the hon. gentleman to give attention to the letter that I was inclosing to him from one of my constituents who had written me. I inclosed it to the minister, I called his attention to it and I might remark incidentally that the minister is retaining letters that do not belong to him, and that have not come back yet. As far as that is concerned I simply took the opportunity of inclosing this letter which was sent to me in the House here by one of my constituents. If the hon. gentleman says that I presented it in the House he is not correctly stating the fact. This letter has only come to light recently and it is only within a few days that anything damaging has been discovered in relation to it, if indeed there was anything damaging about it.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. My hon. friend takes the full responsibility of this letter:

> The letter, I believe, contains correct information.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. 'Fairly correct,' is it not?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. No, the hon. gentleman will excuse me:

> The letter, I believe, contains fairly correct information.

And further he says that he has sent letters of reference as to his standing and ability and of the necessity for these various classes of labour. The only point I want to make in regard to my hon. friend on this question is that having denounced the policy of the government with regard to bringing agricultural settlers to this country, he

ought to be willing to share the responsibility of his own acts as a member of this House. Previously to the hon. member for Brantford taking the floor I was beginning to think that something had seriously happened down in the good old province of Quebec for the resolution was enunciated by a prominent member from the province of Quebec, and it was supported, one after another, by members from that province. The cloud of dismal description, pessimistic complaint presented to the view of the House by these gentlemen led me to think that something had happened in Quebec. To listen to those speeches one would think that Almighty Providence had left them, that Satan and his emissaries had been brought in and that by a combination of all the forces of evil with anarchism the whole country was going to be ruined. I have every respect for the representatives from the province of Quebec and for the hon. member who moved the resolution in favour of every kind of restriction upon competitive labour coming into this country, and on that point I am prepared to discuss the question : but in order that the supporters of the resolution might maintain their position they had to ignore the law, regulations and history of the restrictions which have been imposed by the Immigration Department in Canada for years. The contention of these hon. gentlemen is that the policy of bonusing booking agents is the cause of every evil in connection with industrial depression in this country. The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Chisholm) gave extraordinary reasons and made extraordinary charges against the policy of paying a bonus to booking agents, and in the course of his speech he gave a number of results which he claimed had come from this policy. One was : He said that an ignorant Scotchman who had been transferred to some part of his constituency did not know the difference between a plough and a manure wagon. That was a very serious calamity, but no one will believe any such story. Then the hon. gentleman went on to say that another thing he had to complain of in connection with this policy was that the wives and daughters of the farmers in his district of Ontario were unable to go to the market in safety because there was such a number of automobiles on the highways. It was news to me that the Minister of the Interior was to be blamed for placing bonuses on the importation of automobiles; this was the first time I had the least suspicion that there was included in the immigration policy of this government the importation of automobiles to frighten the farmer's wives and daughters and to prevent them from getting to the market.

My hon. friend the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville)—for whom I have the greatest respect as I have for the institutions which he represents in this House—he attached the blame of any evils that might exist in connection with the immigration policy upon the paying of bonuses to ticket agents. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman in that, and while I say I have the highest respect for my hon. friend and the institutions he represents, I do not think that when his speech is placed in the hands of the organized labourers in this country—for whom I have no mandate to speak more than in a general way, because in this House I represent every class—and always the masses of this country—when his speech is placed in the hands of organized labour in this country I think the conclusion arrived at will be that the facts were not properly presented by him. The hon. gentleman made very serious general statements as to which he gave very little proof, and later on I shall take the trouble of examining into some of these statements for the purpose of presenting what I consider to be a correct idea as to the condition of immigration matters. My hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Armand Lavergne) drew a doleful picture ; he said that our grand national edifice was going to be torn up, that the constitution of this country was going to be uprooted, and all because he had seen a socialistic parade in the city of Montreal. Well, if he comes out west he will see lots of them. He drew a fearful picture of existing conditions because he had met a few men in Montreal who shouted loudly and who have a perfect right in a British country to parade the streets of a city if they wish to do so, and having seen this parade the hon. gentleman suggested seriously that the Minister of the Interior should lock the door of Canada and keep everybody out.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Will my hon. friend allow me?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. My hon. friend wants to be allowed very often. He does not like to be told what he said. Does the hon. member dispute the correctness of my statement?

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Yes. My hon. friend ought to remember that when I was speaking I answered without objection every question that was put to me. I want to say that these socialists in Montreal not only paraded the streets—a right which I concede to them, but which some of the aldermen sought to deny them—but they insulted priests and broke the windows of Laval university.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. We can find men in every community in every country in the world who do unreasonable things at times. But is that any reason why Englishmen who have contributed their share to the up-building of this country and who make no apology for coming to this country, should be debarred from entering here?

Let us remember that years ago they paid the taxes for the protection and security of the citizens of Canada and their action in this respect is appreciated to-day by all intelligent citizens of Canadian birth. If my hon. friend (Mr. Armand Lavergne) has courage enough to follow up the logic of this argument, then he would get a whip and whip every one of us out of the country who were not born here ; he woutld lock the door of Canada, he would keep within the three and a half million square miles of the richest territory in the world which we enjoy only two or three millions of people, and let me tell him that if that condition prevailed the country would run to seed in a very little while indeed. My hon. friend (Mr. Armand Lavergne) spoke about the religious sentiment of the people. In this British country we do not ask a man whether he is an atheist, a Methodist, a Catholic, or a Protestant. That is not the test of true citizenship in a British country. Every true Britisher believes and every true man believes that even though his fellow man be not a professing Christian, he may still be a moral man, and the last thing a British subject would do would be to make a religious profession a test of citizenship. A man may be an atheist, but his moral character may be equal to that of the man who is not an atheist, and in my opinion it is simply mocking the intelligence of this House to raise such an argument against the British people who are coming to our shores. What the government of Canada has to do is to bring here people who are industrious and enterprising, and to prevent the imposition on the country of scoundrels who may be a menace to our civilization and our liberty. But to argue that you can have a stupendous system of immigration and that you can provide some kind of national sieve small enough to clean out every man who does not come up to a certain theological standard and who is not associated with some Christian institution and who may not be up to the average standard of the industrial people of this country, is to argue for an impossibility. But in this country of ours, with all its territory and all its wealth, when we speak of taking men from the congested districts of the British isles and giving them an opportunity to breathe free air and to have a little more room than they ever had in their lives before, I want to say on the floor of this House, that to me it is a proud thing to be a citizen of a country that can offer such advantages to this class of people when they are placed on the vacant land of Canada. Now, the hon. the mover of the resolution blames every evil that may exist on this policy of paying bonuses. It seems to me that the whole question is whether the immigration policy of the government as well as the machinery for carrying it out is beneficial to the people of Canada as a whole. Let us see what has been for years the declared policy of the government on this matter. It has been asserted that it was the policy of the government to bring artisans and mechanics here to compete against that class in this country. They encourage only people for the lands. Four years ago I brought up in this House the question of certain persons in England using their influence in favour of bringing artisans to this country, and the then Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) published on the records of the House an advertisement printed in every newspaper in the British isles giving notice to all the people of the old country that the immigration policy of the Canadian government was to bring no one to this country who would not come to take up homesteads and settle on the land, and domestic servants. Surely the hon. member from Maisonneuve must know that every time this government became aware that there was the slightest suspicion of any misrepresentations being made in the British isles which would induce mechanics to come to this country it at once instituted proceedings to correct these misrepresentations ?

They have circulated literature ; they have instructed their agents ; they have advertised in English newspapers ; they have passed a law prohibiting misrepresentation; they have sent a representative to the British government to ask them to pass a law against misrepresentation similar to the law passed in Canada. Taking the immigration policy of the government as we have it on record, and taking their action as disclosed by the facts I have mentioned, I submit that there is every evidence that the government have done everything in their power to prevent the bringing into this country labour that would come into competition with the labour in the cities and towns of the country. I have evidence in my hand that some of the strongest regulations that have been adopted to protect the labourers of this country against unsuitable labour from the old country, have been suggested to this government by the very booking agents who receive the bonuses that the hon. gentleman thinks should be dispensed with. I have a periodical in my hand, written by Mr. Bruce Walker, in which he lays before the minister the serious dangers of philanthropic societies in England. He mentions the East End Emigration Fund. the Self Help Emigration Society, the Salvation Army, the Church Army, the Church Emigration Society, the Central Unemployed Body and the Central Emigration Board; and gives the numbers they have sent out to Canada. But the point I am making is this, that the very machinery which hon. gentlemen condemn as inducing unsuitable people to come to this country is demonstrated by this very pamphlet to be the machinery that is keeping the minister informed, and is offering

suggestions to him as a result of which regulations are adopted to prevent the very thing which these hon. gentlemen say is accomplished by this very machinery. On the 25th February, 1908, an order in council was passed which reads as follows:

The minister, therefore, recommends that an order in council be passed, prohibiting, from and after the fifteenth day of April, 1908, the landing in Canada, of any person whose passage has been paid, wholly or in part, by any charitable organization or out of public moneys, unless it is shown that the authority in writing of the assistant superintendent of emigration for Canada, in London, has been obtained for the emigration of such person, and that such authority has been acted upon within a period of sixty days.

That order in council was passed a little over a month ago, and no attention has been paid to it by the hon. gentlemen who are so sweepingly condemning this system.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Who made the recommendation?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Mr. Bruce Walker, one of the superintendents of immigration in England, the very instrument that my hon. friend said ought to be dispensed with. I have in my desk a large number of articles which have appeared since this order in council was passed in the most important and responsible newspapers in London, expressing the strongest possible complaint and condemnation of the department for the passage of such an order, because of the restriction it imposes upon English people who have the right to come to this country except for physical reasons. I cannot take up the time of the House to read them, but I mention the seriousness and importance of these articles and of letters written by responsible men who are at the head of different English societies, complaining of the tyranny of the Immigration Department of Canada. And at the very time these criticisms are being made upon the department, a resolution is presented by my hon. friend to this House complaining of the very reverse. I would like to remind the House again of the severe restrictions that have been imposed by the Immigration Department in the interest of proper immigration. On the 27th of March, 1908, an order in council was passed stipulating that immigrants must be in possession of a certain amount of money; and the whole policy of the government, if the hon. gentlemen would be honest in stating it, has been one continued disposition to restrict undesirable immigration to Canada.

Mr. MONK. Was the provision of the order in council extending the bonus to railway navvies in England and on the continent a restriction? That only dates a year or so back. Does my hon. friend approve of that?

Mr. R. SMITH.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. The extension of the bonus to railway navvies in England and on the continent was a matter that might reasonably come under the consideration of the Dominion government. I want to say to my hon. friend that the most difficult employment in this country to get any kind of intelligent workmen to go on to is the construction of railways on account of the small wages paid for that kind of work. My hon. friend has not been very far out of the province of Quebec, and I do not propose to allow him to set up his experience in these matters as against mine; and I want to tell him that in the Nanaimo district to-day, times are slack and miners are out of employment but it is not easy to get them to work on railway construction, they prefer to wait for a chance of work in the mines rather than work on railways. My hon. friend must admit that the standard of wages in the construction of railways is very low.

Mr. MONK. That is not what I asked my hon. friend. I asked him whether the extension of the bonus to railway navvies in England and on the continent was a restriction or not.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I am answering my hon. friend that if it was a restriction, it was made necessary by the circumstances of the case, and I am maintaining that considering the enormous extent of railway construction in this country to-day, it would be utterly impossible to get the masses of skilled labour which is necessary for the construction of these railways in this country. If that is so, that is the answer to my hon. friend. If the government extended the bonus to railway navvies, it was done not in the interest of the government, but in the interest of Canada. It was because they had good reason to believe that it was impossible to get this particular class of labour for this particular class of work in Canada. So far as I am concerned, when I have looked into the matter and have come to the conclusion that the thing is necessary, I am quite prepared to take the political responsibility of that position. All that I, like any enterprising member of this House, want is to build up this great country; and every industry in which large capital has been placed that is running below its capacity of production involves loss to the labourers of this country just as it is an injustice to have more than is needed. If every railway has just the number of men it wants and every mine has just the number of men it desires, and every other business enterprise has exactly the number of men it requires, and everything is being developed to its greatest maximum of output, that is a condition of things that is in the interest of every labouring man in this country as long as the supply does not become greater than the demand. When any hon. gentle-

man advocates the principle that it would be in the interests of the workingmen—the men who work in the mines and the railway concerns and on the canals and in the development of all enterprises—to keep the supply of labour below the demand, he is doing them an injustice. If any of our industries are not producing to their full capacity, you are raising the cost of living and the expense of the working people. It is in the interests of all citizens, and especially of the working classes, that every enterprise should be fully employed and producing its maximum of benefit.

Mr. MONK. The labour congress does not admit it.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. If they do not, they are foolishly advised because the principle is indisputable. It is one on which the hon. gentleman would operate his own mill or his own mine.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. That is the employer's point of view.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. No, it is in the interests of the workingman. If an industry has the equipment and the capital to provide labour for 100 men and if it is short ten per cent of the labour it requires, there is a ten per cent loss in the production of that industry and the labouring men have to pay for it. There is not a living man who will take the responsibility, in the presence of the labouring men, of controverting a proposition of that kind. No man of the intelligence and experience of my hon. friend would ever think of adopting any other principle with regard to his own business.

I want to deal for a moment with the argument that bonuses are paid on all immigrants. I got a telegram from a friend of mine in British Columbia last Saturday which I should like to read to the House. My hon. friend's speech had been sent to the newspapers of that province, and this telegram gives the impression which the newspaper despatches of his speech made on the minds of the community:

The despatch report of Mr. Monk's speech contends that bonuses are paid on the total immigrants to Canada.

Does my hon. friend take the responsibility of that proposition? That is the impression which was made on the public mind by what he said, namely, that this government were paying out of the public funds bonuses on the total immigration.

Mr. MONK. I never said that. I said what I believe, and what is generally believed, that bonuses are paid in many cases where they are not due.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I do not think there is a man who would not say that the impression I have mentioned is one which would reasonably be drawn from his speech. If his speech be analysed, there is every indication to show that it was his intention to create that impression. Let me take the opportunity of placing on the records of the House a few figures that will remove that false impression. My hon. friend in his speech—see page 6892 of 'Hansard'—gave a statement of the total immigration to Canada in ten years. Immediately following that statement he gave a statement of the bonuses paid on immigrants during the same decade. Any ordinary man reading the statement showing the total immigration to Canada and right beneath a statement showing the total bonuses, cannot fail to conclude that the bonuses were paid on the total immigration. Certainly I could come to no other conclusion. But what are the facts? Many people believe not only that the bonus is paid on every immigrant but that it is paid individually to the immigrant. I have had to correct a misapprehension of that kind hundreds of times. But certainly lots of people believe it, and they believe it because of the speeches made by men like my hon. friend, and of tabulated statements given in the way I have referred to. No reasonable man reading his speech could fail to conclude that the total immigration and the total bonuses covered the same number.

Mr. MONK. I do not see how that could happen because the immigration is given for every year and the amount of bonuses paid every year, and it is easily to see, by comparing the two, that the bonus is not paid on every immigrant. But what I believe is that the bonus is paid to people who go to the States and the people who go to jail.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. There are people in every country, even in countries where there are no systems of immigration, that go to jail, and there are lots of men in every country who ought to be in jail and are not.

Mr. MONK. Is my hon. friend alluding to the grafters? They never go to jail.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. We have in Canada, as other countries have, people who are not desirable; but if we are superlatively good ourselves we ought to be thankful to be given the opportunity of redeeming the character of other men and communities worse than ourselves. In 1904-5, the total immigration to Canada was 146,266. I have compiled these figures from the records so as to place them in 'Hansard' and dispose of the misapprehension which exists among so many people. The number on which bonus was paid was 28,833 or one-fifth of the total immigration that year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The answer given by the Minister of the Interior, as recorded in 'Hansard,' is 32,604.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. My hon. friend, if he follows closely, will see that he is mistaken.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am referring to the answer given by the Minister of the Interior to be found in the revised 'Hansard' of the 19th March. I am not saying that the hon. gentleman is incorrect. I am merely pointing out that he is not in accord with the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. When I took these figures from the record, I compared them with figures given by the minister the other day, and I find that the statistics are the same.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The figures he gave were 32,684.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. In 1905-6 the total immigration was 189,064 and the total number on which bonus was paid was 33,608 or about one-sixth. In 1906-7, the total immigration was 124,667, and the bonus was paid on 14,094, or on one is nine of the immigration coming to Canada. In 1907-8, the total immigration to Canada was 235,328 and the bonus was paid on 20,492, or one in twelve. So, if we take the average, it seems to me we shall find it would range from fifteen per cent to twenty-five per cent of the total immigration coming into the country.

Mr. MONK. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ralph Smith) is proving that we get immigration without the bonus.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I am correcting the misapprehension cultivated by hon. gentlemen opposite that the bonus applies to the total immigration to this country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk— then made a reference to the United States, declaring that no immigration bonus was given in that country. I am not sure that there ever was a bonus system in the United States—certainly there has not been for many years. But I do not think that fact helps the hon. gentleman at all. There are over a million immigrants coming into the United States every year. But whence do they come? Largely from southern Europe. Whence come the immigrants to Canada under our system of bonuses to agents and careful regulation? They come largely from the British Isles and northern Europe. It is true that the State of Virginia has a system of bonus assistance to immigration from Belgium, designed to bring in a special agricultural class from that country. But, generally speaking, there is no bonus in the United States, and the hon. gentleman asks if we cannot have the same system in Canada. I declare with all earnestness my opinion that, if the government were to withdraw the whole of the machinery used in carrying on its immigration policy, the labour coming into this country would soon become very largely of the very class of which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) complains as combined employer's associations and transportation companies would become the agencies. If we did as the hon. gentleman proposes to do—called back your agents from England, broke off relations with your booking agents, destroyed your immigration department, but merely kept on the Atlantic coast officers to enforce a reasonable protection so that the worst classes could not enter, we should receive a much greater proportion of the very nationalities of people of whom the hon. gentleman complains, but who would have the right to come into this country. But these very classes are kept out by the supervision which our present system affords.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ralph Smith) point out the words in the resolution which declare that the government agents should be withdrawn?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I say that if the resolution were carried out to its logical result——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Where are the words that point to that?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) advocates doing away with the bonus. Can the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) tell me the difference between giving a bonus to a booking agent and having a special agent in the same place who would be paid out of the public treasury for using exactly the same influence in bringing immigrants to Canada?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is just this difference, that the resolution attacks one and does not attack the other.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. But the reputation of a successful immigration agent in any country depends upon exactly the same foundation as does that of the booking agent —it depends upon the successful service he renders in sending a good class of people to this country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How does it happen that 215,000 came without a bonus, and only 20,000 with the bonus?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) is discussing a result which was due to the very energy I am speaking of exercised years before. These agents have been lecturing for years; they have been distributing literature for years; they have been advertising for years. All these agencies, paid for by the government, have been exercising their influence, and immigrants come to us as a result, not to compete with Canadian labor but to develop the lands of Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was it these influences of the bonuses that brought the 215,000 ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. My opinion is that the bonus is not the great influence that hon. gentlemen opposite think it is—and I think I know something about some of the men engaged in this work. Take, for instance, the evidence of Mr. Jury himself before the select committee of this House : Did not he declare under oath that every opportunity was taken advantage of by the paid immigration agents in England to instruct all engaged in the work as to the classes of people wanted in this country ? I do not think the booking agents in England simply go out and gather up the scum of the population for the sake of getting so many dollars out of the enterprise.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I am expressing an opinion, in opposition to the opinion held by hon. gentlemen opposite. It might be possible for the government to exercise the greatest discretion in selecting suitable men to do this work. But what I believe is that the government is doing its utmost to get the right class of men to operate these agencies, and I believe these men are a good deal more honest in their work than hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken on this question would have us believe.

I was speaking about the statement made concerning the United States. I have a few figures here which will not take a minute to read and which I would like to put on 'Hansard.' I take it that the following countries offer good material for immigration to Canada : Great Britain and Ireland, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Denmark, France, the German Empire, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Australia and New Zealand. Now, I have collected the reports of immigration into the United States. I find that in the fiscal year 1905-1906, the total immigration into the United States was 1,100,735 people. Of these only 38 per cent came from the countries I have mentioned, the countries from which we most desire immigrants. From Italy came 25 per cent of the whole, and from Russia, including Finland, 20 per cent. That is, from the countries that we seek to protect ourselves against, the United States received 45 per cent of its total immigration for the year referred to. This immigration, of course, was without bonus and without the supervision and regulation that that system allows.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Is it not a fact that the proportion coming from these countries to Canada is greater than that going to the United States according to population ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I will state the figures which are a complete answer to the hon. gentleman. I do not believe his statement for a moment. I was making a comparison in view of his statement, and now I will complete it. During the same year that Canada received 189,064 from these favoured countries, the United States took 30 per cent and Canada took 56 per cent. From Italy, from which undesirable immigrants come, we took 4 per cent, and from Russia and Finland, from which undesirable immigrants come, we took 2 per cent. From these three countries we took less than 9 per cent of their total immigration. From the United States, Canada received 30 per cent of the entire immigration for that same year, while the United States received from Canada and Newfoundland less than one-half of one per cent of our entire emigration. In other words, the United States received from Canada and Newfoundland in that year 5,063 souls, while in the same period Canada received from the United States, 57,919.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in understanding the hon. member to say that the United States got from Canada only 5,000 last year?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I have said more than once that in 1895 and 1896 the United States got from Canada and Newfoundland, 5,063.

Mr. SPROULE. What of 1907?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I have not got the figures for 1907.

Mr. SPROULE. They got 19,000.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Well, the hon. gentleman can say so at the proper time. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to deal with some statements of my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville), statements which are very general and very misleading. My hon. friend stated :

> But the bonuses have been diverted to other classes (other than farming).

Now if my hon. friend is content to make a statement of that kind in the face of the regulations, in the face of the orders in council, in the face of the advertisements from those countries, in the face of instructions to agents, of course he will have to take the responsibility for it. But I do not think he can prove in a single case that bonuses have been diverted to other than agricultural classes. I have been unable to find a single case, and I have made inquiry at the Immigration Department, and this is what the department told me, that whenever the labour men of this country could discover a case of a bonus having been paid for a man that had not settled on the land according to his agreement, the department would take the responsibility and expense of deporting that man back to

the country from which he came. In not a single case has that been done.

I have before me several other extracts from the hon. gentleman's speech, but I have not time to refer to them, because I have to conclude at six o'clock. But I will take the liberty of handing them to the reporter, along with my criticisms thereto.

But the bonuses have been diverted to other classes (other than farming).

Bonuses are payable only on female domestic servants and on those coming to Canada to farm, to take up homesteads or engage in railway construction work, who in the old country have had at least one year's experience in one of the prescribed occupations.

During a previous discussion it was shown that misrepresentations have been made for the purpose of securing the bonuses on immigrants.

As the immigrants have no inducement in misrepresenting their past or intended occupations it is reasonable to suppose that they tell the truth, and the statements of the booking agents carry no weight whatever in the adjudication of their claims, as the only statements taken into consideration are those made by the immigrant, at the time of landing, to the port agent and his staff.

The bonus system has opened the door and permitted the Canadian Manufacturers' Association to flood the labour market.

The Canadian Manufacturers' Association has never made any effort to secure for Canada the classes on whom a bonus is paid by the government; no bonus is paid on the persons brought by them, and so anxious is the department to discourage a propaganda for skilled labour that the booking agent who acts or acted as their representative on the British Isles is not even allowed a bonus on the farmers, railway construction men, of female domestics sent by him to the Dominion.

It (the bonus system) has also enabled land speculators to realize large profits.

It seems peculiar that huge profits can be made out of immigrants who according to the speaker in his previous sentence 'were sufferers and beggars.'

It (the bonus system) has even induced charitable institutions, church societies and the Salvation Army, to step in and organize on a solid basis all for one sole aim and object, the making of money no matter how.

With the exception of the Salvation Army, the societies mentioned are practically supported by private contributions, and it is safe to say expend $100 on immigrants for every $1 they receive in the shape of bonuses. With the object of making this clear the following table shows for the calendar year 1907, the number of persons whose passage was paid wholly or in part, and the amount received in bonuses during the same period from the Dominion government.

Society.	Number of Immigrants assisted.	Amount paid in Bonus.
		£ s.
Church Army,.....	1,595	99 ..
Self Help	506	109 ..
East End.....	6,096	325 ..
Church Emigration	663	47 ..
Central Unemployed.....	2,842	336 10
Central Emigration	228	15 10
	11,930	932 ..

It will be seen that bonus is paid approximately on only one in twelve of those brought out by the above societies.

It would seem that the time has arrived when the flow of population to Canada is so numerous, and Canada is so well known, that bonuses are no longer necessary.

The object of paying bonuses is to secure the co-operation of the booking agents in presenting Canada's claim as a desirable field for suitable immigrants. The booking agents besides presenting Canada's advantages in interviews with intending emigrants, advertise widely in the press, distribute immense quantities of literature, make capital displays of Canadian produce and keep posters concerning Canada constantly in the public eye. This advertising would largely cease if bonuses were withdrawn, and every one with any experience in advertising knows that spasmodic efforts in the case of printer's ink is not the method to attract attention.

We may have to pay as much as we have paid in bonuses to return certain classes to the countries from which they came.

The law provides that all undesirable immigrants may within two years of their arrival in Canada be returned to the country from whence they came at the expense of the transportation companies bringing them into the Dominion.

I acknowledge that the government have done this (discouraged emigration of mechanics) but other powerful bodies have taken upon themselves to do the unjustified work that some of the government agents were doing some time ago.

The inference that until recently government agents have been promoting the emigration to Canada of skilled labourers and mechanics is unjustifiable. In 1904 the following notice was inserted in the leading papers of the British Isles :

Ottawa, June 18, 1904.

The government of the Dominion of Canada having been informed that certain persons conducting labour agencies in London, Liverpool, Glasgow and elsewhere in the United Kingdom with the object of promoting the emigration to Canada of mechanics, and other skilled workmen, have been giving false information respecting labour conditions in Canada, representing themselves as agents of, or as having the sanction and endorsement of the Dominion government:—

Notice is hereby given that the Dominion Government has no such agents in the United Kingdom, and has not authorized, sanctioned, or in any way given its approval to any agency in the United Kingdom for promoting the emigration to Canada of mechanics or other skilled labour.

(Sgd.) JAMES A. SMART,
Deputy Minister of the Interior of Canada.

In addition to this advertisement, government agents, the home government and steamship lines were asked to use their influence to stamp out such organizations. Last winter one booking agency in the British Isles persisted in advertising for large numbers of railway labourers when there was no demand, refused to discontinue such advertising, was removed from the bonus-earning list, and finally on the representations of Canadian government officials had their booking agency license cancelled and was thus forced out of business. It will thus be seen that every effort is made by the Canadian government to see not only that no misrepresentation is resorted to, but that only the classes desired are advised to come to the Dominion

Instead of paying bonuses, I think the government would do better if it must have agents to send over to England, men who have settled in the west.

For a number of years the government has been sending farm delegates to the British Isles and these delegates lecture at meetings arranged for by the booking agents, and while stationed in a certain locality remain in the booking agent's office and give reliable advice encouraging desirable settlers and doing all in their power to dissuade people considered unsuitable from going to the Dominion.

We believe also that there is no harm in spreading reliable literature, but we think the people should be left to follow their own will as to whether they come or not.

This is exactly the policy pursued by the government, and even the harshest critic can hardly contend that persons are forced to Canada against their own wishes.

Lord Strathcona's interview.

This is a fair sample of interviews given by government officials to the press, and any departure by such officials from the well recognized policy of the government would mean a change in the staff.

223½

Canada in a nutshell.

In this government publication there is no inducement held out to mechanics or skilled labourers to come to Canada, and the policy of the government is fully explained on page 11 of that pamphlet, the paragraph closing with these words: 'The Immigration Department does not encourage them.'

I would look upon every man who left for Canada in the light of the $5 that would go into my pocket.

This statement is misleading, as it implies that a bonus is paid on all immigrants, which of course is not true.

That shows that while the coal mines in Nova Scotia were far from wanting men, representations of this kind were made in order to obtain the bonus.

No bonus is paid on miners, consequently this statement is incorrect. No bonus is paid to any organization employing the word 'Canadian' or 'Canada' in its title, consequently this charge falls to the grounds.

Now, I want to deal with one fundamental principle. Is it a good thing for the great masses of the people in this country that we should have an immigration policy of bringing in men to settle our vacant lands? The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Chisholm) said that the lands were going to be all taken up, and that in a few years hence his son would not be able to get any land. I want to say that the lands of this country cannot be settled too quickly by bona fide settlers. Being one of the members from British Columbia, I have collected statistics showing the prosperity of that province, and I want to say to this House that the prosperity of British Columbia dates from the inauguration of the immigration policy adopted by this government of settling the land. I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is no country in the world, possessing as it does millions of acres of uncultivated land, that affords to settlers so great an opportunity of enriching themselves as does Canada. Yes, Sir, bring men on to the land. I have been brought up in England and I know something about the land grievances in that country. I have felt some of the hardships of twelve, fifteen or twenty landlords dividing up amongst themselves the lands of a great region and holding them in perpetuity. I can understand the grievance of the Irish peasants who have been deprived of proprietary rights in their native land. We have suffered in England in consequence of a similar policy. In bringing in and placing a settler upon the land you are bringing in a man who realizes that every time he puts a spade into the soil he is increasing his own wealth as well as the wealth of the country, and you are getting out of him the maximum of interest and labour that you will not get by any other process.

I want to say to this government: Settle all the vacant lands in this country, divide them up just as quickly as you can among bona fide settlers. Get the people on to the land and arrange as quickly as possible to alienate the public lands from railway companies and sell it reasonably to settlers. That is a foolish and false theory that is set up by my hon. friend from Maisonneuve, that it is possible to cultivate the lands to the injury of the industrial labour of this country. Why, Sir, it is the settled land that affords a market for the results of the productive labour of other industries. Keep the people from the land, keep the people out of the country, keep the lands barren, keep them tied up and you will have no need for factories. Does my hon. friend who is responsible to the associations of labour men place this consideration before them? Every argricultural settler brought into this country and placed on the land is creating a market for the man who works in the mine and in the mill.

Mr. VERVILLE. Who is going to absorb all the surplus labour in a slack time in the cities throughout the country?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Get the people on the land and provide a market and you are pursuing the best policy in the interest of industrial labour, but keep the people off the land and there is no need for factories. The barren lands of British Columbia, the immense stony hills of that country, that were not considered to be worth anything, are being made most fertile in fruit producing properties. Why? Because there is a market in the Northwest. The rich timber areas of British Columbia have been developed to an enormous extent. Why? Because they have found a market in the agricultural districts of the Northwest. Fish and coal production has developed enormously within the last two years. Where do they find a market? They find a market in the Northwest. I want to say to this House that when this country becomes settled with enterprising pioneers beneficial results will accrue to the industrial classes. It is not an easy thing to get people on the land. It is not an easy thing to collect men who are prepared to go to the backwoods and take up land. Hon. gentlemen opposite act upon the assumption that it is perfectly easy to get people to settle on the land. The member for Brantford says: Do you not give them 160 acres each? My hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne) complains that Quebec is not receiving justice. Why do the people of Quebec or of Ontario or of Nova Scotia or of British Columbia not go upon the land?

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Why is it that the government prevents a man from going west from Quebec and helps an immigrant coming from the old country?

Mr. R. SMITH.

Mr. OLIVER. How does the government prevent any man from going from Quebec?

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. The government prevents a man from——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. No, Mr. Speaker, I want to answer the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. My hon. friend from Montmagny asked a question and I am going to answer it.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. The hon. minister has asked me a question—

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman rises to a question of privilege he has the right to do so.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. The minister has put a question to me and I think I should have the privilege of answering it.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Perhaps the House will give me three or four minutes as I am obliged to go to a meeting this evening. I want to say to my hon. friend that there is no citizen of Canada who has not an equal opportunity with every immigrant to take up land in the Northwest.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I deny that.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Well, my hon. friend is afraid to allow me to give him his answer. I do not make statements without being prepared to vindicate them.

Mr. TAYLOR. Six o'clock.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. My hon. friend asks: How is it that immigrants from the British isles can go to the Northwest at a less rate than people from Quebec? The government have nothing to do with that; they do not determine the rate.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. What about the railway commission?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Has my hon. friend submitted that grievance to the railway commission?

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Is it not the duty of the Minister of the Interior to submit it to the railway commission?

Mr. TAYLOR. Six o'clock.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I cannot conclude before six o'clock, and I must thank the House for their consideration. Will hon. members give me one minute? I want to say a word to the House and to the government. What the people of this country want is a bold and courageous government which will get settlers unto the lands. There may be weaknesses and mistakes in some cases, because the government is made up of human beings, just like other poor creatures, there are no such things as cabi-

nets of angels in this country any more than in any other, but I want to say that the people are looking to the Laurier government to promote, even more extensively than they are doing to-day, the development of this great country by the extension of the principle that they have adopted in applying strict regulations to immigration on this side of the line and in granting financial and other assistance that discretion and supervision may be exercised on the other side of the line in favour of bona fide settlers to the end that these people may be placed upon the land, that more markets and greater opportunities may be opened up and that the country may be further developed as a consequence of this policy. I want to assure my right hon. friend that in spite of everything that has been said the great mass of the people will support this policy and forgive a whole lot of the small trifles that hon. gentlemen put before the country and waste time in discussing in this House. These are small matters that never reach the corridors of this House, but the great development of this magnificent country and the placing of settlers with a Crown title on the public lands, to hold them for ever for the benefit of themselves and their families, to live under our institutions and to be the subjects of a free British government, is the natural result of the policy which this government have adopted and I want to say that is the policy that will be supported by the people. The government wants to go ahead. Do not take any notice of these whinings and complainings. This whole debate has been one funeral dirge as if the country were going to the devil. We are getting into a terrible condition when some man in Liverpool is getting $10 for sending a man to this country which will enrich it to the extent of hundreds of dollars, or when some other individuals in some other countries are getting a few dollars for sending people here who will enrich Canada to the extent of thousands of dollars. The people understand this policy and they will support it. There is nothing in the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite. If the government exercise close supervision and make a selection of suitable immigrants their coming will be a great benefit to this country as land settlers.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). The hon. gentleman from Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith), enunciated the view, so far as I could hear his closing remarks, that many of the attacks made on the government by the Conservative opposition would not penetrate beyond the corridors of this House. If the volume of his voice was the measure of how far the hon. gentleman's speech would carry, his utterances would certainly get beyond the precincts of this building, but I venture to think that when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ralph Smith) has time to reflect he will be glad if some of his statements in the latter part of his speech should remain in oblivion to those whom he mainly represents in this House. The hon. gentleman made a new departure this afternoon and although he had volume of voice he had not the volume of independence we would expect from him. The hon. gentleman has seen fit for reasons best known to himself to turn his back upon the labour party which he was supposed to champion, and to stand on both feet for the government party in support of their immigration policy. I do not propose to follow my hon. friend in his dealings with the labour party, because no doubt they will themselves determine how far they are satisfied with him. However, if you give certain people rope enough they will hang themselves, and that seems to be the misfortune of the hon. gentleman. He asked for more time to finish his speech, and then with the assistance of the Minister of the Interior he endeavoured to crowd down the statement of the member for Montmagny that in the matter of transportation, there was discrimination between immigrants coming to this country, and our own good citizens. A moment's reflection will show that there is a distinct discrimination against the people of Canada in the matter of transportation. If the sons of the province of Quebec for example, wish to go to the west they are not carried by the transportation companies upon the same terms as the poorest and most wretched foreigners who come to our shores.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. Does the hon. gentleman think that the policy of the government should be to transplant the people of this country from one portion of it to another ?

Mr. LENNOX. When hon. gentlemen on the other side interrupt me to ask a question that has no relevancy to the point I am discussing I do not propose to answer. The question of the hon. gentleman has absolutely no relation to the matter with which I am dealing. The hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) thought fit to deliver a vicious attack upon the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockshutt) had the privilege of replying I would not refer to it for I know he could dispose of the hon. member for Nanaimo in good style. He attacked the member for Brantford because, he said, he has changed his views on this question since May of 1905. But what ground is there for condemnation. The hon. member (Mr. Ralph Smith) alleges that

at that time the hon. member for Brantford advocated the importation of skilled labour into Brantford and other cities of the Dominion. I do not admit that such a position was ever taken by the hon. member for Brantford.

Mr. JOHNSTON. It was.

Mr. LENNOX. I prefer to take the documents rather than the statement of my hon. friend from Cape Breton with respect to that. And the written evidence shows that what the member for Brantford did was to forward to the proper department a letter from one of his constituents.

Mr. JOHNSTON. And what did he ask ?

Mr. LENNOX. Never mind for the present ; you are very fond of breaking in.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I thought you would not answer.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. member for Nanaimo has condemned the hon. member for Brantford because he alleges that in May, 1905, that hon. gentleman advocated the immigration into this country of skilled labour, and that now he has changed his attitude in regard to that. Would the hon. member for Nanaimo dare to take the position to-day that he advocates the introduction of skilled labour into Canada ? He did take a pretty distinct departure from the position of an advocate of the labour party ; but he would not dare to take the position that he advocates the indiscriminate immigration into this country of skilled labour and artisans ; and yet, with his inconsistency, he attempts to condemn the hon. member for Brantford.

Again, he condemns the hon. member for Brantford because he says that a year ago that hon. member advocated immigration into this country, whereas to-day he says he condemns immigration into this country. The hon. member for Nanaimo has not properly sized up the situation. I venture to say that neither he nor any other member of this House can find, in all the speeches made by hon. members on this side, during either this or preceding debates on immigration, one utterance condemning immigration to this country. It is not immigration that we condemn, but it is the system which he government pursues of bonusing booking agents to send to this country a class of immigrants that we do not want.

The hon. member for Nanaimo waxed eloquent over the position he takes on the question of religion in connection with the class of immigrants he desires to see brought into this country. Now, I do not for a moment say that we are to make nice distinctions in this regard as to the class of people who come to this country; but when I find the hon. gentleman stating that he does not care whether an immigrant is an atheist or a Christian, that the moral or religious attitude of the immigrant is an entirely immaterial question to him, I venture to say that the good sense of the people of this country will not join with the hon. member in that position. Speaking for myself, while I draw no narrow lines in this regard, holding that a man can exercise his conscience in the way he sees fit, I do feel that it is important that we shall bring into this country a class who shall be God-fearing people, and that it shall not go forth that an atheist is an acceptable citizen of this country. What is atheism? It is the absolute repudiation of the existence of God ; and do you want it to go forth that the representatives of the people in this parliament have got to the position that they care not at all whether the class of immigrants who come into this country are or are not such as the hon. gentleman said he was quite willing to have come into the country—atheists and men of that class ? I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not here, but I strongly commend to the perusal of the labour party in this country the utterances of that hon. gentleman this afternoon. I think it will be a surprise to them to find that he has so utterly and completely abandoned them and gone over, as I could have predicted long ago he would, holus bolus to the present administration.

Now, I have never spoken upon the question of immigration, although I have thought very seriously upon it ever since I came into this House. I have been somewhat puzzled as to the best policy to pursue having regard to a certain class of the inhabitants of this country. I have always felt that the people whose interests should be most anxiously considered are the people who form the backbone of this country, the farmers; and from a careful watching of this debate, I think I can say without any fear of contradiction that not one note has been sounded from the government side in favour of the agriculturists of this country. I believe that whilst we should endeavour to advance the interests of all classes, the interests of the bulk of the community, of those who contribute most to the country's progress and prosperity are most to be considered. The farmers are the largest class in the country, and if I were convinced that a payment of money, by bonuses or otherwise, for the purpose of promoting immigration would be in their interest in the sense of giving them the labour they require on their farms, I would not be prepared to condemn it in any way. But I am convinced, from a careful observance of the policy of the government, that we shall never get in this country a class that are required to labour on the farms of Ontario and the other older provinces, or for assistance to the farmers who are settled in the west, by the system we are pursuing at the present time. Now,

as to the relative position of the farmers and another great class in this country, the manufacturers, we have in Canada farmers, owners and tenants, to the number of 544,688. Computing in the ordinary way the residents on the farm, the people who are dependent directly on agriculture for their existence, will number 2,723,440, or more than 50 per cent of the entire population of Canada. From the census returns of 1901, I find that the farmers have invested in their farms and implements and various means of carrying on their industry $1,787,102,620. and that they pay for hired help $24,173,968 annually. On the other hand, the investments of the manufacturers amount to $446,916,487. Of this their working capital, which can hardly be called a permanent investment, amounts to $237,537,849, leaving only a little over $200,000,000 as an actual permanent investment by the manufacturers of the country. The farmers therefore have at stake as a permanent investment in this country, in order to advance its prosperity, four times as much as all the manufacturers of the country. Then, take the products. The farmers of Canada in 1901—and there has been a vast increase since then—produced $363,126,384, whereas the manufacturers, if we take the sales, produced $481,053,375. But the amount of raw material which went into the manufactured products and a large portion of which was produced on the farm was $266.527,858. Therefore the actual product of the manufacturers was $215,525,517, as compared with the figures I have given with reference to the farm. In other words, the products of the farm exceed the products of the factories some 70 per cent. What I say is this. We must not neglect the interests of any class, but all the same we should keep steadily in view the fact that Canada is preeminently a great farming country. The farming interests should therefore be the first consideration of any competent and wise government because that which is the greatest producer must tend in the greatest degree to the prosperity of the country.

I know that the policy of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) is a western policy and a western policy alone. I do not object to a western policy within proper limits. It is a policy to people the farm lands of the west. But we want something more than that. Our first object should be to secure farm help. Labour is wanted on the farms of Canada, and if we do not see to it, the finest land in any part of the world to-day—I refer particularly to the older portions of Canada—will be left uncultivated for the lack of an adequate labour supply. Therefore the first consideration of the government should be, not so much to get farmers to take up farms in the west, as to get in farm help. Get in people who will work on the farm, let these people acquire in that way a knowledge of the country, and after they have done so let them take up farms of their own and they will be successful to a degree they would not be, under other conditions. I have said that the policy of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) is a policy of occupying the farms of the west and a policy of that kind alone. Let me refer to his statement in the debate on the 15th of January last on this same question. Dealing with a letter written by Mr. Scott to the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) the Minister of the Interior said :

> He (Mr. Cockshutt) received his answer and it states the policy of the department, which then and before and since has been to secure settlement of the western lands.

And he follows that up on the next page by saying :

> I know it is, but it is my hon. friend and not I who is finding fault. He was at that time with the policy of the government so far as the need of immigrants was concerned, but his policy differed from the policy of the government in that he wanted to empty the overcrowded tenements of Europe into the city of Brantford and other cities of Ontario, when the policy of the Dominion government, as stated to him in black and white over the signature of an officer of the department, was to settle the Northwest, to cultivate the prairies, to fill up that western country in order that there might be employment and business for the commercial and financial interests of eastern Canada.

So that the policy of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) is a policy of filling up the farm lands of the west and that alone. We must no doubt fill the farms of the west, but if you bring into this country a hardy agricultural class who will assist our farmers before taking up lands of their own, who will graduate from farms tilled by men who understand the conditions of the country, you will develop this country in the most effective way and you will ensure that those who take up lands will not afterwards abandon them into the hands of speculators and grafters. This government have made no attempt of that kind to assist our farmers, particularly those of the older provinces and enable them to obtain the necessary help from the old country. Will the policy of the minister bring about an improvement in that respect ? I venture to say that when we pay a bonus to a booking agent, his chief effort will be to secure quantity rather than quality and thus increase his commission, and the same may be said of the transportation companies. All these are concerned in procuring the greatest possible number, regardless of quality, and in this way making the greater profit. Their interests are in that sense antagonistic to those of the people of Canada, and while that system continues we shall never acquire that class of immigrants which will be a benefit to our own

farmers. What is the remedy ? I am not called upon to devise a remedy, although it will be but a little time before we on this side will have to propound a remedy. When that time comes I shall be prepared to give my advice in the interests of Canada, but in the meantime it seems to me that we ought to adopt the methods which any business man would use in securing assistance in his business. We might very well establish an Immigration Bureau which would keep a record of the labour required. Our farmers, manufacturers, merchants, miners, railway companies and other interests could then readily communicate with the government through this immigration bureau and inform them of their wants. They could define, not only the number of assistants, they required but also the terms of employment. A farmer for instance would state how many months he would undertake to employ one or more farm hands. When all that information is obtained, then work, not from this end, but from the other end. Employ reliable agents in Britain to come in direct communication with the class of men required and let these agents guarantee that the men they send out are the kind we want. Knowing how many farm labourers are wanted, they will try to obtain them. The responsible agents of the government will take pains to ascertain that the proposed immigrants are actually and bona fide farm hands or as the case may be. They will make arrangements with these people, having in mind the condition that exists on this side of the ocean and the actual farmers who want these men. Then they will enter into arrangement for these men to come here, and the farmers here will be advised that the men have come and will be asked to meet the men, make their contracts, and take the men to their homes. If you do this, you will be bringing in a class that will add permanently to the welfare of our country and will assist in supplying our producers with the men they require.

Now, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) seems to think that 160 acres of free land is not a sufficient inducement to the people of Europe and elsewhere to come in and occupy our territory. The hon. minister objected to comparing the conditions of Canada to-day, with its six millions of population, with the conditions of the United States with 80,000,000. He said : I ask you to go back one hundred and twenty-five years in the history of the United States. But let him take us back any number of years he likes, he will not find the United States ever made an offer such as we are making, or gave a bonus such as we are giving to bring immigrants into their country. And I ventenure to say that neither the United States nor any other country has offered the same inducements to hardy, sturdy, self-reliant immigrant that the Dominion of Canada is offering to-day in the lands of the west. We do not need to give prize-packages in order to get rid of these lands. Our west is the greatest and last west available for the teeming millions of Europe. And if you adopt the policy of endeavouring to restrict immigration to the end that none but the fittest should come in, that none but those who measure up to the level of our own citizenship should be allowed to enter, you will have these lands occupied as readily as by depreciating their value and crying them down—which you are doing at the present time by saying in effect: Here is a prize, an inducement for you to come in and settle these lands.

Now, what kind of immigrants are we getting by our efforts? I wish to refer you to some records upon that matter. I do not think that the hardiest and most reckless of the supporters of the government will dare to say that the class of immigrant that we are getting into this country make a better average than those they are getting into the United States. I do not think there is any of these hon. gentlemen quite hardy enough or indifferent enough to the facts to assert that, taken as a class, our immigrants compare favourably with those that go into the United States. Therefore, for a moment, I will direct attention to the class of immigrants that are going into the United States, even with all the precautions taken in that country, with all their rigid examinations and in spite of the tax of $4 per head that the immigrants must pay before they can enter that country. Before I go into that, let me say that the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Uriah Wilson)—a county with a very good name—wrote to the United States to ascertain whether that country ever paid a bonus to encourage immigration in the reckless and dangerous fashion in which we are endeavouring to encourage it. And he received the following letter from the acting Commissioner of Immigration for the United States :

> I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 8th instant, which has been referred to the bureau for attention. So far as I am informed, the United States never solicited immigrants, although no restrictive measures were enacted until 1875, prior to which time foreigners came to the United States of their pleasure.

So they have had restrictions upon immigration ever since 1875. Beginning with a charge of $2 per head, they now charge $4 per head for admitting immigrants to the United States, besides subjecting all to a most rigid examination as to their fitness, physically and otherwise. Let me read a few quotations from the report of Thomas Darlington, M.D., president of the board of health of New York. Under the heading of 'Inspection of School Children in New York City' he said :

They are subject to a rigid physical examination. During the first three months of 1906, 23,733 children were examined and 17,462 were found to be suffering from some physical abnormality. Of this number of defectives, 12,170, or 70·1 per cent were of foreign birth. It is safe to assume that a large proportion of the remainder were of foreign parentage, for their names give satisfactory evidence of foreign extraction.

In 1905 the 88 children in one truant school in Manhattan were examined. Of these 77 were found to be physically defective; 74 or 96·1 per cent of these latter being of foreign birth. In 1900 about 40 per cent of the school children in the city of New York were foreign born.

In another paragraph of this report I find the following:

An investigation of 500 consecutive deaths of infants from diarrhœal diseases in New York city, shows that 120 or 125 per cent were of native parentage, while 325, or 75 per cent were of foreign parentage. These conditions exist although 63·5 per cent of the total population of New York are natives of the city.

And again:

Practically 33 per cent of the insane—

And this is a very important question.

—in the United States are of foreign birth.

The New York State Lunacy Commission in 1904 reports that 60 per cent of the insane patients in New York city were foreign born. From 1885 to 1894 the total admissions to the hospitals for adults of New York city were 282,928; of these 63·7 per cent were of foreign birth. During 1905 there were admitted to 7 of the largest hospitals of the city 26,839 patients; of these 12,550 or 46·6 per cent were native born, and 14,289 or 53·4 per cent were foreign born.

So we get a pretty clear idea from this report of the condition of things in the United States. With all the rigid examination, with all the care, with all the regulations adopted by the United States, we find that the large percentage of those who are physically unfit are people of foreign birth. Now take our own country. I will read only brief extracts from the inspector of hospitals in Ontario:

There is marked evidence that public attention should be called to the large number of undesirable and unsuitable immigrants that are being induced to seek a shelter in Ontario. This has been found nowhere more noticeable than in the city of Toronto, where more than half of the indigent casuals, who have had to be provided for, belong to the immigrant class. . . .

The present policy of Canadian emigration agents in Europe would seem to be to secure the number and pay no heed to the quality of persons urged to seek a haven in this country. The system of the Dominion government of bonusing agents to send out in an apparently indiscriminate manner a class of people totally unfit to provide a livelihood for themselves is deplorable.

Further on, and summing up, he says:

But you must have noticed how crime is on the increase in Canada—crime of an abominable character. Evil deeds are rife in this land which we never knew before. Our nation was a better one before these people came.

I do not think there can be any doubt as to that. Now, Mr. Hanna the other day spoke in regard to lunatic asylums, perhaps the most serious phase of the whole question:

We seem to be bringing into this country a class of people who are going a long way towards peopling our insane asylums, towards peopling our jails, and towards supplying a pauper population for the cities during the winter time.

Mr. Hanna points out that five years ago, of the total commitments to the insane asylums in Ontario, 20 per cent were foreigners and 80 per cent were Canadians. Now, the percentage of foreigners has increased to 30 per cent, and the percentage of Canadians is 70 per cent. During these five years Mr. Hanna points out that the cost of maintaining those immigrants in Ontario has increased from $24,613.20 to $51,744.30. He shows that last year the total number of patients was 1,162, and of these 346 were immigrants. He also makes a computation, which I presume is correct, to the effect that taking the probable average length of life of these people, the province of Ontario will pay for their maintenance during their lives the sum of $1,487,038.80. He says that of the total population of the province over 16 years of age, 20 per cent are immigrants, or 291,675, and 80 per cent are Canadians. or 1,209,308; but that although the immigrants are ouly 20 per cent of the population, the jail population is composed of 38 per cent of immigrants, and the cost of maintaining them last year was $21,724.65.

Now we have had a large influx of these undesirable people, but for some reason, I think without reason, the Minister of the Interior has seen fit still further to stimulate the bringing in of these people. He cancelled the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company on the 30th of November, 1906, and we paid no bonuses down to the 19th of February, 1907. From this latter date to the 8th of January last we were giving 5 shillings per head for children, 10 shillings for adults of certain classes, such as farmers, farm labourers, navvies and miners, and 10 shillings for domestic servants. But at a time when every city in this Dominion was groaning under the weight of taxation, voluntary taxation it is true, brought about by the invasion of these helpless people, this government, with a recklessness which has not been explained, saw fit to double the bonus to be paid, and no earthly reason can be suggested for it unless it be some ulterior motive of assisting those pets of the government who are in

some mysterious way brought into relations with the government in order to bring about this immigration.

Could any sane government imagine for a moment, that, at a time when every city in this country was complaining of the presence of foreigners who were a tax upon the generosity of the good people of those cities, when every jail was more than crowded by the class of people who had been brought to this country, it was necessary or wise for the Minister of the Interior to double the bonus and thereby increase the difficulty under which this country was groaning? What was the bonus for? I have only heard one explanation—that it was for the purpose of enabling the booking agents to advertise Canada in foreign lands. I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior—and before he joined the government he was a sensible man—who should do this advertising? Do we always want middlemen intervening in the affairs of Canada or, if we have to advertise Canada, would it not be better that the people of Canada should do their own advertising and not go to middlemen such as the North Atlantic Trading Company was and such as these men now are not knowing even whether the money has been expended or not? If I remember rightly, if there has been anything that the minister has boasted about or prided himself upon it has been, in this House and on the public platform, to let the labour party know that he was not hand in glove with the Manufacturers' Association, that, in fact, he was hostile to the Manufacturers' Association. Is the government honest with labour unions and skilled labour? I want to know and to-morrow the labour unions, and skilled labour, will want to know, whether the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) has been honest to-day or not, and I think they will bring in a verdict adverse to that hon. gentleman. I want to say definitely and emphatically that all the evidence goes to show that the government have been playing a double game in this matter, that they have not been honest with the labour unions or skilled labour but they have been playing into the hands of the Manufacturers Association, while they pretended by their speeches to the labour party that they were fighting the Manufacturers' Association. The Minister of the Interior, like his brave supporter to-night, made a vicious attack upon the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) and I think in that regard he did not go too far, if he was judicious, because he had a foeman worthy of his steel. He realized that the hon. member for Brantford was doing the government very serious harm in regard to their immigration policy, but in the discussion he brought in some questions which resulted in the hon. member for Brantford retaliating. Among other things the hon. member read a letter which came from where?—which

came from the Department of the Interior—and which showed pretty conclusively the attitude of the government in regard to skilled labour in this country. Now, I will read that letter and I will point out to you, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the reading of it, that the Minister of the Interior did not dare to ask that the hon. member from Brantford should give the name of the official, who sent out this letter. Why? Because if he had got the name he would have been bound, if this gentleman had done wrong to call him to account. The only reason I can suggest in connection with the matter is that he knew perfectly well from the tone of the letter that it was in accordance with the express or implied instructions of the government to that official and he dared not call him to account. Here is what the letter says. It is an unsolicited letter which shows what the minister calls the aggressive immigration movement of the government:

Interior Department of the government of Canada.

Immigration branch,
Agent, John McLennan,
26 Guild Stret,
Aberdeen, June 3, 1907.

W. F. Cockshutt, Esq.,
Brantford, Ont., Can.

Dear Sir,—I see by reports of various newspapers, that numerous members of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association are in need of skilled and unskilled help. As representatives of the government here, we have many inquiries from skilled mechanics in nearly all branches of the trade, desiring information about opportunities for their line in Canada and having no specific information we must be governed in our replies by general terms and conditions.

That looks like a desire on the part of the government to be put in a position of supplying necessary information to these men who are making inquiries in order that they might come and find homes and employment in the labour market of Canada and to that extent, come into rivalry with the skilled and union labour men of Canada. This letter goes on:

I believe that if the secretary of your association would supply the government offices from time to time, of which the inclosed is a list; of the needs of your association, that it will be of great practical assistance in securing some of the needed help, say for instance, in this form, that there are so many carriage blacksmiths, so many boilermakers, lathe men, moulders, carriage builders and so forth wanted If we had such a list as that in our hands we could give definite assurance to men that they could get work, and then refer them to the headquarters of your association in Toronto, Montreal or other large centres, for distribution.

That looks like wanting to enter into a contract with the Manufacturers' Associa-

tion, to concur with them and carry on this aggressive propaganda, which the Minister of the Interior is so fond of speaking of—in bringing into Canada skilled labour in competition with the skilled labour of Canada. It goes on :

I make this as a suggestion, as we are quite often at a loss what to say, not having any definite information respecting the needs of numerous lines of work, for which we have inquiries here.

I am directing this communication to you, as I believe that you are the president of the association or was, the last information that I had.

Mark you what he wants done.

I know in any event that you will forward it to the proper authorities, in the event that you are not at present the active executive of the association I will be glad in any event to hear from you, your opinion respecting this suggestion.

Very truly yours,
JOHN McLENNAN,
Canadian government agent.

And the Minister of the Interior recognizing the significance of one of the his principal agents in the old country coming into direct conflict with the organized labour unions and skilled mechanics of this country, did not dare to ask the hon. member (Mr. Cockshutt) the name of his informant. Do the union men of this country want more conclusive or damning evidence of the guilt of the government and of the minister than the production of that letter? I do not think so. But the Minister of the Interior even though he be not always brave is daring, and he concluded his eloquent but irrelevant speech by reading a document which was issued by a certain historical personage whose alias is Lazarus. Was it not daring and indiscret for the minister to mention Lazarus or Leopold in connection with immigration. He read a letter to show that Mr. Leopold was advertising as follows :

This week's vacancies are: fitters, turners, joiners, labourers, tinsmiths, toolmakers, coatmakers, brushmakers, hammersmiths, chairmakers, cottonweavers, brass workers, cabinetmakers, paper mill engineers, wood working machinists. Fresh vacancies from Canada by each mail. Girls! Girls! Girls! Also families, high wages, assisted passages. Experienced and inexperienced machinists for straw hats, caps, whitewear, tailoring. Mill hands for knitting, woollen and cotton mills. Chocolate dippers, &c., &c.

And the Minister of the Interior said this was signed by Mr. Louis Leopold on behalf of the Manufacturers' Association. Who brought Leopold from oblivion into the position he occupies ? Who but this present government, and who but the Minister of the Interior and his predecessor. Have the people of Canada forgotten that this Louis Leopold alias Lazarus who was picking up large crumbs at the expense of the people of Canada was the man who acted hand in hand with W. T. R. Preston, who is still in the employ of the government, and as to whose acts although the government promised an investigation they dare not investigate. It was this Mr. Lazarus who had an office in the same building with Mr. Preston when he was representing the government in England, it is this man whom the Minister of the Interior resorts to in an endeavour to refute certain facts. The chickens have come home to roost. Such an incident opens the eyes of the labour unions and the skilled mechanics of this country who are struggling to make an honest and competent living, and who have been befooled far too long by this government. Now, I want to revert to a statement made by the Minister of the Interior in this debate on April 13, when he thought fit to refer to the amendment to the immigration law passed this session, and to the attitude of the opposition in connection with it. He said :

It is not long since in an effort to make it possible to carry out our understanding and to complete the fulfilment of our obligations, there was before the House a little amendment to the Immigration Act, a trifling little matter of some four or five lines.

Mark you, this was to enable the government, as he said, to carry out their understanding with one nation, evidently meaning Japan.

We had to face an immigration question on the Pacific coast as well as on the Atlantic, and it is different on the Pacific from what it is on the Atlantic.

I agree in that.

The immigration differs at every point of the compass. It is necessary to adopt a restrictive policy on the Pacific coast.

You will see what restrictive policy they have adopted because I intend to charge that here again the government have not been guilty of honesty. I do not want to use any harsher term, but I say that the government have not been guilty of being candid either with the people of British Columbia or with the labour party of this country.

Different measures were suggested with regard to that restrictive policy, but it was thought well in the interests of the country, in the interests of the empire, that a conciliatory rather than an aggressive policy should be adopted in connection with one country at any rate.

Evidently meaning Japan.

In pursuance of that idea an amicable arrangement was arrived at with that country, and it is hoped that a similar arrangement can be arrived at with another that is in a somewhat similar position in regard to immigration. But an agreement with Japan as to the restrictions on immigrants from Japan to Can-

ada or an agreement with the government of India as to the restriction of immigrants from India to Canada was of no value without the provision we asked this House to pass the other night. It was absolutely of no effect.

Mark you, they could not work out their policy with Japan or with India unless they got this legislation. I want to say, not only has the government added additional shackles to Canada in the matter of immigration by the Act they passed the other day, but at the present moment Canada, by reason of the treaty, by reason of negotiations of the Minister of Labour, and by reason of the final crystallization into law of that whole matter, stands in the most humiliating and degrading and despicable position of any nominally free nation in the world.

I want to say to the people of British Columbia, I want to say to the labour people of Canada and to all the people of Canada, that we are tied hand and foot as regards the question of immigration, by reason of the treaty with Japan, the treaty being, as the right hon. gentleman said the other day, above the law with regard to immigration which we put on our statute-book. My right hon. friend shakes his head. I do not go by a shake of the head ; I go by the records of this House, and I refer to what was said the other day when we were debating this matter, and when the right hon. gentleman said that as between the statute we were passing and the treaty, the treaty should prevail over the statute; and so it does as a matter of fact, whether the right hon. gentleman had said it or not. Now, what have we done? As the Minister of the Interior said, we had to pass this law. There were negotiations, and we had to satisfy Japan. The right hon. gentleman said: Japan is a sensitive nation; it is willing to be treated on the same basis as other nations, but is not willing to be discriminated against. The right hon. gentleman has made it clear that we are in this position, that whatever restrictive laws Japan may have as regards emigration from its shores, Canada is not allowed by Japan to enact any legislation which will conflict with Japan unless Canada enacts similar legislation with regard to every other country in the world, including Great Britain itself. A sensitive nation, the right hon. gentleman says. Yes; yet in 1905, when the treaty between Great Britain and Japan was in force, Australia demanded free action as regards immigration, and Australia got that concession from Japan. A sensitive nation! Yes, sensitive when Canada has only a population of six millions, but not sensitive towards the United States when the United States has a population of eighty millions: and in 1904, the same year in which the treaty with Great Britain was consummated, Japan conceded to the United States the right which we should have safeguarded in our treaty with Japan. Sensitive? Is no one to be sensitive in Canada? Are we to have no national pride? Are we to surrender the right of making our own laws, and submit to the indignity of having our laws in regard to immigration made at Tokio, as in fact they are at the present time? Just follow out this legislation. Before the other day we had this provision:

The Governor in Council may, by proclamation or order, whenever he considers it necessary or expedient, prohibit the landing in Canada of any specified class of immigrants, of which due notice shall be given to the transportation conpanies.

The hon. Minister of the Interior says that means a certain class as regards occupation, not as regards a country, and I think he is right as to that. Then the government the other day introduced an Act which was intended to get over difficulties—which was intended to prevent Japanese coming to Canada, which was intended to keep the Hindus out of British Columbia, and it was proclaimed to the people of British Columbia as having that effect. It has not that effect, and the right hon. gentleman and the Minister of the Interior well know it. Here is the form in which the Act was introduced:

The Governor in Council may, by proclamation or order, whenever he considers it necessary or expedient, prohibit the landing in Canada of any specified class of immigrants—

That was in the old Act, and in the new we read:

—or of any immigrants who, being natives or citizens of any specified country, have come to Canada otherwise than by continuous journey from that country on through tickets purchased there.

That was the Act as it was introduced. But when it came to be considered by this House, that would not do. That gave us too much liberty. That enabled us to specify Japan; it enabled us to say that if the labour market was congested, the Governor in Council could make an order that Japanese artisans or mechanics or labourers should not come in. But we dare not do that, because the right hon. leader of this House says that Japan is a sensitive nation, and is only willing that we should legislate in the same way in regard to Japan that we do in regard to other countries. And so what we must do in order not to offend Japan is to surrender our rights. We have, as he told the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), the right to shut out British subjects if we like; we can shut them out with reason or without reason. But, the right hon. gentleman says by his action and the action of his ministers, we cannot do that with regard to Japan. The Minister of the Interior says this parliament is supreme, but in the same breath he asks us to mutilate the statute which he brought in, and it was passed in this form:

—or any immigrants who have come to Canada otherwise than by continuous journey from the country of which they are natives or citizens and upon through tickets purchased in such country.

What is the meaning of that ? The difference is this: that we had the right to specify any country under the Act as it was introduced. But Japan would not stand that; we dare not do it. And now by the change made the only order in council that can be passed is an order which excludes everybody—which puts Australia and every other British possession, which puts Great Britain itself, on the same line of exclusion that we adopt in reference to Japan. That is the position we are in. We are bonusing immigrants; it is the boast of this government that we are endeavouring to get British immigration into this country. British immigrants come to Canada, remain for a year, and then go to the United States. British immigrants go to the United States, remain there a year or two, and want to come to Canada. An order in council has to be passed. That order in council confronts them at the border, and it is said to them: You are British subjects; you have never foresworn your allegiance to the British Crown; you are of us, but you cannot come in. That is what the law does. We are endeavouring to get immigrants from Holland; the Hollander must come by direct course or he cannot come at all. We are endeavouring to get the citizens of France; they must come direct from France or they cannot come at all--why? Because Japan says so. Take every country from which we are seeking immigration, and we are confronted with the mandate of Japan. It is by the mandate of Japan that we have had to pass this law, which will exclude British subjects unless they come direct, which will exclude the people of the best nations of Europe unless they come direct, which will exclude the citizens of the United States unless they came direct, which will exclude everybody unless he comes direct, or else we have to leave that law a dead letter. Is the hon. gentleman going to enforce that law? No. He says to the labour people of British Columbia: I have passed a law which will be your protection. I say to the Minister of the Interior that no more humiliating condition ever existed in Canada or in any other country than that which exists by reason of the attitude of this government in regard to that treaty with Japan. Although I desire that we should have friendly relations with that nation, yet rather than feel that we in this free country have surrendered our rights as a sovereign people to make our own laws with regard to immigration and have consented to have our laws made at Tokio, I for one would be prepared at any moment to denounce the treaty we have with Japan at the present time.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (East Assiniboia). The resolution which my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has presented is one of vast importance to every portion of the Dominion. It is of special importance to the western country, and that must be my excuse for my taking up a short time of the House to-night. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Lennox) passed a few compliments to the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith). He said that the hon. member for Nanaimo was now opposed to the labour party. Well, I would venture the statement that the labour party in Canada have not in the whole Dominion a better or a truer friend than my hon. friend from Nanaimo. He has given evidence of his devotion to the labour party time and again and he has, as a big broad-minded man, done more for the labour interests in Canada than any other man in public life. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) argued that because my hon. friend from Nanaimo supported this government he was therefore opposed to the labour party. But that does not follow by any means. No one who is not a blind partisan will deny that no government in Canada has ever done so much for the labour interests as the present administration. I would venture the statement that the labour party themselves acknowledge this. I do not say that every individual does, but the labour interests as a whole are convinced that this government has done more for them than any previous administration.

Then we had the hon. gentleman arguing that the government are discriminating in their immigration policy against the province of Quebec and the other eastern provinces. Well, would he advocate that this government should spend money to take thousands of people from Quebec or Ontario up to Manitoba or Saskatchewan or Alberta or British Columbia? I venture to say that any hon. gentleman who would move a resolution to that effect would be laughed out of court. It is not the duty of this or any government to remove population from one part of the Dominion to the other. Is not a good citizen in Quebec or Ontario worth as much to the Dominion, earning his living there, industrious and contented, as he would be if we were to remove him to the west ? As representing a western constituency, I should certainly not be inclined to support any such proposition any more than I would be disposed to support a proposal that the government should pay out money for the purpose of taking settlers from Saskatchewan or Alberta and bringing them down here. The policy is so absurd that one wonders how any reasonable man could think of suggesting it.

The hon. gentleman also claims that the policy of this government on immigration is not in favour of the farming community. That statement rather surprised me, be-

cause if there is any part of the community which benefits by that policy it is our farming population. What are the classes of people on whom this government pays a bonus for bringing them out? They are first of all the farmers and farm labourers, then female domestic servants and under certain circumstances railway navvies. Those are the only classes on whom we are paying a bonus, and even with the payment of this bonus we have not been able, although we have been giving special consideration to the agricultural class, to secure sufficient labour. My hon. friend suggests that it is not farmers, but farm labourers to which the government should specially devote its attention. Would any sensible man prefer, as a settler, a farm labourer to a farmer who would own and work his own farm ? I do not think that the class of farm labourers, those who would be content to always remain farm labourers, is the most desirable class and the one we most require. What we specially want are men who will, if you like, work as labourers for a year or two and then take up farms of their own, or who will, if they have the means, take up a farm at once. I think, therefore, that the government is doing what is the very best in the interest of the farming community.

The hon. gentleman tried to create the impression that the west is receiving the greatest benefit from the policy of this government. Let me tell him that the province from which he comes is that which gets by far the largest number of immigrants. Ontario gets far more immigrants than Manitoba or Saskatchewan or Alberta or British Columbia or any other province. I have here a statement of the number of immigrants who have gone into each province every year. Take the last three years for instance. Ontario got in 1906 52,000 ; in 1907, 32,000, and in 1908, 70,000.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman must be wrong because we are only beginning 1908.

Mr. TURRIFF. I mean the nine months of the fiscal year 1907-8. Quebec received 25,000 in 1906, 18,000 in 1907 and 40,000 in the nine months of 1907-8. Manitoba received 35,000 in 1906, 20,000 in 1907 and 36,000 in the nine months of 1907-8. Taking the totals from 1901 to the present time we find the immigrants were divided as follows :

Ontario..	243,417
Quebec..	164,371
Manitoba..	230,946
Saskatchewan and Alberta..	299,949

So, it will be seen that if this is a western policy it is also a Dominion policy, it builds up the east as well as the west, the immigrants being sent largely where they want to go. Of course, you cannot make people go to the maritime provinces if they wish to go to the prairies; you cannot make them go to Ontario if they prefer to go to Quebec. But the government gives information and what guidance it may and does not interfere with their going to one province or the other. The immigrants have distributed themselves and the province of Ontario, from which the hon. gentleman comes, has received far more immigrants than any other province of the Dominion.

The hon. member also stated that it would be but a short time before they would be on this side of the House, and they would find a remedy. I can only say to the hon. member again that he and his friends were on this side for eighteen long years. And, by the way, the hon. gentleman spoke this afternoon about prize-packages, saying they were not necessary in order to secure the occupation of our western lands. But, if is is so easy to settle up these lands now why did not his friends do something during the eighteen years they were on this side of the House ? They had time enough to experiment; but what they succeeded in doing was not in bringing a million immigrants into Canada but in sending a million emigrants from Canada into the United States. That is the difference between the policy of the government under its successive Ministers of the Interior and that pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite. I doubt that the people of Canada, knowing what was done by hon. gentlemen opposite during their eighteen years of office to populate that western country as well as the rest of Canada, will give these hon. gentlemen the mandate to find a remedy for this policy, for there is no remedy needed. Things are going very well; the country is prospering——

Mr. TAYLOR. For a portion of the people.

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes, it is going very well for nine hundred and ninety-nine out of a thousand of the people. You can go to any part of the Dominion and you will not find very much grumbling. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) said that if the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) had stated that there were ten men out of employment now for one out of employment ten years ago, he would have been nearer the truth. I do not think the hon. member (Mr. Cockshutt) will find many to back him up in that statement. I remember very well, as I am sure most of us do, the condition of things ten years ago, and I doubt if any hon. gentleman except the member for Brantford will say that the conditions for employment of labour were as good then as they are now. And I venture to say that at this moment—and the same would be true of any time during the past six months—notwithstanding the talk about unemployed people in Toronto, Montreal, Winnipeg and others of our larger cities, there has not been employment for every man in the Dominion who was will-

ing to go to where the work was and to do the work when he got there. What is the reason that people are unemployed? Simply because they would not do the work offered them. Some, perhaps, were not suited to the work. A gentleman from Winnipeg who came down to-day told me that he had the greatest difficulty during the past few months in securing farm labourers. He offered $25 a month and board and could not get men to work. He hired a number who promised to go but afterwards would not go. Certain people will not live in the country; they congregate in the cities and complain if they do not get work there. I believe the statement cannot be refuted that at no time during the past five years has there been more labour in Canada than the demand for labour, except in a few places where there has been overcrowding because the people were not willing to go where they could get work. The hon. member also made the statement that the United States were getting a much better class of immigrants than Canada is getting. How any man can make a statement like that is more than I can understand. As stated several times in this debate, the United States do not pay a bonus on immigrants, nor have they any immigration agents authorized to carry on work in European countries. Further than that, they put a head tax on immigrants for the purpose of keeping the people out. I believe that the mover of this resolution, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and almost every hon. member on that side who has spoken in this debate has advocated the adoption by Canada of the same measures as have been adopted in the United States. Well, if the result of adopting those measures should be the same as what we see in the United States, God forbid that we should adopt them. For, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) 65 per cent of the immigration going into the United States—and it is going in now at the rate of a million and a quarter people a year—comes from a portion of Europe that we look upon as undesirable, the southern countries, in which countries we do not carry on an immigration propaganda or from which we do not seek to induce immigrants to come to this country. On the other hand, not more than ten per cent of our immigrants come from these countries. In fact, if you exclude the Japanese and the Hindus you find that only six or seven per cent of the total immigration into Canada comes from such countries as southern Italy and other places in the south of Europe and in Asia that we do not look upon as desirable fields of immigration. I say we do not want to adopt the same methods as are adopted by the United States, if they are going to bring about the same results. I have no doubt that if we did adopt those methods the result would be exactly the same.

A good deal of objection has been taken during this debate by members on the other side of the House to the system of paying bonuses, and they claim that all the undesirables that come into Canada are brought in, practically, by the bonus system. Now I do not pretend that there are no undesirables coming into Canada. You cannot bring in a quarter of a million people per annum without having some of the lower classes among them. But the very fact that we pay a bonus enables us to select our people. The bonus, as has been pointed out, is not paid to the settler, and it is not paid to the booking agent primarily for the purpose of inducing him to secure immigrants for Canada. The object of the bonus that is paid to the booking agent is this : The booking agent gets a commission on the tickets that he sells. If he sells an expensive ticket his percentage is naturally a great deal more than if he sells a cheap ticket. A steerage passage ticket from Europe to Canada will cost about $25 or $27. The commission on that ticket does not amount to nearly as much as the commission on a ticket to the Argentine Republic, to Australia or New Zealand, or Brazil, or many of the other countries which are anxious to get immigrants. Naturally therefore the desire of the booking agent is to sell the ticket to wherever he can make the most money on it. So in order to offset the inducement they would have of advocating these other countries and directing settlers to go there, the government steps in and gives them a bonus on all the people of a certain class that the booking agent can direct to Canada. Now what is the result ? Suppose that five men of different occupations go to a booking agent in order to get information. They want to find out about Canada, about Australia, about New Zealand and about the Argentine Republic. If there is a farmer amongst them or a farm labourer, the booking agent naturally, for his own benefit, advises that farmer or that farm labourer to buy a ticket to Canada, because, although he gets a smaller percentage from the steamship company, he gets a bonus from Canada. But if among the five men there are three who do not belong to the classes on which we pay a bonus, the agent does not advise them to come to Canada. Why ? Because he gets no bonus on them, and if he sells them a ticket he makes a smaller commission. But if he can persuade that man to go to the Argentine Republic, or to New Zealand, or to Australia, he sells a much higher priced ticket and he gets a larger commission. So the result is that the payment of this bonus has exactly the opposite effect that speakers on the other side of the House have tried to make out all through this debate. It has the effect of bringing the right class of people to Canada, and it has the effect of keeping the

class of people that we do not want out of Canada, and directing them to the other countries who do want them. Those are the facts of the case, and they cannot be controverted.

The hon. member was very anxious to know why the government had doubled the bonus. I will tell him why. It is because we want more settlers. We want more settlers in the western country. I do not know whether the people of Ontario and Quebec want more settlers to settle up their farm lands, because those provinces have millions of acres of good land yet to settle. When the government of Ontario a few years ago sent out men to inspect the north land, they found one stretch of 16,000,000 acres of good land. You have to think for a moment in order to realize what 16,000,000 acres of land means. It means as much land, I think, as is cultivated in the province of Ontario at the present time; at all events, it means about three times as much land as we have cultivated in the three western provinces on which we have raised in some years as much as 200,000,000 bushels of grain, besides all the cattle. There is any amount of land in Ontario being opened up at the present time by the Temiscaming and Northern Railway, and by the new Grand Trunk Pacific. The same remarks apply to the province of Quebec. In the hinterland of Quebec there are many millions of acres of good land. Does not the Dominion of Canada want to have these lands settled up? Does not Ontario want to have her lands settled up? Does not Quebec want to have her lands settled up? I do not think any one will say for a moment that these lands should not be settled up as quickly as possible. The bonus has been doubled in order to bring out more settlers, and because we are getting settlers of the right class. I know that in the western provinces, for which I can speak, we are getting the most satisfactory class of people.

Now almost every speaker on the other side of the House has reflected on the character of the immigrants that come from the continent of Europe. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have seen hundreds and thousands of those settlers in the northwestern provinces; I have driven through their settlements, I have stopped at their farms, I have entered their houses, and I want to say that you cannot go to any country in the world and find better settlers than the Icelanders, than the Germans, than the Swedes, than the Norwegians, than the Hungarians, than even the Galicians, who have been ridiculed so much by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I want to say that the Galicians are a good class of people, they make good settlers for the western country. We have thousands of Galicians who have settled on lands that the ordinary English speaking settler from the old country, or from Canada or the United States, would not have settled on at all, for the present at all events, land that they would not take as a gift. But these Galicians have gone on those lands and have made good farms out of them and are becoming prosperous. I venture the assertion that within twenty-five years from this date the Galicians in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, will, as a class, be the wealthiest farmers in that country. Besides being able to make themselves comfortable, they are good settlers, because the first thing a Galician learns is to say, 'Me Canadian.' He wants to become a Canadian at once. He wants to forget his Austrian way of living, he wants to forget his Austrian way of farming. When you find a Galician settlement and an English speaking farmer in the near vicinity, you will find them going out three or four at a time and spending hours watching him doing his work. Inside of two or three years, drive up to a Galician house, or to his farmyard, and until you speak to him and find that he speaks broken English, you would not think, by looking at his place, that he was not a settler from the province of Ontario. If you wanted to teach them the Galician language in the schools they would not accept it. They say, no, I want my children to learn English, I want my child to be a Canadian; we can teach them the Galician language at home, but we want them to learn English in the schools. They have the right spirit all through, and are a clever people. They have been criticised simply because when they first came out after a months' travel on land and water, they are not as finely dressed as our settlers would be going up from this country. They have their Austrian style of wool or sheepskin coats which look a little incongruous perhaps, but, in a year or two, you do not know these people. They are just as fine a class of settlers as we have in Canada. I have none in my constituency, so I am not saying this for the sake of catching any Galician votes.

Mr. HENDERSON. We thought you were.

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes, but you are very often mistaken when you have thoughts like that; you are entitled to another think.

Mr. HENDERSON. You are helping your friends.

Mr. TURRIFF. Well any friends of mine who have Galicians in their constituencies do not need any help. Not only in this debate but out of the House and in different places we find hon. gentlemen opposite criticising the foreign immigrants who are coming into the country, but, taking them as a class, they are a good lot of settlers, and let any hon. gentleman go to any

of the western provinces and he will find that the class of settlers we have there will compare well with the class of settlers that can be found in any other part of the country. The hon. member also had a good deal to say about the letter of an agent by the name of McLellan written to Mr. W. F. Cockshutt, the hon. member for Brantford. I remember some discussion of this at the time and if I am rightly informed the letter was not unsolicited as the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) states.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, it was.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The letter was entirely unsolicited.

Mr. TURRIFF. On your part.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Unsolicited by any one.

Mr. TURRIFF. Was it not in reply to a letter written by Mr. Cockshutt, who was then president of the Manufacturers' Association ?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. No, it was not written by Mr. Cockshutt or any one else. The writer of the letter says that he had seen notices in the newspapers that the Manufacturers' Association wanted skilled labour.

Mr. TURRIFF. I was informed at the time—perhaps I am wrong and I accept the hon. gentleman's word as being correct as he ought to know the facts of the case —that the letter was not unsolicited. Apparently, the letter was in reply to notices that had been seen in the papers. At all events the member of the service who had departed from the line of his duty in so far as to write that letter was disciplined by the department. He had no authority or instructions to take part in any such correspondence or in any such immigration work.

I just wish to say another word or two in reference to why the bonus was doubled. I wonder if many of us really realize what we have to settle up in that western country. At the present time there are about 120,000,000 acres surveyed, roughly speaking, south of the North Saskatchewan river and extending from the eastern boundary of Manitoba to the Rocky Mountains. Of that area there are about eight and a half million acres under cultivation. There were five million acres in wheat in 1906 and from that five million acres there were one hundred million bushels of wheat threshed. There were also about one hundred million bushels of coarse grains. In addition there were cattle raised by hundreds of thousands. What I want to say is that if with the cultivation of eight and a half million acres there is a production of some two hundred million bushels of grain and hundreds of thousands of head of cattle, what are the possibilities of that country when, say, half of that area will be under cultivation ? In a very few years, not many years to come, within the lives of men who are now listening to me, we will be raising in these three provinces south of the Saskatchewan river, or in what we may call the settled portion of the Northwest, a billion bushels of wheat. What does that mean to the whole country ? Does it mean benefit only to the western portion of the country ? What does it mean to Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton and the different manufacturing towns and villages throughout this eastern country ? It is acknowledged that the best customers of the manufacturer to-day is the farmer on the prairie because he is a large producer, he is a large buyer, he is able to pay for what he buys, he raises wheat and cattle, he sells these products for cash and he has cash to pay for his goods. If we can accomplish what we have done with eight and a half million acres under cultivation what will be the position a few years hence when we will have fifty million acres under cultivation ? With that prospect in view would we be justified, would this government be justified, would the Minister of the Interior be justified in sitting idle, doing nothing and letting the country go back to that state of stagnation it was in ten or twelve years ago when we only got 16,000 of a total immigration and when a very small proportion of the British emigration came to this country ? At that time I do not think we got over ten per cent of the people who left the British isles. What has been the result under the administration of this government ? At the present time we get more than half of the immigration that comes to the continent of America. We are getting thousands every year from the British isles, more than double the number that go to the United States, whereas, ten years ago, they were getting about ten times as many as we were. That is what we have to look forward to. By the peopling of that country the manufacturers, the merchants and the railways of the east, the railways of the west and everybody in Canada are going to reap the benefit, not only the people of the west but everybody in the whole Dominion. That is the reason why this government is justified in doubling the bonus ; they are doing it in order that we may double the immigration coming into this country. I believe that if we can double the immigration instead of having a quarter of a million people coming in yearly, inside of three years, we will be having had a million people annually coming to our shores. Not only have we that one hundred and twenty million acres to settle, but the people of Canada are now finding out, that, north of the Saskatchewan river, in that part of the country that a few years ago we did not look upon as being suitable for settlement, or only a small portion of which, between Edmonton and the Peace river,

was regarded as being suitable for settlement, there are great possibilities. The more we learn about that country the better we find it to be, and for hundreds of miles north of Edmonton there is a country that men who have travelled through it and who are in a position to express an opinion about it say contains as much good land fit for settlement and possesses as good a climate as can be found south of the Saskatchewan river where, as I have said, there are one hundred and twenty million acres of land already surveyed. That being the case why would not this government double the bonus and bring in people, not a few thousands at a time as we had them coming some years ago, but by the quarter or the half million, and in a short time make every part of the Dominion prosperous? Some hon. gentlemen, especially the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), keep going over and over again the vast expenditure that this government are making every year upon immigration. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier referred to the fact that we are now spending a million dollars a year on immigration, and he also pointed out that since the government came into power they have expended $780,000 in bonuses. So they have, but, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that during the next ten years, instead of paying out $780,000, they may pay several millions of dollars in bonuses if by so doing they can bring in the same class of settlers that they have been securing in the past and thereby do good to the country.

Mr. J. D. REID. Doukhobors.

Mr. TURRIFF. There has been a great deal said about the Doukhobors, but out of 7,000 or 8,000 of them that have come to Canada all but the merest fraction are first-class settlers and are doing well and nothing can be said against them in any shape or form, and so far as their mode of living is concerned it may be said that they are more moral than we Canadians; a better class of people you cannot find anywhere.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would the hon. gentleman speak for himself?

Mr. TURRIFF. A great many hon. gentleman opposite have not been in the west and they do not know what they are talking about. When I was interrupted unnecessarily, I was going to say that while there are a few among the Doukhobors who are religiously crazy, I have seen English speaking people in the city of Ottawa whom I thought were religiously crazy, and just about as crazy as anybody could be.

Mr. J. D. REID. What part of the city of Ottawa was that in?

Mr. TURRIFF. Not far from here. You must not judge a whole community by the actions of a few. You might as well say that because a Canadian commits a murder that all Canadians are bad. Of course nobody approves of the actions of some of these Doukhobors and while we would not advocate bringing in any more of them at the present time, yet I do say that the great majority of them are very good settlers. Objection has been raised to the government spending $1,000,000 a year on immigration, but let me point out that during the last three or four years the value of the settlers' effects coming from the United States has amounted to over $50,000,000 a year in addition to the cash these settlers brought in.

Mr. BRODER. They were not bonused.

Mr. TURRIFF. A portion of them were bonused exactly the same as a portion of those coming from the British isles and from continental Europe were bonused. I am safe in saying that for the $1,000,000 a year we are spending on immigration, $100,000,000 a year is brought into the country. Now, is that good business or is it not?

Mr. SPROULE. It is not $100,000,000 a year.

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. The Trade and Navigation returns do not give any such figures.

Mr. TURRIFF. I got the information from the superintendent of immigration as to the value of settlers effects, and I have estimated the amount of cash brought in.

Mr. SPROULE. The settlers' effects are given in the Trade and Navigation returns.

Mr. TURRIFF. Only with respect to the immigrants coming from the United States, but not with respect to those coming from the British isles or continental Europe.

Mr. SPROULE. But you spoke of those coming from the United States.

Mr. TURRIFF. The hon. gentleman from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) argues that we should stop paying bonuses, and he said the best advertisement we could have is the contented settler in the west. I agree that the contented settler in the west is a very good assistance, but to say that we shall stop paying bonuses would be on a par with saying that the wholesale merchant who for years and years has built up a prosperous trade by judicious advertising and sending out travellers to sell his goods should cease advertising and should cease employing travellers. It is all very well to say that that wholesale merchant had contented customers in different parts of the country, but if he ceased his enterprise and if his rivals continued advertising their business and sending out travellers, the man who had decided to rest on his oars would very soon find himself without a business. There is no use making spasmodic efforts to attract immigrants;

you must keep steadily at work and it has been the steady work of the Immigration Department during the last few years that has resulted in such great numbers of people coming to this country. Now, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier said:

So far as I have been able to find out, not only from the official reports of the United States, but from personal information sought by me in Montreal and the United States itself, their inspection laws at present are well nigh perfect.

Let us see how that is. The examination of immigrants conducted by the Canadian government is practically the same as that conducted by the American government. True, immigrants are excluded from the United States because of certain diseases and with respect to which in Canada they are put into hospitals, and if they recover they are allowed to remain here. On the other hand, there is a good deal of political influence in the United States bearing on those immigrants who should land and those who should be debarred, and happily we are free from that. The following statement will show the number of immigrants debarred in the years 1905, 1906, 1907, both in the United States and Canada:

UNITED STATES.

—	No. of Immigrants.	Released from Hospital.	Debarred.	Deported after being in Country.
1905....	1,026,499	7,776	11,879	845
1906....	1,100,735	9,300	12,432	676
1907....	1,285,349	11,528	13,064	995

CANADA.

1905....	146,266	1,948	611	86
1906....	189,064	3,046	524	137
1907,9m	124,667	3,103	440	201

In these three years there were 37,375 people debarred from entering the United States. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier argued that it was their perfect inspection laws that prevented these people coming in. Let us analyse that statement. The hon. gentleman all through his remarks was not as fair as he usually is. We on this side of the House have placed the hon. member for Jacques Cartier on a pretty high pedestal; but on this occasion, while I do not accuse him of being intentionally unfair, I can hardly think that he gave careful attention to the reports which he read, though he appeared to be so anxious to have his statement right that he did what is seldom done in this House, he read it. I do not wonder at his doing that because he was on very dangerous ground: he was advocating a policy which I venture to say he dare not advocate before his friends the Manufacturers' Association, the principal pet, the godchild of hon. gentlemen opposite. He dare not advocate before his political friends in the large transportation companies, nor before the large importers or business men, nor before the farmers of the country, what he advocates, not so much in the words of his resolution as in the speech he has made. But he makes his appeal practically altogether to the labour element in one part of the country. He says that the laws of the United States are almost perfect, and he gives the number of people who were debarred in those three years from going into the United States. But let us see why they were debarred. A man is debarred from going into the United States if he has made a contract to work for another man. We, on the contrary, look upon it as a great advantage if a man who comes to this country has his work secured. A great number of the men debarred from the United States were men who the authorities considered had not funds enough, and might become a charge on the people of the United States. The number debarred on the ground of having made contracts was 4,912; the number debarred on account of not having sufficient funds was 21,833. So that of the total number of 37,375 debarred in those three years, 26,745 were debarred for reasons that are not in existence at all in Canada, and they would not have been debarred at all from coming into the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. TAYLOR. What about our Alien Labour law?

Mr. TURRIFF. That does not apply to people coming in from Great Britain.

Mr. TAYLOR. Not from Great Britain, but from foreign countries.

Mr. TURRIFF. Nor does it apply to a farmer in Saskatchewan who hires a man in Dakota. It has never been so applied.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the reason? Because it is no good.

Mr. TURRIFF. So that the American law which the hon. member for Jacques Cartier finds almost perfect is administered under altogether different conditions to what we have in Canada, and the results are not as good. Now, let us carry this on to its conclusion. Deducting the 26,745 who were debarred by reason of contracts or not having sufficient funds, there were left 10,630 who were excluded during those three years as being morally and physically unfit, out of a total immigration of 3,412,583, or one person excluded out of over 321. In Canada in the same three fiscal years 1,575 persons were excluded out of a total immigration of 459,997, or one out of every 292. So that under the inspection by the Immigration Department of Canada we are

in reality excluding between 9 and 10 per cent more than they are excluding at Ellis Island in New York. So that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, in setting up the laws of the United States as being much ahead of our laws, and recommending the Minister of the Interior to adopt the methods of the United States, either was trying to deceive this House, which I would not think of accusing him of doing, or he had not looked carefully into the reports or given to them thorough consideration, and therefore came to a wrong conclusion. It is well known that the steamship companies endeavour as far as they can to have the inspection of certain classes made easy and to have the inspection of any settlers going to the United States through Canada made difficult, in order as far as possible to have them booked by American lines to the city of New York instead of by Canadian lines to Montreal and St. John. Another statement made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier was that the Department of the Interior, through the initiation of the American officers had arranged to have returns made of all the people that went into the United States through Canada, and he gives the credit for that to the American officers. That is very wide of the fact. That question was taken up in the year 1903, not by the American officers at all, but by the Department of Immigration here, and I will read the first correspondence in the matter. This is a letter dated Ottawa, May 30, 1903:

Dear Mr. Watchorn,—I beg to inclose you herewith a list of names of Galicians and Bukowinians sailing from Europe per Allan line steamers between the middle of June, 1902, to April, 1903, and also a list of the same nationalities sailing per Beaver line steamers, from the 1st of July, 1902, to 4th of March, 1903. Would you do me the favour of having one of your clerks go over these lists and mark opposite each name the date upon which they went to the United States. I have no doubt but what you have a full list of the names in your office. I would be exceedingly obliged if you could return me these lists at an early date.

Since that letter was written regular monthly reports have been received of the passengers going to the United States within one year after their arrival at Canada. I fail to see how the hon. member for Jacques Cartier could give the credit to the American officers when the whole matter was initiated by the department here. When the hon. member for Jacques Cartier was quoting from the report of the commissioner of the United States, he read only a part of the report, leaving out a part which was very material. The hon. member was endeavouring to make out that Canada had not been active in reporting undesirables. If he will look at page 59 of the report for the year ending June 30, 1904, he will find the following paragraph:

Not only has Canada deported large numbers of undesirables who sought to permanently settle in Canada, but of the 24,797 applicants for permission to pass through Canada those who were rejected by your officers as unfit persons under United States laws, because of being afflicted with loathsome contagious diseases, were deported to Europe by the Dominion immigration authorities, the steamship companies bringing them to Canada being compelled to return them and to assume all expenses incident thereto.

During that year, the total rejections at Canadian border stations numbered 2,022, as given in table 2, page 84, of the same report. The hon. gentleman tried to make out that a great many of these people were a poor class which came through Canada in order to reach the United States but were refused admission into the United States and remained in Canada. But of that 2,022 which were refused at the American ports of entry, 297 were Canadians, 342 were excluded under the contract labour law, and 864 for the stated reason that they were liable to become public charges or not possessed of sufficient money to pass through. So that out of the 24,797 who passed through Canada to the United States, only 579 were excluded because they were unfit mentally, morally or physically. The balance were excluded because they had not money enough or were going contrary to the contract labour law.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) took it for granted that all those who were refused admission into the United States had come through Canada, but the fact is that quite a number had originally come to the United States direct and then drifted to Canada, and when they wanted to return to the United States, were refused. But I have here a statement showing the number of immigrants who arrived at American ports, passed United States inspection, drifted into Canada, applied for and were refused admission to the United States again within one year of the date of their arrival from the North American Continent. In 1906 there were 191 and in 1907, 253. These were settlers who came to the United States by New York and then came to Canada and were refused permission to return. There are several other inaccuracies in his statement.

Mr. MONK. In that report these men are specially mentioned as having been booked to the United States through Canada and going to the United States within the year. How can the hon. gentleman say they went to the United States first and then came to Canada and wanted to return ?

Mr. TURRIFF. If my hon. friend will look at that report more carefully he will find that out of that number there was quite a large proportion who were refused admission at the American ports from Canada. The bulk of them were people who were shipped through Canada to the United

States, but a certain number were people who had drifted into Canada through the United States and wanted to get back.

Mr. MONK. There is no trace of that in the report whatever.

Mr. TURRIFF. I have a table which gives the number each month.

Mr. MONK. I quoted from the report giving those who came to Canada first and then went to the United States. How can the hon. gentleman say they came to the United States first and then went to Canada and then returned to the United States? It is impossible. That is not in the report.

Mr. TURRIFF. My hon. friend may be very easily mistaken because he said a very large number were refused admission into the United States but did not give the reason why. He wished us to believe they were refused because they were unfit morally or physically.

Mr. MONK. I did not give the causes. I said they were refused. Some may have been refused because they violated the contract labour law and others for other reasons. I did not pretend to give the reasons but said they had been refused by the United States and remained with us.

Mr. TURRIFF. That is what I object to all through the hon. gentleman's speech. His speech would convey an impression altogether different from the facts The hon. gentleman was referring to the American laws as being much more strict than ours and was pointing out that 2,000 remained in Canada, who intended going to the United States, because they would not be allowed into the United States. And the impression he gave was that these people were refused entry into the United States because they were morally or physically unfit.

Mr. MONK. He will find that stated in the American reports for 1902-3 and 4, and the American authorities take credit for having improved our system.

Mr. TURRIFF. If the hon. gentleman will look through the report carefully, he will find that out of the 2,022, 297 were Canadians, 342 were excluded under the contract labour law, and 864 because they were likely to become public charges or had not sufficient money. So that out of the 24,797, 519 at the most come under the heading of being undesirables either physically, morally or mentally.

Mr. MONK. That is pretty good for one year.

Mr. TURRIFF. But instead of the number being 2,022 it was only 519, and some of those 519 were people who came to the United States via New York and then drifted into Canada and wanted to go back.

Mr. MONK. No.

Mr. TURRIFF. I think I am right.

Mr. MONK. There is no authority for that.

Mr. TURRIFF. Further on in his speech the hon. gentleman said:

> Of those arriving at Canadian ports with the avowed and declared intention of going to the United States there were in 1905 12,663, and 183 were debarred. What became of them when they were debarred at our Canadian ports I do not know. It is impossible to find any trace of their disposition.

Some hon. gentleman asked him if they were still in Canada and he said he supposed they were. I want to correct the impression that those undesirables were allowed to remain in Canada. Of the 183 who were debarred the hon. gentleman said it was impossible to find out any trace of their disposition. If he had looked carefully through the reports of the Interior Department, he would find that on page 123 of the annual report concerning immigration for the year ending June 30, 1905, there is a table VII which shows by nationalities the deportation of 139 immigrants of the 183 mentioned by him. The remaining 44 were either still in the hospital at the time of the report, or, after careful examination, had been considered suitable for Canada and allowed to remain. So that those who were debarred from going to the United States were not turned loose in the Dominion of Canada, as the hon. gentleman would have us believe, but 139 of them were deported. He will find that in the report. Further on in his address the hon. gentleman made this statement:

> It is impossible for me to think that a man having at heart the interests of the country, and totally dissociated from the interests to which I have referred—great, powerful and influential interests—could ever have believed that a scheme of paying so much a head per immigrant, was a suitable, feasible and wise method for a country to follow that was desirous of increasing the national family by the addition of good, suitable and carefully selected subjects.

Now, in connection with that, I want to read a letter which, I think, the hon. gentleman should regard as satisfactory:

> June 24, 1889.
>
> Dear Mr. Carling,—I beg to refer to your telegram of the 20th (?) March and the 23rd April, on the subject of the discontinuance on December 31 next of the payment of the $5 bonus to continental steamship agents, for adults whom they may book to Manitoba and the Northwest Territories. In accordance with your directions, I have arranged that the agents shall be notified in July next. After discussing the subject with Mr. Dyke I came to the conclusion that it would be unwise to send out the notice before that date, for the reason that it might imperil the success of this year's work.

I cannot, however, allow the opportunity to pass without placing on record an expression of my opinion that the measure will in all probability tend to retard the movement which after many years of labour and effort we have been able to set in motion in the direction of the Dominion. I certainly think the bonus system was the best and most economical that could possibly be adopted for obtaining continental immigrants, and for these reasons I regret its suspension. I believe there is no difference of opinion as to the value of these people as settlers, or as to the fact that we must look to a considerable extent to the continent in settling the vacant lands in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories.

It must be borne in mind also that the payment in question was not an indiscriminate expenditure of money, but simply a payment by result. The success, however, which has attended our efforts in this direction is abundantly proved by the statistics of the emigration that has taken place. I find that in 1885 the total number of bonus emigrants was 448; in 1886, 566; in 1887, 808; and in 1888, 1,430. In this connection it will be remembered that no payments have been made excepting in those cases in which the settlement of the people in Canada has been proved beyond question. From the information I have been able to gather, I fear it is a matter of some doubt whether the steamship agents on the continent will be licensed to distribute printed matter about Canada and endeavour to attract attention to the advantages which are offered by the different parts of the country with that eagerness they have hitherto shown if they have not some more inducement to do so than the steamship and railway commissions.

I would also call to your attention our past experience——

I wish to draw the hon. gentleman's attention particularly to this passage:

—in connection with the cessation of activity in emigration work. We may pursue a policy of comparative inactivity for two or three years, and in this way show some saving in the expenditure, but the time inevitably comes when a period of activity is again necessary, and in order to get the people then, a very much larger expenditure has to be incurred than would have been necessary had a steady and moderate policy been continued, devoted to keeping before the public in all countries wherever emigration has taken place, the advantages of Canada for purposes of settlement. I do not regard our expenditure in connection with emigration either continental or British on this side as having been at all of an extravagant nature. Indeed, it has been exceedingly moderate, and very much less than that which individual railway companies in the United States have devoted year by year to such purposes.

All that I have said on the subject of continental emigration applies with equal force to the importance of keeping the Dominion prominently before the British public. Immigration of certain classes is very essential to Canada, not only to populate the vacant lands, but for the purposes of developing its trade and commerce, and it seems to me that this is not sufficiently borne in mind when the question of the comparatively small expenditure that is necessary to attract it is under consideration in the press and other quarters.

I am, yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) CHARLES TUPPER.

This, it will be seen, was a letter written by Sir Charles Tupper, when High Commissioner to England, to Hon. Mr. (now Sir John) Carling, whose department had charge of immigration work for the Dominion of Canada. Thus it will be seen that the hon. gentleman's own friends took a very different view from that which he takes. And every word of this letter is applicable at the present time. And the letter shows how easily they were satisfied in those days, for it speaks with satisfaction of an increase from 500 or 600 to 1,400.

Mr. MONK. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) has been reading from a carefully prepared document. Would he have any objection to laying it on the table of the House?

Mr. TURRIFF. This is information that I have gathered from the Department of the Interior and other sources and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) will find all that I have said in 'Hansard.'

Mr. MONK. I would like to see the document the hon. gentleman has been quoting from, if he will lay it on the table.

Mr. TURRIFF. It is a letter from Sir Charles Tupper to Hon. John Carling; and as I have spoken a good deal longer than I intended and as I do not wish to take up the time of the House in all the matters here prepared, I should be pleased to hand the matter I have prepared to my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) or to lay it on the table; there is nothing in it of a private nature, it is compiled mainly from the reports of the Department of the Interior.

Now, I think I have shown some reasons at all events why this government should continue the bonus system. I think I have shown that the bonus system is not responsible for any of the undesirables that come into Canada. No doubt we should get some undesirables—you cannot have a quarter of a million of people come into a country during a year without having some undesirables among them. But I venture to say that if we do away with the bonus system we do away with our right of selection and we throw our doors open indiscriminately to everybody who wants to come into the country. The result will be here as in the United States that, instead of getting ten per cent of our immigrants from countries of southern Europe that we look upon as not being the best, we shall get, as the United States are getting from sixty-seven per cent to seventy-five per cent of our people from these countries and only a small portion from the British islands and the northern countries of Europe. So, I think

the government will do well not to pay any attention to the carpings of my hon. friends opposite and their desire to do away with spending money in populating the country, but will continue the good work.

Now, while hon. members opposite are decrying the class of people coming into this country—not only those from continental western Europe, but those from the United States and British isles as well—I should like to show what their friends in the west think of these classes of people. I have here the Winnipeg 'Telegram' of April 16 instant—and I think that nobody will accuse the Winnipeg 'Telegram' of being other than a very staunch and loyal supporter of the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Still, the Winnipeg 'Telegram' is published in Winnipeg, and it has something to say about the class of people who are going in and who are wanted in that western country. It would not agree with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that all efforts should be stopped, it wants to see that country filled up. I will read an extract or two from that paper, written by a man that was sent out by the paper to meet several trains of immigrants coming into the country. Here is what he says:

They were mostly British immigrants, here and there interspersed with a taciturn Scandinavian, who had crossed the Atlantic on the last trip of the 'Empress of Britain,' and were being borne in on the crest of the wave of the immigration of 1908. They were pouring into the country by hundreds, and every outgoing train from Winnipeg was carrying them, here, there and everywhere, distributing them wherever the trail-blazers had hewn the first notches of advancing settlement. Hard times in Great Britain, fulsome praises of Canada from relatives, and chances to do better here had turned their attention toward the great educational campaign that had been instituted across the waters, and the tons of literature that had been distributed advertising the last great west. Hence their wholesale migration. That was also the reason that 'The Telegram' delegated a special correspondent to meet train loads of the new settlers before they reached the western metropolis and to test their plans and see how they were likely to learn the discipline of a new life in the upbuilding of a new country.

Then he goes on to say:

One perceived that they were the prospective tillers of the soil, saw that they were men who were to know what is understood as settlement or home making in western Canada, enjoyed their exuberant optimism, tolerated at times their masterful airs, smiled at their ideas of western geography, and sympathized with them in their temporary dejection. Had I been master of this great country, endeavouring to procure great people to develop her great resources, I admit I would have been satisfied.

There is the verdict of a prominent Conservative newspaper in Winnipeg. The writer admits that he was satisfied. There is another long article here that is well worth reading, but I will not take up the time of the House by reading it. The writer gives the names of a number of men that he talked with, and says:

Andrew Tweedley, a Dumfrieshire Scotchman, was bringing his wife out to Canada and intended to locate somewhere. He had some money laid by to start on. By this time I knew that I had obtained a start. The train had just pulled into Keewatin.

'What I want,' declared William Dryden, a native of Dundee, 'is to have a look at the country. That Dublin exhibition was certainly a fine thing for Canada. If the west can produce what they exhibited there, why, I ought to be in the game to stay.'

Mr. HENDERSON. That is very important.

Mr. TURRIFF. It may not be important to the hon. member, but it is important to the people of Canada. He will find when he goes before the people of Canada that no other subject is as much discussed as the immigration policy of this government, because it is the immigration policy of the Dominion of Canada that has made the difference between 1896 and the present time. So if it is not important to the hon. gentleman——

Mr. HENDERSON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. What I said was that the article he was reading was very important.

Mr. TURRIFF. I misunderstood the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HENDERSON. I admit that I said it in sarcasm.

Mr. TURRIFF. Then I was right in the first place. He will find that the country believes that the government is right in carying out the policy they have adopted. While hon. members may decry the policy of the government for party purposes, their friends in the west will not deny it, because it is filling up the west, it is building up the west; and not only is it building up the west but it is building up the whole Dominion of Canada; because you cannot build up one part of the country and make it prosperous without helping all parts of the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I apologize for having taken up so much of the time of the House. But I regard this as a subject of special importance to Canada, and of special importance to the west, and I felt justified in trying to offset in some degree the very erronous impression sought to be made by hon. members on the other side of the House throughout this discussion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman need not offer any apology for speaking so long on so important a subject. But when he concludes that he has said very

much in support of the bonusing system, one is tempted to believe that his mind has been affected by some of those peculiar religious exercises which he says he has witnessed in Ottawa. As a matter of fact, what he said with regard to the bonus system bears about the same proportion to the rest of his speech that Falstaff's pennyworth of bread bore to his gallons of sack. Let us look for a moment only at certain of his arguments, because I desire to be very brief. He endeavoured to criticise the argument of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) with regard to those who, having gone to the United States via Canada had been turned back by the United States authorities; and he said that of these, 183, or some such number, had drifted from the United States over to Canada and then had attempted to cross again to the United States and been turned back. I would like to ask any man of common sense what there is in that argument. These men were permitted to come into Canada and then they were not permitted to return to the United States. Does not the hon. gentleman's statement of that fact show that the regulations concerning the admission of immigrants into Canada are more lax than those of the United States on their side? One cannot understand what logical result the hon. gentleman was aiming at when he made that statement. Then he says that some 800 or more of these were turned back to the United States because they were public charges. Is he so absolutely ignorant of the immigration laws of this country as not to know that the fact that a man is liable to become a public charge is good ground for excluding him from Canada? What then is the result of his argument in that regard? Does he pretend that these men should have been admitted to Canada in violation of the law, although they were properly turned back to the United States in the proper enforcement of an exactly similar law? Therefore this very feeble attempt at criticism of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier amounts to nothing at all, because the hon. gentleman has not succeeded in making a single point.

Then he has spoken of the wonderful results of the efforts of this government in regard to immigration. Might I ask him why it was, if to this government is due all the credit of the great immigration of recent years, that it was six years in power before there was any very substantial increase of immigration? The great increase of immigration to this country came after the great crop in the west of 1901 or 1902. It was that which advertised Canada to the world, and it was then for the first time that immigration to this country reached the hundred thousand mark. Then he tells us in the most extraordinary statement of all that we are likely, by the abolition of the bonus system, to bring into this country immigration from certain undesirable countries that he mentions. He regards Italy and Russia as especially undesirable, and he declared to this House upon his standing and responsibility as a member, that he believed the abolition of the bonus would result in bringing in immigrants from Italy and Russia. Well, can any man of common sense in this House understand that argument?

Mr. TURRIFF. I did not mention Russia at all. I mentioned Italy and other southern European countries.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not care what country the hon. gentleman mentioned; the argument is precisely the same. How in the world will the abolition of bonuses bring us immigrants from Italy and other southern European countries that we are not now receiving from those countries? Did any one ever listen to such an argument out of the mouth of mortal man as that which was presented by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat? Further than that he told us that the effect of this bonus is to keep undesirable immigrants out of this country. I am quoting his words as exactly as I can from recollection. Well, Mr. Speaker, last year we received 235,000 immigrants. With respect to 20,000 of these bonus was paid, and with respect to 215,000 no bonus was paid. Does the hon. gentleman desire us to understand that the 20,000 alone were desirable immigrants and that the 215,000 were undesirable immigrants?—because that is precisely and exactly the logical effect of the argument which he has addressed to the House in that regard. I do not think I need say anything further; to state the argument is precisely to state its refutation.

Let me say one or two words in regard to certain statements which were made by hon. gentlemen who preceded the hon. member for East Assiniboia in the debate. The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. McIntyre), who, I regret to say, is not in his seat at the moment, made a very sensible speech and with a very great portion of it I thoroughly concur. But, it did not seem to me that in all respects it was up to the standard of fairness which we might expect from that hon. gentleman, because, while he criticised my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) very severely, although in very courteous terms, he endeavoured to lead the House and the country to believe that we were desiring to conceal from the people the fact that the bonus is paid on only a very small proportion of the immigrants. Why, Mr. Speaker, the question was put for the purpose of extracting that very information because the answer to that question is the best possible argument in favour of abolishing the bonus as I shall endeavour to point out further on. How could the hon. member for South

Perth say that there was any endeavour on the part of the opposition to conceal that information from the House and the country when the information was given to this House in response to a question addressed by the government by my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) ? Well, he criticised my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier because of some statements appearing at the head of one of the tables. That table established exactly what my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier was demonstrating and any man looking at that table must be an obsolute idiot if he could be deceived for one minute as to what was intended. He commented on the speech of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier in other respects which I need not especially allude to and his remarks merit no further answer than to say that the statement of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier showed completely the facts as they were disclosed by the official records and no man who read that speech with any care or listened to it with any attention could be deceived by it in any way.

The hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. McIntyre) was good enough to devote some of his attention to myself and he did not seem inclined to accept the statement which I had made when in the west as to the speech which I had delivered at Valleyfield, I think it was. As soon as the report of that speech came to my attention I made the correction, and I would have thought that with the usual courtesy which is extended from one side of the House to the other, my hon. friend might have accepted my statement. However, if he does not see fit to accept it that is his own matter, and I do not know that I shall be greatly distressed on that account. The hon. gentleman showed himself to be the champion of the North Atlantic Trading Company. He portrayed to this House the advantages which resulted from the North Atlantic Trading Company. There is one thing that he forgot; he forgot to explain how it was that so valuable and beneficient a contract as that which existed between this government and the North Atlantic Trading Company was put an end to by the government. Why did not my hon. friend rise in his place in parliament when the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) announced the termination of the contract and protest against it if it were so valuable a contract as he has endeavoured to make it appear. If the hon. gentleman desires any statement with regard to the character of the Galician immigrants he had better not refer so much to my remarks as to those of the hon. Minister of the Interior. In 1901 I listened in this House to the remarks of the hon. Minister of the Interior with regard to these immigrants. Does my hon. friend from Strathcona concur in that gentleman's statement as to their character ? He has read it ; will he state now whether he approves of it or repudiates it ? My hon. friend seems to regard that as a conundrum which he is unable to answer. I listened to the diatribes of the Minister of the Interior. I was influenced to some extent by them. I went west next year myself, I came back from the west and in the year 1903 and again in 1904 I said to this House that I had been subject to some prejudice against these people principally on account of the remarks of the hon. Minister of the Interior, but that I had gone to the west and I had been agreeably disappointed, that I believed the Galicians would make good settlers and I repeat the statement now and state my belief that we would hardly be able to distinguish the second generation from the sons and daughters of Canadians in the west. Last year I repeated to my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior his own remarks characterizing these people in the most scandalous terms and what answer did I get from the Minister of the Interior? I got from him the answer that his statements were facts. I have these words under my hand here and the Minister of the Interior will not see fit to deny them. Thus, if the hon. member for Strathcona wishes to learn the opinion of his leader, which he is not willing either to approve or repudiate, let him turn to the debates of 1901 and commit to memory some of the adjectives which were applied by his present leader to the Galicians. So much for that portion of the matter, except that I want to say one or two words about certain remarks of my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Smith). He has been answered on all points, I think, except one, and that is the one I desire to mention. He declared in this House and he gave me an evasive answer to what I thought was a courteous question that the motion of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier was designed to do away with all efforts to promote immigration to this country. There are no such words in the resolution. My hon. friend from Nanaimo knew that perfectly well when he made that statement. The motion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier simply declared that while it is desired to maintain the efforts to promote desirable and legitimate immigration the time to pay bonuses has ceased; that is all.

Let us look for one minute at the merits of the question itself because I desire to be very brief indeed. Before doing so, however, just let me make one remark. We have had speeches from three or four gentlemen from the west, but from not one of them have we had a single reference to the 200,000 lost immigrants who ought to be in the west but who are not there according to the census returns. Does the member for Strathcona know where they are. Have they been destroyed in some great catastrophe ; are they hidden in some remote corner of the Northwest, have they

gone to the United States, or did they exist only for the purpose of paying bonuses to the North Atlantic Trading Company. In the old days the Minister of Customs made the welkin ring while discanting on these discrepancies between the immigration returns and the census returns, but now there is not one word from him or from his friends as to the whereabouts of these 200,000 lost souls who are supposed to be in the west if the immigration returns are to be believed.

The total immigration to this country, according to a government return, from 1896 to 1907-1908 (nine months) was 1,209,437 ; the bonused immigration was 250,259 and the non-bonused immigration 959,179. Less than one-fifth of the total immigration during that period was bonused. During the very last year the total immigration into Canada was 235,235, the bonused immigration 20,516, and the non-bonused immigration 215,000. Can any hon. member of this House tell me how many of these 20,000 bonused immigrants would not have come to Canada if there was no bonus paid. I am not one of those who believe in the glib story often repeated on the other side of the House about men going to booking agents to decide for them the country in which they shall make their future home. I am firmly of opinion that very few of these 20,000 bonused immigrants would have been lost to Canada if we had paid no bonus at all. We got 215,000 people to come to Canada last year on the merits of Canada and by properly advertising Canada, and on 20,000 immigrants only did we pay a bonus. And when we realize that a very great majority of these 20,000 would come to Canada in any case what man of common sense will say that the motion of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is not absolutely right, and that the time has come to cease giving a bonus for immigrants.

Let us see how these bonuses have been paid during past years. From 1898 to the present time we have paid in bonuses on British immigratns $252,230.89, on United States immigrants, $82,571.97, but on continental European immigrants we have paid no less than $445,811.16, making a total altogether of $781,613.96. I have already said in the House that bonusing might be justifiable under certain conditions and for the purpose of obtaining settlers of a specially excellent type; but I have never heard it claimed that the 20,000 immigrants that came last year under the bonus were of any better class than those who came without the payment of a bonus.

The hon. member for Perth (Mr. McIntyre) called attention to some remarks I made in the House last year when the hon. member for Montmagny moved a resolution in the exact words which the Minister of the Interior used before he took office. On that occasion I said:

I was impressed with the baldness of this resolution when my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne) moved it. But its somewhat bald and abrupt wording was explained afterwards when it was shown to consist of two sentences taken from two speeches of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). It could not therefore be expected to be in precisely that form which would command the adhesion of a majority in this House.

Let us look at it for a few minutes and see what it involves. It declares that the payment of bonuses on immigrants has a tendency to bring a less desirable rather than a more desirable class of people into this country. That was the utterance of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) some few years ago before he was a minister of the Crown. I do not think that sentence expresses a principle in which I would be inclined to confer. It does not seem to me that the payment of bonuses in itself has any tendency to bring in a less rather than a more desirable class of people into this country. That would depend altogether on the way you work it out. If without the payment of bonuses you permit people to come in indiscriminately, if you use every possible means by advertising and otherwise in any particular country from which immigration is not very desirable, you might, without a system of bonusing at all, increase the tendency to bring in people who are not desirable. On the other hand, if you use the system of bonusing, you might attach to it such conditions as would not tend to bring in undesirable people.

I adhere to that statement to-night. I do not see one word in it that is at all inconsistent with the motion of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). The motion of my hon. friend from Montmagny last year with regard to which I spoke was this :

That the payment of bonuses on immigration has a tendency to bring in a less rather than a more desirable class of people, that it is a most unwise policy and expenditure and therefore should not be continued.

If the hon. member for Perth (Mr. McIntyre) were here, I would ask him if he is prepared to extend the same words of commendation to this language of the Minister of the Interior before he took office, as he did to the more recent utterances of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) in regard to this matter. At all events the words quoted in the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Lavergne) are entirely inconsistent with those the Minister of the Interior has since uttered.

Reference has been made to the settlers from the United States who are going into the Canadian west. Having seen something of these settlers during the past year, I am prepared to say that I do not believe there is a better class of settlers in the western provinces than those which have come from the United States. I have seen them in

Alberta and Saskatchewan especially. I have found them imbued with the spirit of our institutions, understanding the principles of responsible government and immediately upon their arrival in this country prepared to take an interest in our public affairs and to assume the full duties of citizenship. I do not think we have anything to fear from settlers of that kind. My hon. friend from Perth alluded to what he termed the spirit of sentiment of Canadian citizenship and the impossibility of our obtaining at the present juncture people from all countries in the world who fully comprehend the spirit of responsible government. I do not doubt at all that men who come from continental European countries which enjoy in some measure at least responsible government will make thoroughly good citizens, but at the same time I believe it to be most desirable so far as possible to bring into Canada and especially into the great west, only those who are already acquainted by active participation, with the duties and the responsibilities and the privileges of that same responsible government which we enjoy in Canada. Let us not forget that criticism has been made upon the English speaking nations of the world—that, the principles of democratic government are only in an experimental stage, and that the day may come when there will be some reversion from the system which we now enjoy, and more absolute system will take its place, for the very reason that men engaged in the haste and pressure of the affairs of every day life are not inclined to give to the service of the state that proportion of their time and energy which is necessary if we are to attain the highest standards of democratic responsible government. If there be anything in that criticism—and perhaps it would not be well to minimize it too greatly—it is certainly desirable that we should get in this country as far s possible men of the type I have described; and therefore, while for the most part, I concur in that regard in what my hon. friend from South Perth has said, I still insist that a great deal of care should be taken in the line of what I have just now suggested.

Of the character of the immigration that is coming into this country, I do not propose to speak by way of distinguishing one nationality from another. I propose to speak of it by way of distinguishing those of any particular nation who are fit from those of that same nation who are not fit to become citizens of Canada. We have gathered some rather important information on this point reported to us from the events of the past year and of the past six months, and I propose to refer for a few moments to a very notable speech—which unfortunately has not been very fully reported—delivered by the hon. Provincial Secretary of Ontario not very long ago. The fullest report of that speech that I have been able to obtain uses the following language:

During 1907 there were 1,163 admitted to asylums of the province, of whom 346 were foreign born.

Mr. Hanna was evidently using the expression 'foreign-born' to indicate those born out of this country.

During the past five years the perecentage of foreigners admitted to these institutions had increased from twenty to thirty per cent, while Canadian born patients had decreased from eighty to seventy per cent. In the same period, from 1903 to 1907, the cost of maintenance of foreign born patients had increased from $24,613.20 to $51,744.30. While the foreign born of the entire adult population were only twenty per cent, the total admissions to asylums from that class was thirty per cent. The figures showed the necessity of effective methods to prevent the dumping of undesirables by friends and others aided by charitable associations with no other object than to get rid of the responsibility of providing for them. Taking into consideration the probable length of life of these patients, the cost of maintaining those admitted in 1907 alone would amount to $1,487,038.80, without including any proportion for capital expenditure.

That statement attracted my attention to such an extent that I sent to Mr. Hanna and asked him for particulars of it, and I have here the particulars which I will take the liberty of bringing to the attention of the House. The statement on which he bases it is this:

For future maintenance we find that the expectation of life (Carlisle) at age 37 (the average of foreign born patients) is 29·64 years; and assuming that the cost of maintenance is $145 per patient per annum (which is a low estimate) the total future cost to the province for maintenance of the foreign born patients admitted during 1907, spread over the years they will be on our hands, will amount to the sum of $1,487,038.80 without taking into account the compounding of interest, cost of buildings and many other items of expense which are sure to arise in the future.

Then he proceeds as follows:

Of the estimated total population of the province over sixteen years of age, 1,209,308 were Canadians and 291,675 foreigners, or twenty per cent of the whole. At the same time, of the commitments to jail thirty-eight per cent were of foreign birth and the cost of providing for them amounted to $21,724.65.

The difference in percentage is rather striking. The percentage of persons born outside of Canada committed to jail should be 20 per cent. Instead of that it is 38 per cent, or nearly double. That seems to me to indicate a rather serious condition of affairs. He goes on to say:

Toronto asylum gave a practical illustration of the position. Of 262 persons admitted less than half were Canadians.

I have obtained the exact figures. They are 134 born outside of Canada and 128

born in Canada, and among those 134 born outside of Canada, 77 were recent arrivals. Mr. Hanna continues :

Of course, many of the foreign born had been resident in Canada for some years, but no less than seventy-seven were recent arrivals, who should have been deported if a satisfactory law had been in force. The majority of these people should not have been allowed to enter Canada. Owing to technicalities, only twenty-four came within the requirements of the Deportation Act, and therefore Ontario had to assume the cost of maintaining forty-three. That meant that the province would have to expend $224,000 for the support of people who had not the slightest claim for their consideration. No matter how it was regarded, the picture was one that could not be contemplated with equanimity. The figures, he claimed, showed that the proportion of insane among arrivals was twenty-six times greater than it should be, and there was a strong suspicion that many were deliberatetly sent out from Great Britain to be got rid of. An analysis showed that whole families of degenerates were included among arrivals, and weaklings of all objectionable types were represented, as well as many with criminal records.

In a communication to me, Mr. Hanna says :

An analysis of their characteristics is an interesting study in degeneracy of a type we rarely see in Canada. Sexual perverts of the most revolting kind, the criminal insane, slum degenerates, general paretics, in fact weaklings of all objectionable types are represented. Whole families of degenerates have been found.

Under these circumstances, I do not think it can be contended that our inspection of these people is what it ought to be. Does the hon. Minister of the Interior or the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) realize the care that is taken in this regard in the Uuited States ? In that country they have created an expert department for the purpose of detecting mental infirmities. While I have several extracts on this subject, I will read only one. Dr. Salmon says :

At first thought it would seem a hopeless task to attempt to pick insane and mentally defective immigrants from the unending lines of humanity which file through Ellis Island, but a systematic plan of inspection has been devised which results in the dectection of many. Officers of the Public Health and Marine Hospital Service, who have had special training in institutions for the insane, are assigned to this duty, and the other medical officers unite with them in searching for immigrants who seem a typical or who present signs even remotely suggesting mental disease.

Then he goes on to enumerate various other precautions taken for the purpose of detecting any mental infirmity.

I would like to make this one suggestion before I close. It does seem to me that we should have some regard to the fact that we have in Canada surely as good a country for the immigrant, under present conditions, as can be found on the face of the globe. I have only to remind my hon. friends opposite, who want to discuss this question in a dispassionate manner and with the view of doing what is best in the interests of the country and of assuring ourselves that future generations will have nothing on account of which to reproach us in connection with our policy, that we have in the Northwest and the eastern provinces as well as lands to offer to the best races of the world which ought to induce the very best elements of their populations to come to this country. Look at the United States to-day. Let me quote the words of Mr. James J. Hill showing how little is left in the United States for the emigrating races of Europe. In an address delivered on 'The Nation's Future' at St. Paul, Minn. on the 3rd September, 1906, Mr. Hill spoke as follows :

The United States has been able easily to take care of the great increase of population in the past because it had a vast area of unoccupied land. This was the main asset in its natural inheritance. Within practically the last half of the last century the whole country from the Mississippi river to the Rocky mountains was occupied. No pressure of population could make itself severely felt when it might be turned loose in such an empire. In those fifty years there were added 547,640,932 acres to the agricultural area, an increase of nearly 200 per cent and the increase in the actually improved acreage was nearly 300 per cent. This is cut off from the list of resources. Within the last six years there have been transferred from public to private ownership more than 100,000,000 acres of government land, an area twice the size of the state of Minnesota. The entire area of surveyed and unappropriated land within the United States is only 2½ times that amount.

At the present rate therefore every acre of public land would disappear within the next fifteen years. But as a large percentage of the lands included in this estimate are wholly or partially unfit for tillage, it is literally true to say that our arable public lands have almost disappeared. And where are our children to find standing room and the tens of millions of the future a place for wholesome industry? This is an intensely practical question. It is immediate. For within twenty years we must house and employ in some fashion 50,000,000 of additional population; and by the middle of this century, at a time when the child now born will be in the prime of life, there will be approximately 2½ times as many people in the United States as there are to-day.

With such a prospect of access of population to this great continent of which Canada forms a part, ought we to be in a hurry to bring into this country any except those who are the most desirable ? Therefore I repeat once more that it is a question of quality and not of quantity to which the immigration policy of the government should in the future be directed. I do not minimize the necessity of the west for

population—the immediate necessity of the west—but with 215,000 people coming in without any bonus at all, surely we may say that the day of the bonus has gone by, and surely, with the reports of the asylums of Ontario before us, we ought to exercise a little more discretion regarding the fitness of these people than we have seen fit to use in the past. The strain of the blood of the people of Canada is a good one. It is one we are proud of. And it is no harm to say so because that man is not worth very much who is not proud of the race from which he has sprung and the blood which runs in his veins. The men who first came to this country, its pioneers, came from the shores of France, and the best blood of France from the peasant to the noble, was represented in that population which came to hew out homes for themselves in the wilderness three hundred years ago. After that we had the great trek of the Loyalists from the United States, at the time of the revolution, into Ontario and the maritime provinces and I believe also into the Eastern Townships. And when my hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) said no doubt inadvertently, that all our ancestors had come to this country for the purpose of bettering their condition, I would desire to take issue with him as regards that particular class. These men sacrificed home and property and prospects, everything almost that men hold dear, in order that they might remain under that flag which floats to-day over Canada and proclaims Canada to be part of the British empire. And later on those who came from Scotland, Ireland, England and Germany as well—the pioneers of Ontario and Quebec and the maritime provinces—these people were surely of the best strain that the countries from which they came could give. They came to the wilderness and hewed out homes for themselves. They converted that which was a wilderness a hundred years ago into a garden. They were the makers of Canada, not only in the material but in every sense, and the history of these people, their energy, their courage, their devotion, their faith in the future of this country, should remain an imperishable memory in the hearts of every true Canadian. Therefore surely the parliament of this country should especially look to it to see that this strain of blood in every province shall be maintained without taint and without loss of the strength, vigour and vitality which we have maintained in Canada up to the present. I have detained the House longer than I intended, and shall only say in conclusion that I shall vote for the amendment of my hon. friend.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Although this debate has been protracted to a very great length, I am sure the time of the House has been very well occupied. In fact I do not believe it has been so well occupied during the whole of this session. The subject brought to our attention is a very important one, and therefore it is important that it should be discussed in all its aspects and phases. If I may be permitted to express my own opinion, I think the debate has been maintained on a very high plane and does credit to the House. As regards the speech of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I am bound to say that he put his views in a very able and on the whole a very moderate manner. But with all due deference to those views, he has failed, in my conception at all events, to appreciate the true point of view—the only point of view from which this question can be approached and solved. The position taken by my hon. friend is that we should put an end to the policy of immigration we have been carrying out for many years. No doubt he will take issue with me on that point and say it is not his intention to put an end to the whole system; but although he does not say so in so many words, he wants to put an end to the salient feature of that system, without which it would be ineffective. He wants to put an end, I say, to that system of immigration, which, at last, has brought under cultivation those fertile lands of the west long dormant, long useless, but now, perhaps, the most important part of our national development. His opinion is that we should let nature unaided produce such results as it may; that we should, in a happy-go-lucky spirit, await and accept such results as chance may bring forth. The motive which has inspired him, so far as I have been able to appreciate it—for, I believe, on this point my hon. friend has not been as clear as in some other parts of his speech—is the fear that the present system which we have followed and are now following exposes us to the danger of having our population contaminated by certain undesirable elements. Well, Sir, the position I intend to take upon this question, the position to which I desire to draw the attention of the House, is that the primary and dominant consideration which should influence every gentleman in this House and this country is to retain and maintain upon the soil of Canada every man who is born in Canada. And, Sir, it is a strange fact, it is a fact that it has only been by the impetus given to our national life through our policy of immigration that we have put an end to the scourge of emigration which, for years, was a running sore in the very vitals of our country. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has spoken eloquently and well of the devotion of those who, in the last years of the eighteenth century sacrificed everything that they might remain subjects of the British Crown, who left everything they had in the American colonies and came here to make

new homes for themselves in what was then a wilderness. The praise he gave to these people could not be too high. There never was, perhaps, in any part of the world, a greater example of devotion to conviction. But, Sir, it is a fact that the descendants of those men, and the descendants also of the early French pioneers who likewise came here from very similar motives to hew out for themselves homes in the forests of Canada—the descendants of these people at a certain time could not find a living in their own country, but went away by thousands and hundreds of thousands to seek homes in a foreign land no better endowed by nature than their own. Must I remind my hon. friends opposite that in the closing thirty years of the last century, up to the taking of the last census, the population of Canada did not increase. Decade followed decade, census followed census, but every census had the same story to tell, that Canada hardly retained even its own native population. During all these years mothers brought forth children, but when the time came to enumerate them they were not to be found in the land. Our census showed that in 1891 the population of Canada was 4,883,239, the increase during the preceding decade having been only 5·9 per cent. At the end of the following decade in 1901, the population was 5,371,315, and during that decade the population had increased barely 11 per cent. And how was that 11 per cent made up? British Columbia had increased 81 per cent. —foreign population; Manitoba had increased 67 per cent—foreign population; the Northwest Territories had increased 113 per cent—foreign population. And what were the increases in the older provinces? In New Brunswick, barely 3 per cent; in Nova Scotia, barely 2 per cent; in Ontario, 3 per cent; in Prince Edward Island less than 1 per cent; in Quebec, 10 per cent. The same story had been told by the preceding census. During that decade, ending 1891, New Brunswick showed no increase; Nova Scotia, 2 per cent; Ontario, 9 per cent; Prince Edward Island less than 1 per cent; Quebec, 9 per cent. These figures show the condition of affairs down to 1901. Sir, it is written in the Book that the Angel of Death visited the land of the Egyptians and smote the first born. If any one, not knowing our history had taken the record of these two censuses, he would have believed that even a worse visitation had come upon us, that the Angel of Death had passed through our land and smitten not only the first born but the whole offspring of the nation. These were not dead, but they were lost to us. They had gone, as I have said, from their own country to benefit and favour another with their presence and their labour.

Sir, in the history of the nineteenth century, there is perhaps no page more notable than that on which is recorded the extraordinary development of the United States which brought its population from only two and a half millions, as it was at the time the constitution was adopted in 1789, to no less than 80,000,000 as it is to-day. What is the cause of this wonderful increase? Undoubtedly, the first had been the glamour under which the new nation sprang into life. The appearance of this new democratic community amongst the monarchies of the world was an event that claimed the attention of the people of every country who had their own aspirations to freedom and who, not satisfied with their own laws, sought refuge in the new land. But it would be a fallacy to suppose that this first cause of immigration to the United States was not favoured and helped by the Americans themselves. My hon. friend the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) stated a few days ago in proposing his motion that the Americans had made no effort to bring immigration into their midst. If he meant that the federal government had done nothing of that kind, he was right. But what was not done by the federal authority was done by the state government. I have only to quote to my hon. friend a book which is in the hands of everybody, the last edition of the 'Encyclopedia Americana.' In that work he will find the following:

> The first legislation in the United States on the subject of immigration was of March 2, 1819, and merely provided that a record should be kept of the number of passengers arriving in each customs district, with their sex, age, occupation and country of birth. For many years there was no thought of anything but exultation in the number of arrivals, as increasing the wealth of the country and providing an asylum for the poor and oppressed. Even the Know-Nothink agitation of the fifties, prompted by political reasons, led to no restrictive legislation. In 1864 the first Immigration Act was passed by Congress, and was to promote and not restrain it; this was repealed 1868. Several states established immigration bureaus to encourage it and draw it their way.

Not only was there this action on the part of several states of the union, but the railway companies likewise established bureaus in Europe to bring immigration their way in order to sell their lands and to create traffic for their systems. Navigation companies did likewise. There was a continuous procession of immigrants from all the countries of Europe into the United States. In that long procession the country which led the way was Ireland. For this immigration from Ireland there was not only the same cause which affected the rest of Europe, but, as we all know, the bad and vicious legislation of years was followed in Ireland by famine. One-half the population of Ireland passed over from that country to the United States. Next after Ireland, the country which stands second in the long procession, in propor-

tion to the number of its population, is Canada. In 1901, as I have just said, the population of Canada was 5,371,315. Of this number 4,671,815 were born in Canada, the rest were born elsewhere. But in that same year the American census showed that of the American population 1,183,255 had been born in Canada. Therefore, we had at that moment of people born in Canada, and living either in Canada or in the United States, 5,855,070. Of this number every one in five had gone to the United States. What was the cause? The cause is not difficult to find. The newcomers in the United States had to be fed and clothed and shod. They had to be supplied with tools, instruments, furniture, with all the requirements of modern civilization. A tremendous impetus was thus given to American industries. The labour market of the United States was a great attraction to our hardy population, who went to find in the United States the employment which their own country could not give them, and there, Sir, you have the explanation of the calamitous exodus which for so many years was a sore upon our country. Under these circumstances what was to be done? Were we to remain idle and make no effort to arrest this current of emigration? No, our policy was to tear a leaf out of the book of the Americans, and we not only tore a leaf out of the book of the Americans, but we went them one better. What the federal authorities at Washington left to the state governments, we did ourselves, and the results have been what we know them to be to-day, that immigration which had been coming in a thin and narrow stream, came at last in a copious flood, and not only was emigration from Canada to the United States stopped, but we now have an immigration from the United States to Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do not the American returns show that there were 19,918 emigrants from Canada to the United States last year?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Pardon me, the records of the United States do not show anything of the kind; they show that out of the immigration which came to Canada last year 19,000 immigrants percolated from Canada into the United States. But the records, so far as I have seen them, do not show that 19,000 native Canadians went to the United States. But, Sir, I do not care so much for statistics in this matter as I do for the horse sense of the people. Does not everybody know to-day that there is practically no emigration from Canada to the United States? Does not everybody now say that there is a stream of immigration from the United States to Canada? Why, Sir, in the olden times when these gentlemen were in office, they used to pile up statistics mountains high to prove to us that the country was prosperous, but when the people put their hands into their pockets they could not find prosperity there. At the present time those hon. gentlemen are piling up figures mountains high to show that there is no prosperity in this country, but when the people put their hands into their pockets they find it there. It is no use for my hon. friend to quote statistics to prove that there is still a current of emigration from Canada to the United States, because it does not exist, and everybody knows it.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you deny the correctness of the American statistics?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is quoting American authorities. I will also quote from an American newspaper, the New York 'Sun,' which a few days ago published this article:

News comes from Winnipeg that the spring tide of emigration from our Western states to Canada has already set in and gives promise of reaching at least high water mark. This is a serious loss to the United States. Accepting, as we may, the Canadian statistics of immigration, it appears that since the opening of the century about 300,000 people have moved across the line to make homes in Canada. Probably a few have returned, but most have stayed and are content to stay.

These people do not go to Canada because they are not doing well in the United States, but because they hope to do better in the new land. Many of them are of the class which has made our great west. They or their fathers obtained lands in the west either by homesteading or by purchase for a small sum an acre. They can now sell their holdings for many times the original cost and take their money, their experience and their equipment into a new country, and there buy land for a few dollars an acre and see its value increase as did the value of their farms in this country.

Speaking in the Canadian House of Commons a few days ago, the Hon. Clifford Sifton said of these people:

I desire to say that I do not think any country could possibly get a better class of settlers than the western Americans who have come into our western provinces. They are vigorous, resourceful, law abiding; they become citizens the day they arrive in the country, and at the earliest possible moment they become producers.

I am glad to see that this testimony of my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) is verified by the testimony of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. This article goes on to say:

In point of numbers this exodus from our west to the Canadian west is in part offset by arrivals in our eastern states from eastern Canada, but Canada gets much the better end of the bargain in the exchange of population in both quality and quantity. Comparatively few Canadians now come to this country either for temporary work or for permanent residence, and many who came in earlier years have gone back, some to their former homes and many to new homes in the Northwest.

Many of these Canadian transients and many of the American emigrants take money with them. A considerable cash capital is not at all infrequent.

Mr. J. D. REID. Was a bonus paid on them ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, I would like to know what my hon. friend wants to make out of that question. If he knows himself he will tell us ; for my part I do not understand him. Now, this is the result of our policy. I say, subject to contradiction, and I do not think I can be successfully contradicted, that our policy has put an end to the scourge of emigration. But now the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) comes forward and says, Halt, stop all this, reverse your policy. I answer the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, if we halt, if we reverse our policy, and revert to the old conditions which existed before this policy was adopted, what would be the result? Let me say here that this policy was not our own creation, it was not our own invention, it was the invention of hon. gentlemen of the Conservative party. They do not seem to be at all proud of it now, but it is their misfortune. Because it is successful now they do not want it, and they did want it when it was not successful. Why was it not successful? Because they never carried it out with a stout heart. They always administered it in a feeble manner, in such a feeble manner that at one time they thought seriously of putting an end to it. But there was at that time a man of resolute opinion, a man of strong courage, if there ever was a man who had courage, and the name of that man was Sir Charles Tupper. Sir Charles Tupper wishes the Canadian government of to-day to maintain this policy, and he has reason for it. I will not quote the letter which he sent to Mr. Carling, it has already been quoted by my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff).

Now, I shall give the House the opinion of a noted French economist as to what would be the effect of a cessation of immigration to this country. Mr. Anatole Le Roy-Beaulieu is one of the leading French economists of the present day. He wrote an article to apply not to this country but to the United States, but I quote it, as the condition is absolutely similar in Canada, to show what would be the consequences of what is suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite. Mr. Le Roy-Beaulieu contributes an article to 'La Revue Hedomadaire' of January 4, 1908, upon American immigration, and this is what he says :

With a large number of Americans there exists, at present, an inclination, if not to prohibit, at least, to restrict immigration. Their present laws have already set an obstacle in its way; all who desire to land there may not do so. There are certain categories of people excluded—those stricken with contagious diseases, idiots, anarchists, the indigent and those who threaten to become a menace or a burden for the commonwealth. Every immigrant should be possessed of ten dollars. This amount might be slightly raised; entrance might be made more difficult; but it is not apparent that this would be a benefit to the United States. To diminish immigration would be to check the development of the population in the United States, and thereby shackle its economic impetus—for, it must not be lost sight of that, if the United States has had such a wonderful expansion in the world, it is due above all to immigration. It has been proven that families, which have been American for four or five generations, are less prolific than are the families of immigrants. Consequently, it might well occur that, with the checking of immigration, the population might become stationary.

Who would benefit thereby? In the first place, Canada; possibly also Europe. But they who would above all benefit thereby are the Latin American states. They will possess vast expanses of territory calculated to form two or three republics such as the United States. It would greatly benefit Mexico, Brazil, the Argentine Republic, the Latin section and Latin civilization—all of which need scarcely more than a strong current of immigration to equal the United States in development. It may possibly happen that when the United States has two or three hundred millions of inhabitants, there may no longer exist there any interest in securing emigrants from Europe. Moreover, it is questionable whether in fifty years, or in one hundred years, the European population will continue to increase as it does to-day and have as large a number of emigrants to forward to the shores of the other continent.

Be the future what it may, it now seems that, from both the standpoints of population and of industrial activity, the United States has every interest in not closing its doors against the newcomers from Europe.

Up to the present, it is true, not only has the United States freely received emigrants, but has quickly naturalized them. Frequently they have been accorded the rights of American citizenship before they were able to exercise them. Therein lie abuses and mistakes from which the United States, from which at times the European peoples, might have to suffer: but the remedy is easy. All that is required would be to exact a longer sojourn on the part of the emigrants before granting them the rights of citizenship. For exemple, they might be accorded after a residence of twenty years; a knowledge of the English language might be required of them. In a word, it would be easy to raise a barrier in the pathway of those strangers who unduly lay claim to such rights. To this I can see no serious objection. The Americans would gain thereby; equally so would the European countries; possibly even the emigrants themselves, for when they secure their rights of citizenship too easily they become the prey of politicians who dragoon them, who, for party and not for national interests, drive them to vote. Consequently, a title to American citizenship not being so freely granted, benefits would arise for all—save the adventurers and political agitators.

This reservation as to the obtaining of

political franchise being excepted. I believe that the United States would commit a grave error in opposing any legal barriers to the emigrants from Europe. The United States has every interest, political and economic, in remaining, as heretofore, open to all white men who are sufficiently enterprising to brave the Atlantic. In the past century this has been one of the sources of American greatness, it is still so for the present, and will long remain so in the future.

This is intended for the American people but does not every word of it apply also to Canada? If we check immigration to this country we thereby check our prosperity and we expose ourselves to the danger of reverting to the position in which we were ten years ago. Now, what is the objection to this policy? The objection which has been raised is not against the policy itself so much as against the possible consequences of the policy. It is that, possibly, if we maintain that system of encouraging immigration, we may bring in a certain number of undesirables and degenerates. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) insisted upon that at great length and he made some statements which rather gave me a shock. He stated that our surveillance was not as effective as that of the Americans, and that we accepted degenerates and undesirables. Our immigration laws are almost word for word in that respect the same as the American laws. But, the statement of my hon. friend, or the impression that he gave was that the surveillance of the Americans was much more severe and exacting than ours and that ours was very lax. He also made the statement that we allowed in certain parties who, upon seeking admission to the United States, were rejected as undesirables. My hon. friend, as I said a moment ago, made certain statements that gave me a shock and I thought I would investigate the matter for myself I will give the result of my investigation, but perhaps I cannot do better than give the very words of my hon. friend in order that I may not misquote him or be unfair to him. This is what he said on that question on the occasion to which I have reference:

Of those arriving at Canadian ports with the avowed and declared intention of going to the United States there were 12,663 and 183 were debarred. What became of them when they were debarred at our Canadian ports I do not know, it is impossible to find any trace of their disposition. Were they sent back to Europe in the vessels in which they came to Canada? I doubt it very much. If, on the contrary they did not land and proceeded without examination to one of the examining stations on the Canadian frontier and were there debarred, I doubt very much if they were deported back to Europe.

The second class are those destined to Canada and who have gone to the United States within a year after their arrival in this country. They have to submit to examination at one of the numerous examining stations which the United States government have established along the border, on the ground that we admitted a great many undesirables who found their way into the United States. After having made representations to the Canadian government on that subject which to a large extent the American commissioners admit have been carried out, still they have found it necessary to establish these posts of examination. In the second class of immigrants we find 8,517 and 589 were debarred. I shall not go into the details of the causes of their exclusion from the United States, many were refused admission for those causes which were causes of exclusion from Canada and how they succeeded in entering Canada I do not know. Nor do I know what became of them when they were refused admission to the United States. It is impossible to trace the matter any further, but my own view is that they remained in Canada, and that we have to-day in Canada these immigrants who were deemed undesirables under the American law for pronounced and stated causes.

Nothing can be clearer than that my hon. friend conveyed the impression that while the Canadian authorities at Quebec had allowed a certain number to come in of an undesirable character these parties, upon seeking admission to the United States, were turned back and they had remained in our midst ever since. My hon. friend professed to be very much aggrieved by that state of affairs. My hon. friend and I are old friends and I would not leave him in an agony of doubt. My hon. friend is pained and chagrined to believe that there are hundreds and perhaps thousands of degenerates who have sought admission to the United States but who were kept in this country. But if the hon. gentleman had looked further into the report of the American commissioner from which he quoted he would have been relieved of his pain; he would have found there that according to the report of the American agent these degenerates have been sent back to Europe by the Canadian authorities. This is what I find in the report of the American commissioner, and if my hon. friend had examined it more carefully it is there for him to also find it.

Notwithstanding the fact that the bureau of immigration was duly represented at all the Atlantic ocean ports of the Dominion of Canada by a commissioner and a full corps of inspectors as early as 1893, no deportations whatever are recorded prior to the above mentioned date, (September 1, 1901) so that the whole value of accomplished results up to that time was lost, firstly for want of a sufficient border force, and secondly because the Dominion of Canada made no scrutiny of its immigrants, and consequently had not made arrangements, at least in practice, for deporting undesirables.

Now, however, a change has been effected, a most salutory one, in both instances, the United States has strongly guarded the border at all its vulnerable points, and the Dominion government finding the unwelcome stream

successfully dammed and flowing back on itself, has made very rapid strides towards adopting a policy, in the main similar to the bureau's policy.

As an evidence of this change, it should be stated that the Canadian immigration department has deported a large number of applicants for admission to Canada on the ground that they were unfit to mingle with the citizens of Canada in the pursuit of that life and pleasure which they came here to find.

Not only has Canada deported large numbers of undesirables, who sought to permanently settle in Canada, but of the 24,797 applicants for permission to pass through Canada to the United States, those who were rejected by your officers as unfit persons under United States laws, because of being afflicted with loathsome contagious diseases, were deported to Europe by the Dominion immigration authorities, the steamship companies bringing them to Canada being compelled to return them and to assume all expenses incident thereto.

Mr. MONK. This surely could not apply to the immigrants who have come from Europe and who have been admitted to Canada by our own authorities and who within a year or after a year at one of the border stations tried to get into the United States and are refused. We could not deal with them because we have admitted them into this country.

Mr. TALBOT. How do you know ?

Mr. MONK. I know because there is no doubt about it. What the right hon. gentleman has said may perhaps apply to the immigrant when he arrives in Halifax or at the first port of landing in America, but it cannot apply to the other two classes I refer to, namely, the immigrant who is admitted to Canada by our own authorities and who is refused at Niagara or some other border station within a year or after a year.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In the observation of my hon. friend there is both an admission and a negation and I will deal with the admission first. He may have said to-day that this report of the American agent applies, as it does apply, to those who land in Quebec intending to go to the United States, but what my hon. friend did say the other day was :

Of those arriving at Canadian ports with the avowed and declared intention of going to the United States there were 12,663 and 183 were debarred. What became of them when they were debarred at our Canadian ports I do not know, it is impossible to find any trace of their disposition. Were they sent back to Europe in the vessels in which they came to Canada? I doubt it very much.

The hon. gentleman doubted it a few days ago but he does not doubt it now.

Mr. MONK. There is no proof of it in our own reports on immigration.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is a proof of it in the report of the American commissioner from which my hon. friend was quoting. I shall read the words again.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What page ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Page 79.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What report ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The report of 1904 which was quoted by my hon. friend (Mr. Monk). There is there a statement that those who are undesirable under American laws and landed at Quebec were sent back to Europe. This is what the American commissioner says :

Not only has Canada deported large numbers of undesirables, who sought to permanently settle in Canada, but of the 24,797 applicants for permission to pass through Canada to the United States, those who were rejected by your officers as unfit persons under United States laws, because of being afflicted with loathsome contagious diseases, were deported to Europe by the Dominion immigration authorities, the steamship companies bringing them to Canada being compelled to return them and to assume all expenses incident thereto.

Nothing could be plainer than this. Even on the admission of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) this applies to those who landed in Quebec with the intention of going to the United States. The hon. gentleman asks : What becomes of those who resided in Canada for some time and then sought admission to the United States? Well, as I understand this report—but as to this I do not speak with the same certainty as with regard to the other question—as I understand this report those people were also examined at the border station and sent back because the American agent here speaks of 24,797 applicants for permission to pass through Canada to the United States and at page 87 of the report I find :

——	No. manifested.	No. admitted.	No. rejected.
Examined at ocean ports of arrival..	15,399	15,097	262
Examined by border boards of special inquiry..	9,438	8,771	667

—and it gives the total manifested at 24,797 which is the same number mentioned by the commissioner in his report when he says :

But of the 24,797 applicants for permission to pass through Canada to the United States, those who were rejected by your officers as unfit persons under United States laws, because of being afflicted with loathsome contagious diseases were deported to Europe by the Dominion immigration authorities, the steamship companies bringing them to Can-

ada being compelled to return them and to assume all expenses incident thereto.

Therefore it shows as I understand it, that although they came later on they were examined at the border stations and rejected and sent back to Europe. If that be so it is a complete answer to my hon. friend. But even if it were not so, are we to reject a system of this kind because there may be abuses under it. If my hon. friend were logical his conclusion would be that if the Americans have a superior system of examination we should adopt their system of examination but not reject their policy. Now, to deal with the remarks of the leader of the opposition ; he stated and stated correctly that many degenerates from England have been brought into Canada. But, Sir, far from that being a part of our system of immigration it is absolutely against our system, and we are doing our best to prevent these degenerates from landing in Canada. We know that charitable institutions are disposed to send such people out here, but we have protested against it and the Minister of the Interior in order to prevent a practice has issued an order in these words :

The minister, therefore, recommends that an order in council be passed prohibiting from and after the fifteenth day of April, 1908, the landing in Canada of any person whose passage has been paid, wholly or in part, by any charitable organization or out of public moneys unless it is shown that the authority in writing of the assistant superintendent of emigration for Canada in London, has been obtained for the emigration of such person, and that such authority has been acted upon within a period of sixty days.

This regulation will it is expected absolutely do away with the practice which has prevailed in this respect. There is another feature of this question as to which I shall say a word. My hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne) and my hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Robitaille) have complained that we have no emigration system in France. But before I refer to that let me say to my hon. friend from Montmagny that he made a statement in his speech which on reflection he seriously should regret, because it is absolutely unfair to a gentleman who is not in this House to defend himself, and for whose alleged action my hon. friend has sought to make the Canadian government responsible.

My hon. friend in his speech the other day wanted to prove that Mr. Smart had intended to devise a system specially against French immigration, and he thought he would support his contention by an extract from a newspaper which he had quoted last year. The extract is as follows :

The 'Northern Express,' Liverpool, February 10, 1902.—British blood is needed.

The Hon. J. A. Smart, Deputy Minister of the Interior of Canada, and Mr. W. T. R. Preston, immigration agent general for the Dominion, arrived in Liverpool to-day from London and Glasgow to arrange a gigantic system of British immigration to Canada.

More British blood is also needed to be infused if the views of the Dominion of Canada is not to be Frenchified by the rapid growth of the French population.

Now, Sir, I ask my hon. friend, as a fair and candid man, where does he find that Mr. Smart used that language.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. It is a mistake in 'Hansard'; the last words are the words used by Mr. Smart.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have looked at my hon. friend's language in 'Hansard' of last year, and it is exactly the same.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Yes, because I had the paragraph saying that Mr. Smart had said so and so, but I did not put in any notes. Only his words in 'Hansard' are copied exactly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have not the paper at hand. I can only tell my hon. friend that if this is all the authority he has for accusing Mr. Smart, he is guilty of a serious and unwarranted accusation against an honourable man. First of all, is it fair or right? This is said to be an act in 1903. Mr. Smart has not been in the service of the government for four years. The attention of the government was never called to anything of the kind.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I beg the right hon. gentleman's pardon. It was called to their attention by the ex-member for Labelle, Mr. Bourassa.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. When?

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. At the time the statement was made, in 1902.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I never heard of it. I do not say that it was not done, but my attention was not called to it. If it had been, I would have thought it advisable to have called Mr. Smart's attention to it. But to say that we are responsible when Mr. Smart has not been in the employ of the government for four years is stretching our responsibility to an extreme point.

But now I come to the statement of my hon. friend from Montmagny that we have no system of immigration in France. I say at once that our system of immigration in France has been inadequate ; but we have had no better system there because we have had no direct line of communication between Canada and France. The government has made efforts for twenty years to establish such a line, not only for commercial purposes but for purposes of immigration. The moment we established a line of communication with France we

attempted to establish a system of immigration in France, and at present we have four immigration agents in that country—Mr. Wiallard, Mr. Foursin, Mr. Geoffrion and Mr. Montpetit. In addition to these we have sent from time to time different agents. H. F. Morel was appointed as delegate to Belgium for four months from December 7, 1907. Mr. Morel already has had experience at this work, having been employed for six months by the department as special agent from December, 1905, to June, 1906. Paul Auve, Morinville, Alberta, has been offered a position as farmer delegate in France. The department is not yet advised of his acceptance. He is a practical farmer and has spent fifteen years in western Canada. J. E. Deslauriers has been appointed temporarily to do emigration work in France and Belgium. He would probably enter upon his work on or about the 1st instant. Edouard Parent, of St. Jean Baptiste, Manitoba, had been appointed as farmer delegate to France. The appointment is for three months from January 20, 1908. Mr. Parent is a qualified farmer and strongly recommended as a suitable man.

Now that we have a line of communication with France, we will pursue the work with all possible diligence, because we realize—and in this I am sure I voice the sentiments of everybody in this House and out of it—that we cannot have a more valuable class of immigrants than the French peasants and the Belgian peasants. Every one acknowledges that they possess thrift, morality and all the qualities that go to make good citizens. For these reasons I think my hon. friend will exempt us from the blame he has attempted to fasten upon us.

Now, I have only one word more to say. Everybody admits that one of the sources of wealth of any nation is its immigration. All economists agree that the immigrant brings with him a source of wealth, not only in the cash which he possesses but in the labour he brings to the country of his adoption. The value of the wealth which an immigrant brings to a country has been variously estimated; it is impossible to give an exact figure in that respect. Some have estimated the value at $1,000; but this is not very satisfactory. I find in an American work on immigration by Prescott F. Hall, a paragraph which sems to give a fairly satisfactory basis of estimating the value of an immigrant. Mr. Hall says :

> It is difficult, therefore, to say precisely what the money value of the immigrant is. The remote as well as the immediate effects of his coming must be considered, and also the state of employment and the rate of wages at the time of his arrival. A thoroughly conservative estimate is probably that of Mr. John B. Webber, formerly Commissioner of Immigration at the port of New York. He assumes that there were 10,000,000 foreign born at the date of the eleventh census and that 2,000,000 of these were working at an average of $1 per day; and he points out that these persons added $600,000,000 a year to the earnings of the country.

Now, Sir, last year we received over 200,000 immigrants. If we take the estimate of Mr. Hall that twenty per cent of these were earning $1 a day, these immigrants added to the wealth of the country no less than $12,000,000. We know for a fact that the American immigrants brought into the country, in money and goods equivalent to money, in one year $49,000,000 and in another year over $50,000,000. Does anybody think under such circumstances that we should deprive ourselves of the valuable addition to our wealth which our policy of immigration has brought to this country ? Sir, if we were to do that, we would revert to the condition of ten years ago when we were losing our population. I do not claim that the policy we have at the present time is to be permanent ; it is only a temporary policy ; it cannot last for ever ; but under the existing circumstances, with a powerful neighbour to the south, having a population of 80,000,000, while our population is only 6,000,000, the time has not yet some for departing from that policy, and I would therefore invite the House to reject the motion of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Monk.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lewis,
Armstrong,	Macdonell,
Bennett,	McCarthy (Calgary),
Bergeron,	McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Blain,	Martin (Queens, P.E.I.),
Borden (Carleton),	Monk,
Brabazon,	Morin,
Broder,	Paquet,
Chisholm (Huron),	Perley,
Christie,	Reid (Grenville),
Clements,	Robitaille,
Cockshutt,	Sproule,
Crocket,	Taylor,
Daniel,	Verville,
Elson,	Walsh (Huntingdon),
Fowler,	White,
Henderson,	Wilmot,
Jackson (Elgin),	Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Lancaster,	Worthington,
Lavergne (Montmagny),	Wright (Muskoka)—42.
Lennox,	
Leonard,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Adamson,	McColl,
Archambault,	McCool,
Aylesworth,	McCraney,
Beauparlant,	McIntyre (Strathcona),
Beland,	McKenzie,
Bickerdike,	McLennan,
Boyer,	

Brown,
Bureau,
Burrows,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Caron,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Copp,
Delisle,
Demers,
Desjardins,
Dubeau,
Dugas,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Galliher,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Gervais,
Girard,
Graham,
Grant,
Guthrie,
Hall,
Hunt,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne (Drum. & Arth.),
Loggie,
Lovell,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Martin (Wellington),
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Michaud,
Miller,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Parmelee,
Paterson,
Parent,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Pugsley,
Ratz,
Reid (Restigouche),
Rivet,
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schell (Oxford),
Sifton,
Sloan,
Smith (Oxford),
Stewart,
Talbot,
Telford,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turcotte,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Walsh (Montreal, Ste. Anne),
Watson,
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—95.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Greenway,	Tisdale,
Maclean (York, C.),	Northrup,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),	Ganong,
Schell (Glengarry),	Barker,
Gordon,	Kemp,
Knowles,	Roche (Marquette),
McLean (Huron, S.),	Owen,
Fielding,	MacLaren,
Dyment,	Beattie,
Macdonald,	Stanfield,
Smith (Nanaimo),	Foster,
German,	Osler
Harty,	Hughes (Victoria),
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Haggart,
McCarthy (Simcoe),	MacLean (York, S.),
Sinclair,	Porter,
Cyr,	Lake,
Roche (Halifax),	Ward,
Black,	Pringle,
Crawford,	Clare,
Law,	Smith (Wentworth),
Clarke,	Marshall,
Devlin,	Lalor,
Lemieux,	Forget,
Carney,	Barr,
Brodeur,	Ames,
Conmee,	Bristol,
Wilson (Russell),	Seagram,
Cash,	Avery,
Knowles,	Boyce,
McIntyre (Perth),	Thompson,
Finlay.	Schaffner.

Amendment, Mr. Monk, negatived.

Motion agreed to and House went into Committee of Supply.

Progress reported.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I beg to give notice of the following motion. I propose to move in amendment to the motion to go into Supply when next made :

This House regrets that the sums spent by the country to pay bonuses on immigration have not been employed in bringing back to our country the Canadians who have emigrated to the United States.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12.45 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, April 24, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

LANDS IN SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved that the House go into committee on Monday next to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that the Minister of Finance may, under the authority of the Governor in Council, pay to the proper authorities of each of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, out of the Assurance Fund formed under the Territories Real Property Act, chapter 26, of the statutes of 1886, and continued under the Land Titles Act, 1894, chapter 28, of the statutes of the year, so much thereof as has arisen from transactions relating to lands now within such province.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

SALVATION ARMY IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called I wish to rise to a question of privilege relating to a letter written by Dr. Nadeau, medical officer of the immigration branch at Quebec, which I will read before the House because he apparently so desires. Dr. Nadeau is under the impression that in the remarks which I offered the other day upon the question of immigration I did cast insinuations upon

the integrity of the medical men of Quebec who are immigration officers. Here is what he writes to me:

Quebec, April 21, 1908.

My dear Lavergne,—My attention has just been called to a report which 'L'Action Sociale' of the 18th instant has given of a speech purpoted to have been lately delivered by you in the House upon the question of immigration.

Following is the report of 'L'Action Sociale:'

THE SALVATION ARMY.

I challenge the minister, said Mr. Lavergne, to have an inquiry made into the Salvation Army and the immigrants it has brought into Quebec, and to ask the doctors at Quebec to give their evidence; but I hope this time the government will not stop the mouths of the witnesses who give evidence. There has been collusion between the officers at Quebec and the Salvation Army and I have it from officers who receive the immigrants at Quebec that before they pass the medical examination these immigrants go to the barracks and get the password of the Salvation Army at Quebec, and then go back and answer the doctor. The minister cannot contradict that, if he looks at the correspondence produced.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member is making a great many statements which he puts forward as statements of fact. The statement that immigrants coming out under the auspices of the Salvation Army are treated any different from any other immigrants who come out, so far as my knowledge goes, is absolutely incorrect; and if he can by any means demonstrate that it is the fact we will have a change in the immigration service at Quebec immediately.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. All last summer the immigrants brought out by the Salvation Army were sent to the barracks and there they got the password from the Salvation Army officers to answer the doctors of the Immigration Department. Not only was a complaint laid before the Interior Department here, but Mr. Doyle and the immigration doctors at Quebec, I think Dr. Nadeau and Dr. Potvin were advised, that if there were one hundred Salvation Army immigrants, they would pass before the doctor first, but if less, they would go to the barracks first. That is the statement I have to make and on it I would like the department to throw more light.

Dr. Nadeau adds:

So then, the Salvation Army of England, exclusively, devotes its attention in the recruiting of immigrants, without trying to locate them, relying as to that upon its representatives at Quebec, whose business office is under the same roof as the office of the government agent himself, where all examinations are passed, medical and civil.

As a rule, those representatives keep a list of employment offers to several mechanics or to farmers far in excess of the number of arrivals. Thus they are able to direct systematically and more safely these people to their destination.

The immigrants who do not come under the auspices of the Salvation Army are supposed to have received at the time of their departure from Europe the necessary directions that will enable them to reach their destination; at least, that is mentioned on their tickets. So that they can go directly from the medical inspectors to the civil inspectors, who require them to say what trade or calling they follow, and where they are going.

At first, immigrants coming out under the auspices of the Salvation Army, having passed the medicad examination, had to go to the barracks to learn what their destination was and then came back to comply with all the requirements of the civil examination.

That system gave rise to many inconveniencies, above all it greatly delayed the inspection. It was then decided that the immigrants would go to the barracks first in order to learn what their destination is and should afterwards pass the medical examination, so as to be able to give all the necessary information, when passing the civil examination.

This rule was to apply only if there were less than one hundred Salvation Army immigrants. Otherwise, the Salvation Army officers, for convenience sake, volunteered to attend at the arrival of the steamer at Rimouski, in order to acquaint all the passengers with their destination, so that everything should be ready when they landed at Quebec.

Neither Mr. Doyle or the doctors did ever receive from Ottawa any directions as to that; but the representative of the Salvation Army the immigration agent and the doctors came to an understanding. Besides, all those particulars of the administration are settled in the same way. Our instructions concerning the medical examination of the immigrants admit of no relaxation in favour of anybody, neither for the Salvation Army people nor for any other immigrants. Moreover, I am at a loss to understand what password could be given to the diseased immigrants, so as to conceal their shortcomings, when they come to pass the medical examination.

Dr. Nadeau's letter shows that what I stated the other day is entirely true, namely, that the immigrants who come out under the auspices of the Salvation Army are treated differently from other immigrants. The officers of the Interior Department at Quebec confer with the representatives of the Salvation Army. I said nothing else. I never intended to cast any reflection upon the integrity of the medical officers at the port of Quebec. I am satisfied that they all discharge their duty. This I did say and I say again: the immigrants that come out under the auspices of the Salvation Army receive a different treatment; the officers of the Army that take care of those immigrants are located in the same building as the immigration agency. When they come out, they do not know where to go, having all been inscribed by their officers as farm labourers; then the representatives of the Army direct them where to go, and as the majority of them are mechanics they do not go out and work upon farms, not-

withstanding the policy of the government, as laid down by the minister.

THE NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—MAJOR HODGINS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I have received from Mr. Parent, the Chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commission, the following papers, which I desire to lay before the House :

The Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway, Ottawa.

Office of the Chairman,
April 23, 1908.

Memorandum to the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Prime Minister.

A letter from Major Hodgins, lately our district engineer, at Kenora, Ontario, has been given wide publicity in the press, namely by the Manitoba 'Free Press' and the Ottawa 'Morning Citizen,' where it was commented upon.

There are insinuations and statements in it that should not be allowed to pass unanswered.

Without laying any specific charges, Mr. Hodgins makes vague, general accusations that are absolutely groundless. It is plain that the object in view is to cause us annoyance, without any regard to truth or public interest.

If Major Hodgins has had in his possession any evidence of irregularities or wrong-doing, he should have submitted such to the commissioners. As a corporate body, and being the first concerned, it would have been our duty to investigate the matter promptly. If he had done so, and the commissioners had refused to look into his charges, then he might have been justified in issuing statements to the public. There is nothing in Major Hodgins' allegations to indicate that he is even now in possession of any such evidence.

Taking up seriatim the allegations in Major Hodgins' letter as printed in the papers:

1. That the government is paying padded accounts for the work done, and that the Grand Trunk Pacific people are making no objection because they merely have to pay the added interest.

This statement is without any fondation. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company make objections when they see fit, and these are looked into at once with due care.

2. They (the commissioners) wanted to change my ideas, based on a good many years experience, on the construction to the classification that is allowed to contractors in Quebec.

This statement is also without foundation. The commissioners never, at any time, requested Major Hodgins to adopt in his district any classification not in accordance with the contract and specifications. As to the classification in Quebec, it was looked over and found to be agreeing with these and therefore perfectly regular.

3. If Mr. Poulin, the engineer appointed by Mr. Parent to replace me on the western district, has allowed the introduction of a classification similar to that allowed in Quebec, this will account for the increase in the estimatetd cost of the line. If this increase amounts to $3,000,000 or $4,000,000 it is time the public demanded some explanation.

Such hypothetical statements of course amount to nothing at all. In the first place, Mr. Poulin was not appointed by Mr. Parent, the chairman, who did not even suggest it, but by the board, on the recommendation of the chief engineer, because he was considered to be the best man for the position and to take hold of the work of organizing the district, which had been left in such a bad shape by Major Hodgins. At this point it may be well to remark that classification comes from the chief engineer and not the chairman or the commissioners as Major Hodgins puts it.

Since leaving our employment, Major Hodgins has talked a good deal openly, in fact much more than professional dignity and the sense of justice would seem usually to permit. It is time, we feel, in justice to ourselves and to the public, before whom there is an evident desire to misrepresent the facts, to call a halt and make it necessary for the accuser to bring facts to substantiate his charges.

You will find, attached, newspaper clippings in reference to Major Hodgins' letter, and all correspondence relating to the circumstances of his dismissal; also a letter from our chief engineer, Mr. Lumsden, on the same subject.

In conclusion the commissioners would respectfully request, as they do not wish to remain under the aspersion which such reports cast on them, that the whole matter be referred to and looked into by a committee of the House, and that Major Hodgins be assigned to appear before the same to repeat his charges in a specific manner in order to substantiate them if he can. Then an opportunity will be given right minded people to see where the truth is and if public interest would have been better served by keeping an engineer who ignored the specifications or by replacing him, as was done, by one who will follow them.

The commissioners trust their request will receive early attention.

S. N. PARENT,
Chairman.

The communication of the chief engineer referred to in this letter is as follows :

Ottawa, April 23, 1908.

Sirs,—In regard to the article which appeared in the Manitoba 'Free Press' of the 18th instant and the editorial in the 'Morning Citizen' of the 22nd instant referring to a letter from Major E. A. Hodgins, now of Victoria, B.C., I beg to state that as far as I know no estimates or accounts for work done have been padded. The Grand Trunk Pacific have made from time to time some general objections as to classifications in district 'F,' but until after the dates above referred to no details giving actual points where such over-classification was claimed were submitted to me. As you are aware I on the 14th and 30th January, issued special circulars to the district engineers, giving my interpretation of clauses 34, 35 and 36 of our general specifications accompanied by a diagram explanatory of same, and I have letters from the district engineers in districts A, B, and F, where actual grading was being proceeded with, stating that my interpretation had been and is being adhered to. My letter of the 19th of September last to the chairman, gives

my reasons for suggesting a change in district engineers in district F.

Your obedient servant,
HUGH LUMSDEN.

The Commissioners of the
Transcontinental Railway,
Ottawa, Ont.

In view of the request contained in this letter, I beg to inform my hon. friend and the House that on Monday next I will move that the matter be referred to a special committee for investigation.

ALLEGED IRREGULARITIES AT SOREL.

Mr. BERGERON. I beg to renew my question of yesterday as to whether a report has been made by Mr. Gaudet who has conducted the Sorel investigation and to ask the minister to bring the report down to the House if it is ready ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Gaudet came to Ottawa the other day to complete the investigation. I hope the report will be ready for Monday.

INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Finance Minister any information to give us with respect to the Insurance Bill which was brought down some weeks ago ? It was the subject of more or less investigation in the Banking and Commerce Committee, but since that time little has been heard of it.

Mr. FIELDING. In view of the very extended hearing which took place before the Committee on Banking and Commerce and the numerous statements made, I desired that some time should elapse before proceeding with the Bill, in order that the officials of the Insurance Department might have an opportunity of studying all that was said. We hope at an early date to make a further move in the matter.

QUEBEC BRIDGE COMMISSION REPORT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the Minister of Railways any further information in regard to the printing of the report of the Quebec Bridge Commission ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I made inquiry concerning that report, and I believe that the report proper with the appendices will be printed in a very short time. The drawings and the other parts of the report will be a little later.

I might say in this connection that I propose to move at the proper time that more than the ordinary number of copies shall be printed on account of the very many inquiries we have had for the report. We have had several cables from Europe, and the High Commissioner has informed us that he has had a great many inquiries. In order to supply that demand which I think we should do for the general information of the public, we will have to send quite a large number there. It strikes me that it would be very proper that at least one or two copies of the report should be placed in each public library and that every university library ought to have two or three copies for general information. With this in view I propose at the proper time to move that we have a larger number printed than the regular number.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY—HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE—THE HANEY CLAIM.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). I desire to ask whether or not the claim for extras made by Mr. Haney in connection with the construction of the Hillsborough bridge a few years ago has been allowed, or what progress has been made ?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The claim made by Mr. Haney was not all for extras. The claim would have been disposed of had it not been for a change in chief engineer of the department which rendered it undesirable for the present chief engineer of railways and canals to deal with the accounts, they having already been dealt with by him as chief engineer of Mr. Haney, as he was at that time. The matter was referred to Mr. Schreiber who had been chief engineer, his powers being extended so that he could deal with the question of equity as well as those directly coming under his charge as chief engineer. Mr. Schreiber made an award, the amount of which, I fancy, will have to be placed in the supplementary estimates and can then be fully discussed. The papers in the case were brought down some time ago.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Can the minister tell us the amount of the award and the amount of the claims of Mr. Haney which are not for extras ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The documents containing all this information have been on the table of the House for some time, or if not, they will be presented to the House. Speaking in round figures and from memory only, I believe Mr. Haney's claim was for $390,000, and the arbitrator awarded him $164,000.

SUPPLY—TIMBER LIMITS—DREDGING.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (Leeds). Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I have a few words to say on two or three subjects. I understood last night that the order of business to-day would be Supply, the estimates of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugs-

ley) being taken up. I see that hon. gentleman is not in his place; and, as in a few minutes, I wish to address a few remarks to him, I will thank the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he will ask the Minister of Public Works to be in his seat. Meantime, I will occupy a few minutes with another matter.

I am not at all surprised that the government, after having a number of scandals exposed during the present session in connection with timber limits, mining leases, civil service administration, dredging contracts and numerous other matters, have sent the rank and file of their supporters hunting through the files of the departments covering the term of the Conservative administration for material to offset these scandals, if possible. We have many instances here in recent discussions of hon. gentlemen referring to matters which they could only find in the files of the departments. It is evident that a horde has been sent hunting through the files containing the records under the Conservative government to see if something could not be raked up reflecting upon the action of Conservative members of this House. A few days ago, an hon. gentleman was put up to make charges against myself. This hon. gentleman said:

I also find another member of this parliament who is known to most of you, Geo. Taylor M.P., who made application for friends for townships 39, 40 and 41, ranges 18, 19 and 20 west meridian, not a very small application; he did not go in for small things.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR. I immediately rose in my place and said:

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. gentleman will allow me—he has been perusing the records, I presume, of the Department of the Interior, where he gets his information. I challenge him to produce an application signed by me on behalf of anybody. Mr. Walter Beaty made an application in his own behalf, and I forwarded his letter. The hon. gentleman cannot find anything else in the department, no application that I ever made, either on my own behalf or on behalf of anybody else. He has made a statement. I challenge him either to produce the proof or to withdraw the statement.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. The hon. gentleman is like the rest, he says he made an application, and gives the name of one.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, I did not make an application; I inclosed his letter in one I wrote to the minister.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. That is just as good.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is that a crime? It is simply disgraceful for a member to get up in his place and make a charge against a member of parliament, and then either refuse to take it back or to produce the document.

And further on:

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman said that the applications are on file; are they in the department or in the library?

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. I said the records were in the library.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where?

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. In the 'Hansard.'

Mr. TAYLOR. In the speech made by the late Ananias Cameron?

Mr. SPROULE. And John Charlton.

Mr. TAYLOR. They made statements, as the hon. gentleman is making them, without any authority.

I repeat that challenge to-day—let the government search every file during the administration of the late Conservative government, and they will not find an application made by me, either on my own behalf or on behalf of anybody else for any timber limit. I happened to be in the Public Accounts Committee and was looking over one of the files that had been brought to the committee in charge of an officer of one of the departments—for members of the opposition have no rights, we are told, and a government officer was in charge of the file. I looked over it and made a précis of what the file contained. Here is a portion of it:

Letter dated September 2, 1903, from Latchford, McDougall & Daly, applying on behalf of Colin & Campbell, of Edmonton, to have department advertise a timber berth in the district of Alberta, 8 miles by 3½ miles on each side of McLeod river. Berth was numbered 1096.

September 10, 1903. Letter from P. G. Keyes to Latchford, McDougall & Daly, informing them that berth 1096 should be shortly advertised.

Letter dated September 10, P. G. Keyes to Crown timber agent of Edmonton, informing him to the same effect.

September 10, letter from P. G. Keyes to E. Stewart, Department of Forestry, Ottawa, inclosing copy of advertisement for berth 1096 in district of Alberta.

There are a lot of other letters on file that do not amount to much, but after a while we come down to a letter dated Ottawa, November 11, 1903, as follows:

I hereby offer a bonus of $1,000 for timber berth No. 1096 containing square miles, situated for which public competition is being invited, and I inclose an accepted cheque on Traders' Bank for $1,000, being amount of said bonus.

(Sgd.) JOHN GENTLES,
Kincardine,
Per J. T.

On the margin is marked 'received cheque $1,000, 11-11-03.'

(Sgd.) P. R. for accountant.

This letter is marked as having been received, stamped with the Department of the Interior, Wednesday, 18th November, 1903, Timber and Mines Branch.

On the bottom of the letter is written in red ink to address letter to Hon. John Tolmie, Kincardine, Ontario.

This tender was received in an envelope bearing no post-mark, the address printed thereon being 'Timber and Mines Branch, Department of the Interior, Ottawa.'

There is no stamp on envelope as to when it was received.

Memo. attached: John Gentles, care of Hon. John Tolmie, Kincardine, Ontario.

Cash $1,000 bonus for license to cut timber on limit 1096.

And here is copy of a receipt dated November 11, Department of the Interior, Timber and Mines Branch :

Received from John Gentles, care of Hon. John Tolmie, Kincardine, Ontario, the sum of one thousand dollars in payment of bonus for a license to cut timber on limit No. 1096.

(Sgd.) G. U. RYLEY,
Chief Clerk,
Per Fans Loyer, book-keeper.

Then there is more correspondence involving a good deal of dickering, but I need not quote any of it until we come to a letter dated Kincardine, 11th February, 1904, and addressed to P. G. Keyes, secretary :

My Dear Sir,—Inclosed please find license duly signed by Mr. Gentles and returned by myself. There is something I do not fully understand, and that is that while the license states the lease is from December 11, 1903, to April 30, 1904, the receipt for moneys paid states from December 11, 1903, to December 11, 1904. Kindly explain this.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) JOHN TOLMIE.

Then there is correspondence showing that the ground rent had not been paid. Mr. Keyes writes to Mr. Tolmie stating that amounts owing on berths 1092, 1095 and 1096 had been called to his attention on 28th September, and if they were not paid within thirty days steps would be taken to have berths cancelled, and he now begs to state that the amount involved had not been paid, and that Mr. Gentles' right to cut timber on these berths was withdrawn from the records of the department. Mr. Tolmie wrote back immediately under date of November 20, 1905, as follows :—

Hon. Frank Oliver,
Minister of the Interior.

Dear Mr. Oliver,—I inclose you a letter from the secretary of your department which explains itself. My partner, Mr. John Gentles, in this deal——

Mr. Gentles was his partner in this deal. It looks as if he had had a good many other deals.

My partner, Mr. John Gentles, in this deal was inclined to throw up and hence the delay in paying the ground rent. Kindly send me statement of account due with interest to date and we will send it to you on receipt of the statement.

Kindest regards from yours truly,
JOHN TOLMIE.

Mr. Tolmie was a member then, because there were several letters addressed to him in the House of Commons when the correspondence was going on. I need not read all the letters, but there is another one here dated 16th June, 1906.

W. W. Cory,
Deputy Minister of the Interior.

Dear Mr. Cory,—As I told you the other day by phone we sold the limits owned by

Mr. Gentles and myself, 1092, 1095 and 1096, on the McLeod river, Alberta. The ground rent has been paid by us until either the 1st of May or 1st of June, 1906. The parties purchasing the same assume the payment of the rent for 1906-7. The assignment from Mr. Gentles, signed by him, has been mailed to you, and I trust the non-payment of rent by us for 1906-7 will not be a bar in the way of closing the assignment as we have lost enough. The party purchasing them has inspected the limits and are satisfied, and I trust you will complete your part with us with as much despatch as possible.

Then comes the assignment of these limits to Mr. Gentles at $4,000. These are copies of the original documents on file, showing that a member of this House, while he was a member, made application with his partner Mr. Gentles, and got a limit from this government and sold the same for $4,000. Yet in the face of facts such as these, hon. gentlemen in the back benches will get up and accuse hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who never had anything to do with limits, in order to throw out to the country that we were as bad or worse when the Conservatives were in power. That is all I propose saying on that matter.

Now I have another matter with regard to which I wish to say a few words with regard to the Minister of Public Works. Two days ago when my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) moved the adjournment of the House in order to discuss an important matter—and it has turned out to be important, because since that discussion the Minister of Public Works has cancelled the order in council that he had passed renewing certain dredging contracts. When the matter was up I undertook to discuss a question relating to the Quebec harbour improvement in which there was some dredging, and the Minister of Public Works raised a point of order that I could not discuss that matter because the motion only referred to dredging contracts in the neighbourhood of Midland. But in reading the resolution, you, Mr. Speaker, said it read 'there and at other points' and you authorized me to speak on dredging elsewhere. Then I referred to a contract that was given by this government and notified the Minister of Public Works not to renew it again. It was given in 1903 for the Quebec harbour improvements, in which there was a large amount of dredging done, but with the dredging there were certain goods supplied. That contract has been extended from year to year up to last year. There was paid on the first contract, No. 4613, $183,000. Then it was extended by order in council and a new contract, No. 5111, was made, on which $224,000 was paid. That was renewed by another order in council, and on the new contract, No. 5693, $107,000 were paid. Then it was renewed again by another order in council, a new contract was made, No. 5888, on which there were paid $98,000. A total of

$614,000 was paid in four years for the harbour improvements in Quebec. A contract was given to a firm by the name of Dussault and Lemieux. I presume they may have had it extended, I do not know whether there has been an order in council extending it to this year or not. But I drew the attention of the House to the fact that according to my information, which I believe is correct, a contract for dredging was given at 75 cents a yard, and the gentleman who got this contract had neither dredge nor anything else to do the work with, and they farmed it out for 15 cents a yard to other contractors, and pocketed 60 cents clear for themselves on this job. More than that, they had clearing work to do. This dredge that was getting 75 cents a yard dumped the material over into the dock and then got 32 cents a yard for the filling. This is my information, and I believe it is correct.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the hon. gentleman tell me to whom they farmed it out?

Mr. TAYLOR. We will likely have an inquiry, and we will get the particulars, but I am anxious that another order in council should not be passed extending the time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would it not be more convenient to discuss it when we have the inquiry?

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend might pass an order in council extending the contract, and rob the country for another year. It is to prevent that taking place that I bring up this discussion now, and to notify him that this contract must not be extended another year. Now among the items charged for there are drift bolts, iron, 105,600 pounds at 7 cents a pound. Any person who has ever built a dock knows that drift bolts are simply a bar of iron cut in lengths of 10, 16, 18 or 24 inches long, pointed or sharpened, and anybody knows that you can buy iron at $1.60 or $1.75 per 100 pounds. Yet these gentlemen have been paying from year to year 7 cents a pound for these drift bolts. I took the trouble to write to a party to know what he would furnish them for, and this is what he answered:

I have your favour of the 19th and am much obliged. Bolts such as you ask about including drift bolts pointed at one end are worth about 3 cents per pound. It would depend altogether upon the nature of the specification and how badly we wanted the order, but you could figure two and three-quarter cents per pound as a minimum and about 3½ cents per pound as maximum. This would be f.o.b. factory.

Having a nut on one end would not affect the price hardly at all, as these large nuts are sold almost at the same price as bolts.

They get 8 cents a pound for screw bolts, iron. A screw bolt is simply a steel plate with a hole punched in it, and anybody can buy them for 2 cents a pound. Then we find stone ballast in cribs, 10,500 cubic yards at $1.25. Dredging foundation, 18,000 cubic yards at 75 cents a yard. This is being farmed out at 15 cents a yard. Then stone and gravel foundation, 4,490 cubic yards, at $2.50. Earth filling, 60,400 cubic yards at 32 cents. This was lifted up by the dredge at 75 cents and dumped in at 32 cents more.

Mr. JACOB T. SCHELL (Glengarry). The hon. gentleman characterizes the price as extremely high for the drift bolts. Would he be surprised to know that Mackenzie and Mann are paying me to-day 7 cents a pound for drift bolts. and the prices are put down by themselves in cases where I had no special price mentioned and the quantities are much larger than he has quoted.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. gentleman wants to make a good profit, I will supply them at 2¾ cents and ship them from the factory.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. I can buy just as cheaply as the hon. gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR. My word is as good as the hon. gentleman's. I will supply the bolts at 2¾ cents. I will get a man who will take the contract for supplying the bolts to Mackenzie and Mann at 2¾ cents.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. Does he mean the bolts with the nuts on?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes. They say they make no difference between the drift bolts pointed without the nuts and with the nuts on.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. I will take a contract at that rate.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then I will give it to you.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. Nothing smaller than three-quarters of an inch.

Mr. TAYLOR. We will discuss that afterwards. Any statement I make here, I am prepared to carry out. The hon. Minister of Public Works attempted to bluff——

Mr. PUGSLEY. To what? Do I hear the hon. gentleman right?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes. You undertook to bluff me the other day. If that expression is not parliamentary, Mr. Speaker, I am willing to withdraw it, but I want the minister to understand that as regards being conversant with the practice of this parliament, he is a mere fledgeling and is losing his time when he attempts to practice on old parliamentarians what perhaps he had the privilege of doing in New Brunswick.

Mr. BENNETT. Do not stir up his feelings.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have always thought, and the people have a perfect right to think,

that when an hon. minister makes a statement in parliament, that statement should be true as the gospel. But when he makes a statement that is not in accord with the facts, how much confidence can the people place in him? Here is the statement I made the other day:

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works, if he has yet completed the return in reference to Petit Rocher?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On making inquiry of my deputy, I find that the answer given contained exactly the information which was asked for, that is, matters detailed on a certain page of the Auditor General's report. If any hon. friend desires further information and will be good enough to put another question, I shall be glad to give him the further information.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was not a question at all but a motion for a return.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was for a return as to matters detailed on a certain page of the Auditor General's Report, and that return has been made and is complete.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is the minister's reply.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR. And he puts the onus on his deputy. I am acquainted with his deputy, and I am satisfied that his deputy would not put in anybody's mouth a statement not in accord with the facts.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR. That statement must have come directly from the minister. Now what are the facts ? Here is the motion I made for that return, and in that motion there is not a word making any reference at all to the Auditor General's Report. Yet the minister says that my motion had reference to matter contained in that report.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the hon. gentleman kindly read it?

Mr. TAYLOR. I read it before and the minister went away and came back and tried to bluff me the second time. I shall read it now and ask the hon. gentleman to make an apology:

Return to an address of the House of Commons, dated the 15th January, 1908, for a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, orders in council, contracts and tenders, with the names and amount of each, in possession of the government or any member or official thereof, respecting the construction of a breakwater at Petit Rocher, on the southwestern side of Baie des Chaleurs, as detailed on page 74 of the report of the Minister of Public Works, for the year ended 31st March, 1907.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Quite so.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is there anything in that about the Auditor General's Report? That refers to page 74 of the minister's own report. Yet he comes here and will not give me the answer but tells me something that is possibly untrue. Here is the report. What does it say?

Petit Rocher is a farming, fishing and lumbering settlement on the southwestern side of Baie des Chaleurs, twelve miles north of Bathurst.

To afford protection to the fishing boats and vessels trading in Baie des Chaleurs, for which there is no natural shelter in the vicinity, and to facilitate the shipment of lumber, a contract was entered into May 31, 1904, with Simon McGregor, for the construction of a breakwater, consisting of a main work, 209 feet long on the outer face, and a wing or 'L,' placed at an angle of 74 degrees 30 minutes with the main part, 160 feet long on the outer face. The width on top will be 30 feet. At its inner end the breakwater will be 480 feet from the shore. The depth along the inner face varies from 11 to 18½ feet at low water.

In 1904-5, a right of way, 860 feet long, from the public road to the shore was opened up, graded and fenced.

The contract work was begun on March 18, 1905, and by the end of 1904-5 two cribs, 96½ and 41 feet long respectively, had been built and sunk in place.

A crib to form the remainder of the work was started on February 19, 1906, but on March 11, when it had reached a height of about six tiers, it was carried away by the ice. It was, however, recovered on May 14. The outer section, which was intended to complete the main part of the breakwater was found to be intact and work on it was resumed. By the end of the fiscal year this crib had been built to a height of nineteen tiers and the two cribs sunk in 1905 had been filled with ballast and built up to half tide level, and the upper ballast floors were laid.

During the fiscal year 1906-7, the crib forming the remainder of the main work was sunk in place and a crib to complete the 'L' was begun and placed in position. The building of the superstructure was continued on the main part up to about high water level, when two storms, on November 12 and 16 carried away nearly the whole top, the break being about 9 feet in extreme depth.

Work was resumed on March 7, and by the close of the fiscal year the remains of three damaged tiers of face timbers had been removed, and a part of the wrecked superstructure near the southern end rebuilt, the interior being filled with ballast.

The expenditure for the fiscal year 1906-7 was $5,029.60.

That is what I wanted the information for.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It seems a pity to take up the time of the House discussing whether or not a certain return is according to the motion calling for it. My hon. friend says he has the most perfect confidence in my deputy. I may repeat to him that the instructions sent to my deputy were to furnish a complete answer to the motion made by my hon. friend, and the return laid on the table was made by the deputy. If the hon. gentleman doubts my statement, he is at perfect liberty to communicate himself, either in writing or verbally, with the de-

puty, and my deputy will confirm what I have said. If there be any omission, it rests with the deputy, and the deputy informed me that he had made a complete return as required by the motion.

Mr. TAYLOR. After my having read the motion for the return and pointing out that the return simply comes down to 1905 and does not refer to the carrying away of the piers, as detailed in page 74 of the minister's report, referred to in the motion for the return, or the expenditure since, or who the contractor was or how the contract was let, the hon. gentleman still insists that it is a complete return. But is it not evident that the return is not complete, and that the minister's statement the other day was not in accord with the facts?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I called the attention of the deputy to the page to which my hon. friend refers, and the deputy still asserted that he had sent a complete return of all the correspondence which there had been upon the subject as detailed upon that page of the report. It was the report of the Minister of Public Works. It is a misquotation when the Auditor General's Report is mentioned. It was the report mentioned in the motion of my hon. friend which was referred to the deputy and his return is based upon that. When I called his attention to it he assured me that he had sent a complete return of everything in the department on the subject.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then the minister had better go back to the department and give his deputy a lecture for putting in his mouth a statement which is not correct When I brought it up upon the first occasion I got the same answer. I brought it up again and I was put down; I could not proceed to discuss it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I must take the statement of my deputy.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have not received the information as yet, and I want the return completed. The return brought down only goes to 1905 and the expenditure is in 1906-7.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman will put the matter in the form of a question I will see that he will get a complete answer.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will put no more questions until the return is completed or until the minister complies with the order of the House. The minister must obey that order and complete that return.

Mr. PUGSLEY. All I can say to my hon. friend is that I can do no more than I have done.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then the minister had better resign his position.

Mr. PUGSLEY. One moment——

Mr. TAYLOR. I am making my speech, and when I get through the minister may get up and answer me. All he can do is to come here and tell us that the deputy has told him he has complied with the return, that he can do no more when, on the face of it, he must know and admit before the House that the return is not complete and that he made a statement the other day which is not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know it, I do not admit it, and I shall believe my deputy until I learn the contrary.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would believe the deputy, too, much sooner than I would believe the minister in view of the statement which he made in the House the other day I have as much confidence in the deputy as the hon. gentleman has, because I knew him long before the minister did. I can tell the hon. gentleman that hon. members on this side of the House are not going to be bluffed down by him saying that is the only return, or that is all you can get unless you put another motion or ask another question. I am not going to put another motion and I am not going to ask another question ; I am going to ask the minister to comply with the order of the House and complete that return.

Mr. TURGEON. I might give an explanation to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor), who has just taken his seat, in reference to a portion of the work at Petit Rocher. The contractor is the master of his own work, and if, through inexperience, he makes mistakes he is responsible for them and has to account to the department for them. A portion of this work, in the spring of 1906, was carried away by the ice. The tide is very strong in that locality and the ice carried away the work. He was responsible for it and had to pay for it. He had to do his work over again, and naturally nothing would appear in the accounts of the engineer or of the department. The contractor had to make good the loss and that should explain the lack in the report of the department.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turgeon) admits that the return which has been brought down is not complete?

Mr. TURGEON. It is complete in so far as the department is concerned. The contractor paid $4,000 or $5,000 twice, but that was his own loss and the department has not lost one dollar by it.

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

Public Works—chargeable to income—Nova Scotia—Antigonish, public building, $7,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This amount is required to complete the new building which is in course of construction at Antigonish.

Mr. BERGERON. What kind of a building is it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A public building, brick with stone foundation, 33 x 35, 2½ storeys high.

Mr. BERGERON. What is it to be used for ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Post office, customs house and office of the resident engineer of the Public Works Department.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there much business done at that point?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is quite a thriving town.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it a port of entry?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. How much will the building cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $28,700, which will include the cost of the building, heating, plumbing, wiring, fixtures, furniture, &c.

Mr. BERGERON. How much did the land cost and from whom was it purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the memorandum here ; the cost of the site is not given.

Mr. BERGERON. When was that building commenced?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was begun in 1905.

Mr. BERGERON. Whom was the site bought from and how much did it cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I find that the site was owned by the Crown, so that we had nothing to pay for it.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who is the architect?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Ewart, the Chief Architect of the department. The plans were prepared in the department under the direction of the Chief Architect.

Mr. BERGERON. Shall we have any more to vote after this, or is this the end of it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, nothing more to vote; this is the end of it.

Mr. J. D. REID. Was there any outside architect employed to make these plans?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No outside architect.

Mr. J. D. REID. I think the hon. minister stated that the plans for public buildings were mostly all made in the department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, plans for post offices, custom houses and buildings of that kind are in the great majority of cases made in the department.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there a superintendent of the work during construction?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, there is a clerk of works.

Mr. BERGERON. Who is he, and what is his salary?

Mr. PUGSLEY. His name is Mr. McGillivray, and he received $3 per day.

Mr. BLAIN. What was the total payment to the clerk of works?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot at this moment tell my hon. friend, but he received $3 per day.

Mr. FOWLER. For the four years during which the buildings has been under construction?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Simply while the work of construction has been going on.

Mr. FOWLER. Has not this building been under construction for many years? I remember that the first vote for it was taken when the gentleman who is now a member of the Transcontinental Railway Commission was a member of this House for the county of Antigonish.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract was let in 1905. That would be something over two years.

Mr. FOWLER. Was the clerk of the works paid for all that time?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume he would be paid for the time he attended the work.

Mr. FOWLER. Why would this building require three years to complete?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is quite an expensive building—a $28,000 building.

Mr. FOWLER. It should be built in four or five months.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that the contractors are very excellent people—Rhodes, Curry & Co.—and would not take longer than was necessary.

Mr. FOWLER. Would the hon. minister say that a building that would cost $28,000 would not be unduly delayed if it took two years to complete it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would not necessarily follow that it was unduly delayed. The contract was not let until the summer of 1905, and it would not be many months until the winter was on, when building operations would cease.

Mr. FOWLER. At what time was the contract let?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not until June.

Mr. FOWLER. There would be ample time, then, to have the outside walls erected before the winter. I have done a considerable amount of building myself, and have built up to Christmas in the climate of New Brunswick, which is not very much less severe than that of Nova Scotia, and I do

not think there would be any difficulty at all about completing the outside walls of this building by the time building operations would have to cease for the winter. The inside work would certainly be done in the winter time. Have you no memorandum of what the inspection of this building cost? —because sometimes the cost of inspection bears a very large proportion to the cost of the work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say to my hon. friend that the expenditure under the head of incidental expenses was $1,938, which would include the salary of the clerk of works, and I presume also advertising, printing, and the like of that. If my hon. friend wants to know exactly what was paid to the clerk of works, I can get it.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes. What is Mr. McGillivray's occupation?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not his occupation. His name is A. McGillivray.

Mr. FOWLER. It would not follow that he would be a builder at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I should be glad to get the information for my hon. friend.

Mr. FOWLER. He might be a tailor, you know.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Sometimes tailors are men of very good judgment.

Mr. FOWLER. Very good judgment indeed, in the cut of a suit of clothes, but not necessarily in the quality of work on a building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I know that my hon. friend would think, although he is a lawyer, that he knows a good deal about building.

Mr. FOWLER. Because I have built a good many buildings.

Mr. BERGERON. Was the work let by tender and given to the lowest tenderer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let by tender. Three tenders were received in answer to public advertisement, and Rhodes, Curry & Co. were the lowest and received the contract.

Mr. FOWLER. What was the amount of the tenders?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They ranged from $14,990 to $19,898.

Mr. FOWLER. What did these tenders cover?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will tell my hon. friend what they did not cover—the heating, the wiring, the town clock, the fittings.

Mr. FOWLER. How much would it cost for the heating?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $1,095.

Mr. FOWLER. Who had that contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Rhodes, Curry & Co.

Mr. FOWLER. What was the cost of the wiring?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $650.

Mr. FOWLER. Do I understand the minister to say that it cost $650 to wire the building for electric lights?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not only to put the wiring in, but also for the fittings and electroliers.

Mr. BERGERON. Did Rhodes, Curry & Co. get the contract at that tender of $14,990?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. How much have they received altogether?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could not tell my hon. friend what has been paid to Rhodes, Curry & Co., but the total amount paid to the 31st of October, 1907, was $21,323.

Mr. BERGERON. Did the contractors do the work for the price tendered or were they paid extras ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They did not receive any extras. They were paid $14,990, the amount of the contract.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. minister has already paid out $21,000 and is asking for more. He cites one contract for $14,990. Will he give the other contracts for the extra expenditure ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Printing and advertising, clerk of the works salary, &c., $2,024.90.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to have the separate items.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I should be very glad indeed to get them for my hon. friend but I cannot have them this afternoon.

Mr. FOWLER. Better let that item stand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend not think he should allow that to pass, on the understanding that I will furnish the information on some other item ?

Mr. FOWLER. The trouble is you never furnish it but always forget.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will undertake to furnish it.

Mr. FOWLER. Go on and give the items.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Printing and advertising and clerk of the works salary, &c., $2,024.90 ; paid to the contractor up to 31st of October, 1907, $14,990. That is the price of the contract. For a boiler, $229.80.

Mr. FOWLER. From whom was that bought ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know, the price is not very high.

Mr. FOWLER. It depends on the kind of boiler.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Tower clock $1,140.

Mr. BERGERON. From whom was that bought ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From R. D. Kirk. There were tenders called for.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it the custom of the department to put up clocks on all the buildings ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not in all of them, but in towns of some considerable importance the department has very frequently put up clocks in the towers. Sometimes the tower is built suitable for a clock. Some twenty years ago a building was erected by the government and the holes were made in the tower for a clock. A few weeks ago I had a delegation urging most strongly that I should supply the clock which should have been supplied twenty years ago.

Mr. BERGERON. I hope you will do it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I intend to.

Mr. BERGERON. Are you going to put up a clock in the Valleyfield post office ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend will make representations on the subject, I will consider the matter.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, I make the application now.

Mr. FOWLER. How about the post office at Sussex ? Is there a clock there ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is there a tower provided for the clock ?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, there is an opportunity to put a clock there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If there is any provision made for a clock, I will consider the matter. That building was erected fifteen years ago, did the hon. gentleman ever urge very strongly that a clock should be put there ?

Mr. FOWLER. I did not suppose it was the policy of the government to distribute these clocks. But now that the government are so generous, I thought it would be quite in accord with the policy of the minister and his love for that constituency which he used to represent, that he would undertake to do something for it. It is certainly as important as Antigonish.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hope the hon. gentleman will not try to prevent this being done for Antigonish.

Mr. FOWLER. It is done already so that I could not prevent it even if I wanted to.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Tower clock, $1,140 ; sidewalk, &c., $735.30.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that sidewalk just in from off the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is the paving all around the public building.

Mr. FOWLER. What material ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume granolithic.

Mr. TAYLOR. How many square feet ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The size of the lot is 240 square yards and my hon. friend can figure that out for himself.

Mr. TAYLOR. You cannot figure from that. I do not know how wide the sidewalk is and how many square feet in it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a corner lot.

Mr. TAYLOR. How many square feet around the lot? Is the sidewalk three feet or six feet wide ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not that information, I am sorry to say.

Mr. FOWLER. Is the sidewalk on four streets or on two streets ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On two streets.

Mr. FOWLER. That is a pretty good price.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that a granolithic, fairly wide sidewalk would probably cost that much.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the size of the building ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Thirty-three feet by fifty-five with an annex twelve by thirty-three.

Mr. FOWLER. The annex would not be on both streets. There would be no sidewalk for the annex.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The sidewalk would be on both streets.

Mr. FOWLER. You can only figure 33 feet one way and 55 the other ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I take it for granted the government would build a sidewalk around the whole lot.

Mr. FOWLER. They would go to the line of their lot. Is the lot 55 feet each way ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The only information I have here with regard to the lot is that it contains 240 square yards.

Mr. FOWLER. At $700 you would be paying two prices, but that is not sufficiently unusual to be remarkable.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I forgive my hon. friend that statement because if he did not make it, he would not be acting in accordance with his usual practice. He often indulges in these statements but perhaps thoughtlessly.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister knows me better than that.

Mr. STANFIELD. Is it not usual for the town or city to pay some proportion of the cost of the sidewalk or does the government put a sidewalk all around the lot?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect informs me that where the government erects a building and a sidewalk has to be built, the government usually pays the whole cost.

Mr. STANFIELD. The sidewalk around the post office in the town of Truro is in very bad condition. I would like the government to put that sidewalk in good order, if it is their business to do that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would be repairing the sidewalk. No doubt if the town made representations to the department, they would be received with a desire to contribute something, probably pay half the cost.

Mr. FOWLER. At the public building in Sussex there is no sidewalk laid down by the government at all. I would suggest that the government put a sidewalk there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is there a sidewalk on each side of the building ?

Mr. FOWLER. There is a street but no granolithic sidewalk.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In cases where the town has built a granolithic sidewalk along a public building——

Mr. FOWLER. But the town has not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume that the sidewalk in front of the public building in Sussex is the same as the sidewalk on the street above and below. It would be somewhat anomalous to have a different sidewalk in front of one building from that in front of the buildings on either side.

Mr. FOWLER. Not necessarily?

Mr. TAYLOR. If your lot is 60 feet front by 120 feet deep. which is a large sized lot for a town, as in most towns they are 40 feet front by 80 feet, and supposing the sidewalk is six feet wide——

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am told that it is 12 feet wide.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, I will double it. On the basis on which I have started—a sidewalk 6 feet wide, you would have a total of 1,080 square feet. At 16 cents a square foot, that would amount to $172.80. Or double it, and you have 2,160 square feet costing $345.60.

Mr. FOWLER. That is what I say—we have paid about double.

Mr. TAYLOR. And my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Henderson) says that in his town they get this work done for 12 cents. I paid 16 cents for a sidewalk in front of my own house last year.

Mr. FOWLER. Did the minister say there were 240 square yards in the lot?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. The other expenditures are wiring and fixtures, $660; furniture and letter boxes, &c., $1,343.09; total expenditure up to October 31, 1907, $21,323.

Mr. BLAIN. Were tenders asked for the boxes?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to get at the size of this lot.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I told the hon. gentleman I could not give the frontage and depth but the area is 240 square yards.

Mr. FOWLER. That is an exceedingly small lot. To pay $200 for a sidewalk on two sides of such a lot would be an enormous price.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) is astray in his arithmetic.

Mr. FOWLER. If the lot were 12 yards one way by 20 yards the other way, that would make an area of 240 yards. Reduced to feet, such a lot would be 36 feet front by 60 feet deep. Or, for two sides of the lot 96 running feet. If you make a sidewalk 12 feet wide you would have 1,152 square feet which at 16 cents would be $184.32. I think that arithmetic is pretty nearly according to Sangster.

Mr. BERGERON. How much was paid for the sidewalk?

Mr. FOWLER. $750. When I said the hon. gentleman paid about double, I was figuring on the size of the lot he first gave. But it appears now that, instead of paying double, he has paid over four times.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) speaking of the cost of granolithic pavement from any experience?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, I have built many square feet of it at my own expense around my properties in Sussex.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What does it cost?

Mr. FOWLER. Sixteen cents.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the depth of the granolithic material?

Mr. FOWLER. You measure by surface measure.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But I suppose something would depend upon the location—whether the lot was high and dry or whether you had to go deeper for a foundation.

Mr. FOWLER. Something would depend upon whether you had to build up or not. But the building up is done with gravel which is very cheap material in most places. You do not build up with cement from the bottom. But you would need to build up with gold dust to justify such a price as this.

Mr. TAYLOR. Our town let a contract at 16 cents to lay granolithic sidewalk on several streets, and some of them had to be raised three or four feet. And my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) says that 12 cents was the ruling price there—16 cents is an outside price.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Something would depend on the cost of cement and the description of the land.

Mr. FOWLER. But why should cement be dearer in Antigonish than in other places? In fact, it ought to be less; for. I understand there are cement works in Sydney. There certainly is not enough to account for the difference between 12 cents or 16 cents and the 70 cents that the minister has been paying. It is no wonder that this building, which was to have cost $15,000 or $16,000 has already cost $28,000, if everything else is paid for on the same basis as this sidewalk:

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have the chief architect produce a plan of the lot and building.

Mr. FOWLER. Better let the item stand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect tells me that the sidewalk cost a certain sum per foot, and his opinion was that the price was reasonable. I do not profess to know the cost of granolithic sidewalk, because this material is not much used in the part of the province from which I come.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the architect say that 70 cents is a reasonable price?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He says that the sidewalk was constructed at a reasonable price, but he did not state at how much per yard. But I will get the plan.

Mr. BERGERON. When a building such as this is finished, who receives it for the government and passes the work as having been carried out properly?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The clerk of works would certify to the erection of the building, then the chief architect would send a man from his department to see if it was built according to the plans and specifications.

Mr. FOWLER. Who had the contract for the sidewalk ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot say from this memorandum. But it was let by contract at so much per foot, the total cost being $735. It says, 'Sidewalk, &c.' showing there was something in addition.

Mr. CROCKET. Is it the custom of the department to bear the whole cost of the construction of a new sidewalk built in front of a public building ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The architect tells me that where the work is entirely a new one the department has been in the habit of paying the whole cost.

Mr. CROCKET. What about repairs to that sidewalk ? Does the department pay for keeping the sidewalk in repair ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. After the department has constructed the sidewalk the practice is to keep it in repair.

Mr. CROCKET. I would call the minister's attention to the sidewalk in Fredericton which extends a whole block on Queen street. The government owns all the property on the eastern side of Queen street from Carleton to Regent street. On this property are the post office building and the officers' barracks, and that sidewalk has been in very bad condition for several years past and is in great need of repairs. It is an asphalt sidewalk.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be glad to give it consideration.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you a vault in that building ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, that is the contract. The vault door is supplied by the contractor.

Mr. FOWLER. You had better let this item stand until we get the particulars.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Very well.

Mr. BERGERON. I did not quite understand the answer of the minister as to the procedure after public buildings are finished.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The clerk of works certifies to the department that the building has been completed, and then the chief architect sends an architect from the department to examine the building and see whether it has been completed according to the plans and specifications, and he informs the chief architect of the fact.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that satisfactory to the department ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that is the only way in which it can be done.

Mr. BERGERON. That explains why so many works turn out to have been badly constructed. They are not finished properly, they are made by people who do not care what happens to them after they are finished, but who construct them according to their own notions. There is no supervision. I remember a case where a public work was built by men who did not care whether it was well done or not. They have a clerk of works who is generally a political appointment. He is paid $3 a day, and sometimes does not know anything about the work he is supposed to supervise. He makes a report that the building is finished properly, and it is accepted. When I was in the west last summer I heard of a breakwater built by the government at

Nanaimo, at a cost of $10,000. As soon as it was built a freshet came and carried it away, and it is now lying somewhere in the sea.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Does the hon. gentleman say a breakwater was built at Nanaimo ?

Mr. BERGERON. At a place called Nanaimo, anyway it was in the district of Nanaimo.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Nanaimo is in my constituency, and there is no wharf built by the government there.

Mr. BERGERON. It was in the district of Nanaimo. A day or two ago I heard of a lighthouse built by the Department of Marine and Fisheries that has been carried away, a very expensive work. I mention these things to show that the government should pay more attention to these works and see that they are properly inspected before they are accepted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is exactly what we are doing. Before a building is accepted the chief architect sends an expert, an experienced man from the department, who makes a thorough examination, and he does not accept the building unless it is built according to the plans and specifications.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman's criticisms may be correct with respect to some other cases of which I have no knowlege, but they are not correct with respect to this building in Antigonish. He says that these works are often built by people who have no concern but to get them up and get away. This building was erected by Rhodes & Curry, one of the most reputable firms in the lower provinces, and I am sure these gentlemen have sufficient pride in their work not to build it as the hon. gentleman says. There may be some cases that justify his criticism, but as to any work constructed by Rhodes & Curry, who are contractors of the highest standing, there is no ground for criticism.

Mr. BERGERON. I was speaking in a general way, and criticising the government for receiving these public works without paying sufficient attention to the way they have been built. It may be that in this case the clerk of the works is a good man. But we all know from what takes place in the Public Accounts Committee that in many cases these clerks of works do not even go near the work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What has taken place in respect of this building is an index of what takes place in respect of all buildings, as I am informed by the chief architect. In the first place there is a clerk of works appointed. Inquiry is made as to his ability, his judgment and integrity before he is appointed.

Mr. BERGERON. And his politics.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of course we would not like to appoint a man who would endeavour to have a building badly constructed in order to discredit the government. We try to get a man who will be fair at all events, and see that the work is constructed so as to reflect credit upon the government. Then the department sends an expert from time to time to see that everything is being done properly. When the building is finished the clerk of the works makes his certificate, but the chief architect does not act finally upon that, because he sends an expert from the department specially to examine the building carefully, to look it all over, and see if it has been constructed according to the plans and specifications. He makes his report in writing, and upon his report, when favourable, the building is taken over.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this architect who is sent to make progress inspection, in all cases an official of the department, or do you employ outside architects ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. An officer of the department is always sent.

Mr. FOWLER. How about the progress inspections ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. An architect is also sent to see to the progress inspections.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you employ outside architects in your department and if so for what purpose ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Sometimes we do, but comparatively few. Sometimes an architect may be employed as an inspector on a building. In the case of large buildings there is sometimes a clerk of works and also an architect.

Mr. FOWLER. On what buildings were they employed last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the case of a building at Halifax a Mr. Bush was employed as architect. He acted as clerk of works and architect.

Mr. BENNETT. How much did you pay last year ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not say that is the only case. The chief architect cannot now say how much was paid, without referring to the notes.

Mr. FOWLER. As great a sum as $10,000 ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He thinks not.

Mr. FOWLER. Less than that ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister states that about $10,000 was paid last year for outside architectural services. I have run over some of the payments and I find the

following amounts were paid by the Department of Public Works to outside architects and engineers in the last nine months:

Name.	Work.	Amount.
		$ cts.
H. C. Ewart, Architect.	Royal Mint.....	950 00
Darling & Pearson, Architects.	Winnipeg Post Office.	27,671 00
Architectural and Engineering Co.	Edmonton Gaol...	4,320 00
Vaudelet, Engineer..	St. Andrews Dam.	15,000 00
" " ..	Quebec Harbour Shed.	12,250 00
M. Perrault, Architect.	Montreal Post Office.	7,875 00
" " ..	Postal Station, St. Catharines.	2,302 00
Architectural and Engineering Co.	Belleville Armory.	1,775 00
G. O. Tanguay, Architect.	Three Rivers Drill Hall.	1,150 00
F. M. Talbot, Architect.	Quebec Immigration Hospital.	911 00
H. C. McBride, Architect.	London Post Office	2,358 90
" " .	Stratford Armory.	711 00
" " ..	Woodstock Armory.	2,004 00
Band, Murray & Meredith.	Dominion Archives Building.	4,006 00
T. A. Ewart, Architect.	Royal Mint.....	1,381 00
Investigating Power, collapse.	... .	1,783 00
Maxwell Bros., Architects.	First Prize Dept. plans.	8,000 00
Darling & Pearson...	Second Prize Dept. plans.	4,000 00

Altogether about $100,000 in 1907-08 for nine months was paid out by the Department of Public Works for outside architectural fees. You had better hire 20 good men at $5,000 each.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hope the hon. gentleman does not think that by quoting these figures he shows that the chief architect was in error in regard to the amount paid for services of architects last year for purely architectural services. In the items he has read he includes engineering work. Vautelet is an engineer and his work in connection with the St. Andrews lock and at Quebec was engineering work.

Mr. BENNETT. At Quebec he was putting up a building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But that is not under Mr. Ewart at all. The hon. gentleman has included the amounts paid for prizes for the plans for the large departmental building which it is proposed to construct on Sussex street. I had not in mind the inclusion of these amounts as that is not architects' work in the ordinary sense.

Mr. FOWLER. Would not the man who got first prize be the man whose plans were adopted ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it does not follow at all.

Mr. FOWLER. Then did you get nothing except plans that you would not use, in return for the money paid out ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A board of judges was appointed to ask for and consider the plans and to determine as to which were entitled to the prizes, but the department expressly reserved the right to exercise its own judgment as to adopting any of the plans. The department is not bound to take any one.

Mr. FOWLER. Did you start a competition among architects for plans for a departmental building and offer prizes to a considerable amount and not propose necessarily to take any of the plans ?

Mr. BERGERON. Certainly.

Mr. FOWLER. You offered premiums for the making of plans suitable for a departmental building and gave the prizes although the department did not consider one of the plans suitable for erection purposes? That seems to me a funny proceeding. I would think that you would try to get plans as nearly perfect as possible and if an architect could not draw a plan suitable for that building he certainly did not deserve a prize. It is the most surprising statement I ever heard.

Mr. BENNETT. Deducting $15,000 for St. Andrews and $12,000 for the plans that still leaves $75,000 for outside architects. I am not blaming the minister, it is simply that he does not get proper information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The payment to Darling and Pearson was for services extending over some years, not for last year.

Mr. FOWLER. The question was what was paid last year ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The question was put generally one afternoon when we were discussing estimates and the chief engineer said he did not think it would exceed $10,000 a year, taking the average. A number of the other gentlemen who were mentioned by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) supervised the erection of buildings, acting as clerks of works as well as inspectors. As to the plans for the departmental buildings, these buildings will be very costly and it is desirable that they should be built upon the very best design possible. No one would regard it as unreasonable that prizes should be offered to architects for the submission of plans. Even although the plans received may be departed from in many respects, yet they afford most valuable information to the chief architect and I presume he may take ideas from all of

them. What I meant to say was that the department did not bind itself absolutely to adopt any one of these plans ; it reserved a certain freedom which I think it was desirable to reserve.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you have the right to use the plans ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, yes, I can use any part of them, we can take any part of them we choose.

Mr. BERGERON. Were the prizes paid?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, we paid prizes of $8,000, $4,000, $2,000 and $1,000 ; that is $15,000 in all.

Mr. BERGERON. The answer of the minister seems to be very reasonable when he says that the chief architect will have to go through all these different plans. When the Langevin block was built—and it is looked upon as one of the finest buildings in Ottawa, the chief architect at that time, who, I am sure, was not the superior of the present architect, made the plans without consulting anybody. It did not cost the government one cent for making the plans of that beautiful building. To show the difference between the course pursued by the two governments, I might refer to the estimaters who were appointed to value the properties on Sussex street which have been purchased by the government for the site of this new building. I think there were three or four sets of estimaters.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is the Langevin block the building in connection with which the roof was omitted from the contract ?

Mr. BENNETT. Oh, no.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not know, I am talking about the plans of the buildings. Three or four sets of estimaters were appointed to value the property on Sussex street. One set of men made an estimate and they were paid and very well paid. Another set of men made a second estimate and they were paid, and then Mr. Riopel was appointed to make a new estimate. He was paid a part of his account for services and now he is claiming a very large sum of money. My hon. friend from Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) need not be surprised if money is spent in this way. It all goes to party friends right and left. It is part of the combination.

Mr. FOWLER. Notwithstanding the explanation of the minister, which my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) sarcastically has said was a reasonable answer, and I am sure my hon. friend was sarcastic——

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the hon. gentleman's statement was sincere.

Mr. BERGERON. Certainly.

Mr. FOWLER. I had supposed that my hon. friend was speaking sarcastically.

Mr. BERGERON. No, I referred to the hon. minister's answer.

Mr. FOWLER. Surely my hon. friend is not sincere in saying that the payment of $15,000 to assist the chief architect in drawing up these plans is reasonable ?

Mr. BERGERON. I thought that that was a good answer compared with the other things they were doing a little lower down.

Mr. FOWLER. I knew my hon. friend was sarcastic. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works is so accustomed to giving soft-soapy answers that he always assumes that every thing is all right. Is it not absurd on the face of it ? We pay a chief architect a salary for doing what ?—surely for designing these public buildings that are to be erected. Surely the chief architect has assistants—how many ?—by the score ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A great many.

Mr. FOWLER. How many ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Twelve who may be called architects and draughtsmen.

Mr. FOWLER. The chief architect has twelve assistants outside of those gentlemen who were called in and with all that it was necessary to pay $15,000 in order that the chief architect might get some valuable hints from the brains of those architects who competed for these very handsome prizes. It seems to me that this is a very expensive way of supplying brains to the chief architect. If you do not pay enough salary to get a good man who is able to do this work you ought to increase the salary. I do not know that architects get such tremendous salaries that you could not get a good man for $5,000 or $6,000 a year to take the position of chief architect and do the work, including the chief designing. My hon. friend from Beauharnois has referred to the Langevin block, admittedly one of the finest public buildings in Canada, whatever my hon. friend the minister may say about the absence of a roof. I think it has a pretty good roof on it ; at any rate, the roof did not cost anything like what it cost to put the roof on the post office here under one of the predecessors of the Minister of Public Works, and it did not collapse like the Laurier tower, nor fall into the water like the Quebec bridge. It is a solid, substantial building, it is splendid in its proportions, a fine example of architecture and it was designed by the then chief architect without the assistance of any outside architects but with such assistance as he got from his own staff.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Dominion was not so big then as it is now.

Mr. FOWLER. The building is the same whether the country was as big or not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I mean that the work of the architect's office was not nearly so great then as it is now.

Mr. BERGERON. The men were bigger than they are now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They were very good men.

Mr. FOWLER. I cannot conceive of a greater waste of public money than the payment of $15,000 to these outside architects.

Mr. BERGERON. Was the competition open to the world or only to Canadians ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only to Canadians.

Mr. BERGERON. Would my hon. friend give the names of those who made plans and those who got the prizes ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could not give all the names. Twenty-nine different architects submitted plans.

Mr. BERGERON. Was there a committee appointed to examine the plans ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, a committee consisting of the president of the Ontario Association of Architects, the president of the Quebec Association of Architects, and Mr. Ewart, the chief architect of the department.

Mr. FOWLER. These were the committee ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, they were the board of judges.

Mr. BERGERON. Were they paid ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They were paid.

Mr. BERGERON. Did they compete ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. FOWLER. How much did they get ? I do not think there is any limit to what may be done by this government in the line of wrong-doing.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I knew my hon. friend would say that.

Mr. FOWLER. I want to compliment the Minister of Public Works by saying that of all the ministers he is prepared to go to the greatest length in the waste of public money, and I will guarantee, from what I know of the hon. gentleman and his former career, that he will outstrip them all. He will leave them a long way in the distance. I want to know how much this committee was paid.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This committee was paid $4,500.

Mr. BERGERON. Besides the $15,000 ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, they were paid $1,500 each.

Mr. BERGERON. So that the whole cost about $20,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $20,000—$19,500.

Mr. FOWLER. How much money do you propose to expend on this building ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $4,000,000.

Mr. BENNETT. We will be in that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am surprised at the hon. member for Kings and Albert indulging in talk such as he has in regard to the plans. I am sure that my hon. friend, in his moments of sincerity and soberness. and he is always sober and not always insincere, will realize that when the government were undertaking the erection of these very important and costly buildings to accommodate the various departments, and including a palace of justice, it was not an unreasonable expenditure of money to invite from the architects of Canada designs for those buildings. I think also that any one would say that in not binding ourselves to accept any one of those plans, but giving the chief architect of the department the right to avail himself of any ideas which were unfolded by them, the department was acting wisely. With regard to myself, I am always thankful for any attention that my hon. friend gives me. Even though my hon. friend has at times in the past criticised me and gentlemen with whom I have been associated, I have seen the day when he was the warmest in our praise. Therefore I do not take the criticisms of the hon. gentleman upon myself too seriously. But I think it might be advisable for him to wait until he sees how I administer the department over which I preside before he gives the assurance to this House that I shall not manage it economically and well. Thus far my hon. friend cannot point to anything in my administration of the department which invites his criticism, or even the criticism of those who would look at the matter from a non-partisan standpoint.

Mr. FOWLER. Since my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has read me this lecture, I will devote a few minutes to a reply. In the first place, he makes the challenge that I have been unable to point to any particular thing in which he has shown extravagance as Minister of Public Works. Sir, that was a safe challenge for the hon. minister to throw down. He knows perfectly well that I have had no opportunity yet to know what he has done in his department. He knows perfectly well that until the accounts for the year are produced it will be impossible for us to know just how extravagantly he has conducted the affairs of his department. But I will refer the hon. gentleman to some of

the things which have already occurred, which will bear out the general statement I made to the effect, that whatever extravagance there might be in the various departments of this government, the Department of Public Works, under the superintendence of the present minister, would far outstrip all those other departments in wanton, wilful waste and extravagance; and, Sir, you will find when the next session comes, and when we have an opportunity to disclose to the public just what the hon. gentleman has done in his department, that the words I have uttered will be verified and more than verified. We had an order in council passed by the government at the request of the hon. gentleman; and we had in this House the other day the humiliating spectacle of the hon. gentleman being compelled to stand up in his place and admit that owing to what had been brought out here by the opposition, his colleagues had taken him by the neck, as it were, and had rescinded that order in council which he had defended upon the floor of parliament. No greater humiliation was ever offered——

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not wish unduly to interrupt my hon. friend, but I can assure him that he is now making a statement which is wholly unwarranted. Whatever was done in passing the order in council, and whatever was done in rescinding it, was done wholly on my initiation and at my recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. A. Johnston). I would suggest that we have departed sufficiently from the item before the committee.

Mr. FOWLER. I understand, then, that the chairman feels that his minister is getting rather the worst of this, and that although he invited it by making an attack upon me, the Chairman proposes to exercise his right and refuse to allow me the opportunity of answering him. I have much more to say about the hon. Minister of Public Works, and I would like to have an opportunity now of saying it.

The CHAIRMAN. I think I have allowed the hon. gentleman to proceed far enough. I realized a little while ago that the discussion was out of order.

Mr. FOWLER. You should have stopped your minister, not me.

The CHAIRMAN. I propose to ask the committee to come back to the immediate item which is before the committee. I suggest that for the consideration of the committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend desires, we will let this item stand, and take up the next.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to finish what I have to say in answer to the hon. gentleman first. Surely the Chairman does not want me to do the hon. gentleman the discourtesy of not replying to the statement he made.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman forgets that I was replying to him.

Mr. FOWLER. Not at all. The hon. gentleman was making a statement entirely contrary to the fact, and I was pointing out to him his duty under the circumstances. When the government of which he is a member humiliated him by rescinding an order in council passed at his desire, it seems to me that there was only one course open to him as a man of honour, and that was to lay down his portfolio and resign from the government. Surely no other course was open to the hon. gentleman; but, as some of my hon. friends suggest, he certainly would not do that. The hon. gentleman has waded through too much in order to get this portfolio. He refers to a time when I spoke well of him. There was a time when I perhaps did speak well of the hon. gentleman and of the views which he entertained upon the political questions of the day; but that time was when he was sailing under a different flag from the one he sails under to-day, not the skull and cross-bones. That was when he was sailing under the Conservative flag and was as strong a Conservative as could be found in this country. As an individual he is a very nice, courteous gentleman; but the manner in which you speak of the hon. gentleman's politics depends on the period of the hon. gentleman's career to which you are referring. If you are referring to the period from 1873 to 1878, if you happen to be a Liberal, you will commend most strongly his attitude then on the political questions of the day, because there was at that time, no stronger Liberal or supporter of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie from the Atlantic to the Pacific than the hon. gentleman. But, Sir, there came a change in the year 1878; there was a Dominion election on. The hon. gentleman had not at that time changed his political attitude.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is this modern or ancient history?

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman is not so old that the history of his political career would necessarily be ancient history.

The hon. gentleman is grey, but he is not really an old man except in sin—political sin. I make the distinction. Now, there was a general election on, and any person walking along the streets of the city of St. John and looking at the bill boards might have seen a notice to the effect that there would be a rally of the Liberal party to be held in the hall in the parish of St. Martins, and that rally was to be addressed by the Hon. William Pugsley and other leaders of the Liberal party. This was the notice that appeared on

Monday. But on Tuesday any person passing through the streets and observing the bill boards would see pasted over this notice a placard bearing these words : 'Great Conservative Rally ; a meeting in the interests of the Liberal-Conservative party to be held in the hall of ——— on such a day ; the chair to be taken at 8 o'clock, and the meeting will be addressed by the Hon. William Pugsley and other Conservative leaders.' Talk about the conversion of St. Paul. It was not a circumstance to that of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman's was quite as rapid.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But not so thorough.

Mr. FOWLER. Not so thorough, as my hon. leader says, because the hon. gentleman was yet to undergo another change, a change equally wonderful, and accompanied by another change of government of course. No government could change more quickly than could the hon. gentleman. Time passed. The hon. gentleman was a strong Conservative, and in 1895—not very ancient history—he had aspirations towards Ottawa. He wanted to be a representative of his native county and he was nominated the Conservative candidate. I had the pleasure of moving his nomination and I had the pleasure on several occasions—and I suppose that is what the hon. gentleman refers to—of accompanying him in his canvass throughout the county and of speaking from different platforms with him. I cannot recall now that I was particularly eulogistic of the hon. gentleman personally, but I certainly was of the policy of the party of which the hon. gentleman then was a strong exponent, as I have always been all my life. So that when he says there was a time when I was somewhat vehement in my praise of his political associates, I admit the fact. But that time was when the hon. gentleman was an associate of mine politically and a leader in that party to which all my life I have belonged.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That does not happen to be what I was referring to.

Mr. FOWLER. Then I cannot understand what the hon. gentleman was referring to and would like him to state what it was.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman knows.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not know. But there came a change. The hon. gentleman found that his political course had been so tortuous that the good people of the county of Kings—the Conservative people of the county of Kings—were not satisfied with him as a candidate, and he discovered that if he were to continue a candidate he would be very apt to lose the election. So he wrote a letter to the president of the association in which he resigned the nomination and gave his reasons for resigning.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We had all this four months ago.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman has brought it on himself and he may have it several times before this parliament is through.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What about the suffering country?

Mr. FOWLER. It is a good thing and will bear repetition. The hon. gentleman wrote a letter to the president of the association in which he resigned the nomination and gave his reasons, and his principal reason was that he did not wish to be the means of sowing discord and dissension in the ranks of the grand old Conservative party of which he was such a lover—that party which had done everything that had been done for the upbuilding of Canada. And he went to St. John, and there he ran as a strong opponent of both the government and the opposition. He ran as an independent. Why, he had no confidence, Sir, in you as the leader of the opposition, as the leader of the Liberal party at that time. No man on the government side was one-half so strong in denunciation of you, Sir, and your political ideals as was the hon. minister who is now such a subservient follower of yours.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Stronger than yours ?

Mr. FOWLER. Very much stronger. Why there was not a political sin he did not accuse you of. He called you a traitor to your country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would not interrupt my hon. friend when he goes to such extremes if he were saying what he really believed to be true, but he is simply indulging in flights of imagination and stating what he must know, if he knows at all what I said, to be without foundation.

Mr. FOWLER. I can well understand how this bites, but the hon. gentleman has been forgiven, he has made his peace, he has wiped the feet of the First Minister with his tears of repentance, he has had the benediction of the First Minister laid upon his bowed head and has received the injunction : Rise, son, thy sins are forgiven thee, go and sin no more. This was in the days when the hon. gentleman was in the transition period of his political life. It was in that transition period when he was changing from the caterpillar to the butterfly and when he was still in the chrysalis as a member of the Conservative party. But during that election campaign of 1896 the process of change and disintegration had begun, and when, on the night of June 23, 1896, the news came flashing over the wires that the Liberal party had won, just as quickly as the news came, the hon. gentleman cast aside his caterpillar shell and emerged into the splendor of a

new day, a gaudy, glittering butterfly. He has been a Liberal ever since. Yes, he has since in the twelve years during which he has been basking in the sunshine that radiates from you, right hon. Sir, as the head of the Liberal party——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Address the Chair.

Mr. FOWLER. I am addressing the chair, Sir, through you. Ever since that day he has been a strong, active working Liberal. I want to say, however, to the right hon. the First Minister that I do not think the hon. gentleman has brought very great strength to the Liberal cause in the province from which he comes. I think, Sir, that the defeat, the disastrous defeat which has befallen the Liberal party in the province of New Brunswick, is to some considerable extent due to the dissatisfaction felt by the people of that province in the political principles and methods of the hon. gentleman whom you have taken into your cabinet as Minister of Public Works. I have no doubt that this had largely to do with it. And that disastrous defeat which has overtaken your party in that province, although it was in the matter of local politics, is yet a true index of what will happen in federal politics this autumn, if you decide to go to the country then. Mr. Chairman, I would advise the Prime Minister to cast about him for a man from the province of New Brunswick in whom the people of that province would have more confidence. I am perfectly disinterested in giving this advice, for, from the party standpoint, there is no one who could probably make it easier for us of the opposition to win in that province than the hon. gentleman. But you had, sitting behind him in the back benches, one man who was able to carry a constituency which he represented here; and it seems to me that if you are looking for political success in the province of New Brunswick, you had better change your Minister of Public Works. For, not only will he be a weakness to you in New Brunswick, but you will find that he will continue in his conduct of his present office the methods which he followed in his own province and which brought his party their to disastrous rout. It does seem to me that the condition of your party, owing to the misconduct of the heads of departments, is already deplorable enough without making it worse by giving a free hand to your Minister of Public Works. This advice I give gratuitously to the Prime Minister ; I give it from the patriotic standpoint, not from the party standpoint.

Mr. SPROULE. It is all the more valuable.

Mr. FOWLER. It is all the more valuable, for it is all perfectly disinterested. I hope the Prime Minister will profit by it and that he will relegate the hon. gentleman to the background and bring in a new Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I feel that I should really apologize to the House for taking up any time in replying to the observations of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) for they are not at all relevant to the matter before the committee. But I wish to say one word in answer to the speech which the hon. gentleman has just made. This is the same speech that was reported in the newspapers some months ago as having been made by the hon. gentleman in St. John before the election was called to fill the vacancy caused by the death of my late friend, Dr. Stockton. On that occasion, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) came to St. John and addressed a large public meeting, making the same speech as he has made today. He spoke of my political career, covering some thirty years, and begged the Conservative party to put up some person in opposition to me. But the electors of the city of St. John, Liberals and Conservatives, who know the hon. gentleman and know me, who know the course I have pursued in that city since I went there to make my home among them a good many years ago, gave the hon. gentleman his answer by returning me by acclamation.

Mr. FOWLER. In the first place the statement the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) has made about the speech is absolutely foundationless. I did address a public meeting in St. John, and I did advise the electors to oppose the present Minister of Public Works, even though he had held out as a bribe to the people of St. John what he could do for them if he were returned as Minister of Public Works. And the hon. gentleman plumes himself upon his election by acclamation. I was opposed to his election by acclamation, notwithstanding all the pledges and promises he made to the people. But, if the hon. gentleman had asked the people to elect him without his portfolio, he would have been beaten by more than five hundred votes. It was not the person of the hon. gentleman that was elected in the city of St. John, it was the office. And is that a thing for the hon. gentleman to plume himself upon? Is that a thing for him to boast about? For my part, I should much prefer to be elected on my personality. Why, the hon. gentleman, never once, during his long political career has appeared before the public and asked for their suffrages as a representative of a party in opposition—Oh, yes; I am mistaken. He did, once. On one occasion he appeared, not exactly as an opposition but as an independent candidate. What happened when he dared thus to face the electors of any constituency in Canada on his own personality as a man? Why he lost his deposit—that is what happened. This is the hon. gentleman who is trying to make the people think that so magnificent is his personality,

so much are the people of St. John in love with him, that they fall over themselves to elect him by acclamation. Yet, as I have said, the only time that the hon. gentleman ever faced the electors in opposition to any government was when he ran in 1896 as an independent, and was so disastrously beaten that he lost his deposit. Yes, and even if he had got a thousand votes more than he did, he would still have lost his deposit. And that is what the people think of the hon. gentleman's personality in the city in which he lives. But, Sir, here was a government in power: here was a city that had made tremendous sacrifices in order to provide terminal transportation facilities: and here, they felt, was an opportunity to get some assistance in the establishment of further facilities which were required at that port; and so they elected the office of Minister of Public Works, and, unfortunately, they had to take with it the personality of the hon. gentleman who had been selected by the Prime Minister to fill that office. It was a handicap that the office was filled by the hon. gentleman—almost anybody else would have had a better chance than he. I do not think he will refer to this matter again.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. FOWLER. This item stands, does it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is carried.

Mr. FOWLER. No, it is not carried; and I do not propose that it shall be carried now. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) promised certain information with regard to it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, let it stand then.

Bridgewater, public building, $22,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What is this one to cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman will see that this is a revote of $5,000. This is to make provision for the construction of a public building in the town of Bridgewater. The total cost will be $39,500, including the site, heating, electric wiring, fixtures, furniture, &c. This is a new building. Bridgewater is in the county of Lunenburg.

Mr. FOWLER. How much did the land cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $5,500. The lot is 110 feet on King street, and 130 feet on Dominion street.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the population of Bridgewater ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. By the census of 1901 the population was 2,900, including Bridgewater North and South. The post office receipts for 1907 were $1,362 ; customs receipts, $4,871 ; money orders issued, $42,449 ; money orders paid, $32,000. It has a large bank, a printing office, four gang sawmills, grist mills, and so forth, and does a large trade in lumber.

Mr. BERGERON. Who was the site bought from ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From H. and A. Davidson.

Mr. FOWLER. Was that a vacant lot ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume so.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. It is perhaps fair to say that the price is large ; I suppose judged by the land values in most Nova Scotia towns it would appear to be large. But there were few available places on which this building could be erected, and it appeared desirable to have it built on the principal business street which is somewhat congested owing to physical conditions, and consequently the values on this street are higher than in most Nova Scotia towns. This vacant lot cost the owners practically the amount it was sold for. I had considerable to do in advising the department concerning the purchase of the lot. The owners, in making up the price, took into consideration the original cost, and interest at 4 per cent.

Mr. BERGERON. Who did the Davidsons buy the property from ?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. A corporation known as the Academy of Music Company, Limited, I think were the previous owners. There was an opera house upon the site at one time and it was burned.

Mr. CROCKET. Who selected the site ?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I recommended the site to the department. It appeared on the whole to be the best site in the town, and no other site could be purchased at a lower price.

Mr. BERGERON. Did the Davidsons buy the property on purpose to sell it to the government ?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. No, I may say that the Davidsons sold this land at a lower price to the department than they would have sold to any other purchaser.

Mr. BERGERON. How long had the opera house been burnt before this property was sold to the government ?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. About seven or eight years.

Mr. FOWLER. What lawyer put the title through ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think that is mentioned.

Mr. DANIEL. I suppose this building is being erected by tender ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, tenders were received in answer to public advertisements. The tenders were $23,500 and $24,000, the lowest being accepted. The tenderers were A. D. Falconer, of Sydney, and W. R. Macdonald, of Kentville.

Mr. FOWLER. How much was paid for legal services for getting the title ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total amount paid for legal expenses and advertising, printing, survey of site, &c., of every kind were $216.81.

Mr. BLAIN. Who was the clerk of works, and what was his salary ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The clerk of works is Mr. Lamb, and his salary is $3.50 a day.

Mr. BLAIN. On whose recommendation was he appointed, and what are his special qualifications for that work ?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I may inform the hon. gentleman that I had the pleasure of recommending the appointment. He is a carpenter, and very competent.

Mr. FOWLER. This is certainly a departure from the usual rule, actually appointing as clerk of works a man whose occupation would fit him for that position.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that the policy of the department is to ask the member for the county to recommend a site for public buildings, and also to recommend the clerk of works ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As I understand the practice of the department, when a man is required to supervise the erection of a public building, the member of the county is supposed to know the men best qualified for that purpose, and he is consulted. If he makes a recommendation the head of the department makes inquiry as to the man's capability, his occupation and generally as to his qualifications for performing the duties.

Mr. BLAIN. Does it make any difference on which side of the House the sitting member is ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would think so, yes, that is a time-honoured custom.

Mr. DANIEL. I might remind the minister that I made a recommendation for the enlargement of the St. John post office, which has not been acted upon. I offer the suggestion to the Minister of Public Works to bear it in mind.

Mr. FIELDING. I would suggest to my hon. friend that he should not press that because we are told these things are bribes to the citizens of St. John and it would be highly improper to bribe them.

Mr. DANIEL. The people of St. John could accept an enlarged post office which is very much needed even although the Minister of Finance may possibly consider that it was being used as a bribe. As the west is absorbing some of our immigrants, so we may be able to absorb an enlarged post office without any injury to the political atmosphere of the city.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The improvement of the accommodation of the St. John post office came under consideration some little time ago, and the Postmaster General decided that increased accommodation is to be given and that is to be attended to. By making certain changes in the interior of the building it is supposed the accommodation can be so improved that it will do for a number of years to come, without going to the heavy expense of erecting a new post office.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it the policy of the minister to purchase sites and to appoint clerks of works solely on the recommendation of the sitting member ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought I had made it clear that the policy of the department, certainly my policy, is to make inquiries after the recommendation is made. We would not act on the recommendation of a member without making inquiry as to the suitability of a site. While ordinarily we feel that we may rely on the recommendations of our friends, in this case we would think it well to go further and make inquiry as to the site for the building and as to the qualification of the clerk of works.

Mr. CROCKET. What would the minister think of the selection of a medical practitioner to superintend the erection of a lighthouse ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Everything would depend on his general qualification, but if he had had experience in that kind of work and knew how to handle men he might be a very good man.

Mr. FOWLER. Would it make any difference if he were a defeated candidate ? Would that make his qualifications any stronger ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I suppose not.

Mr. CROCKET. In Sunbury a medical man who has been a candidate in the last two elections was appointed to superintend the erection of a lighthouse.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not in my department.

Mr. FOWLER. Or wharfs?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Wharfs but not lighthouses. If the hon. gentleman says I appointed a medical gentleman to inspect a wharf he is misinformed.

Mr. FOWLER. No one said you appointed him in any case, but a medical gentleman was appointed to inspect the erection of a lighthouse and also of a wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What wharf ?

Mr. FOWLER. I fancy the Oromocto wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I fancy the hon. gentleman is in error.

Mr. FOWLER. Dr. Peake who was the defeated candidate in the last election and also in the election previous was appointed inspector of the lighthouse and a wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The wharf at Oromocto?

Mr. FOWLER. I do not say the wharf at Oromocto but a wharf.

Glace Bay, public building, $20,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What would be the total cost and is the contract let ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total estimated cost is $57,767 exclusive of site. The amount of the contract is $34,500.

Mr. BENNETT. Who are the contractors ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Messrs. Rhodes and Curry.

Mr. BENNETT. The work is under way ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract was taken December 19, 1907, and the work is now under way.

Mr. BLAIN. From whom was the site purchased and at what price ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. One lot was purchased from M. Nolan. Another property, known as the Ferguson property, was also purchased.

Mr. BLAIN. Had Dr. Sullivan something to do with one of those sites ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know as to that.

Mr. BLAIN. I see an item :

Dr. Sullivan, purchase price of site, $4,509.

Mr. FIELDING. The property known as the Ferguson property was owned by Dr. Sullivan. Ferguson is an old name attached to it.

Mr. BENNETT. I see that last year $200 was paid to Whitten, is he the clerk of works ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a case where an outside architect prepared plans and is the supervising architect. He would be the one the hon. gentleman refers to.

Mr. TAYLOR. If I understood the minister correctly the cost of the post office at Bridgewater was $39,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, including the site, fittings and everything.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is there not a mistake? I heard a discussion going on close about me that there must certainly be a mistake of $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the total estimated cost is $39,500.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand that Bridgewater has a population of less than 3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I stated it as 2,900.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, less than 3,000. When the Conservative party were in power our town, which has about 4,000 population and which has a very much larger postal revenue, had to give a free site and got a building costing between $8,000 and $10,000. I think it is an outrage to put a $39,000 building in a little village of 2,900 people.

Mr. TALBOT. That was to make up for the Laprairie post office.

Halifax Dominion buildings—improvements, repairs, &c., $15,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Is that to be done by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is to make provision towards remodelling the interior of the Halifax Dominion building which is to be used for post office purposes.

Mr. BLAIN. Has that anything to do with the customs house?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the customs examining warehouse and the offices of the Inland Revenue Department have been removed to the new customs house building and now we want to make some improvements to the post office building.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the work be done by tender or day's labour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We called for tenders for this building, but no contracts have been let yet. The matter is under consideration.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the work be done by contract or day's labour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are endeavouring to get it done by contract, but I am not in a position to say whether it may not be for the best under the circumstances, which perhaps it may not be necessary for me to state to the committee, to get the work done by day's labour. It may be more economical to get it done by day's work.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the nature of the work ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Remodelling the inside of the building.

Mr. FOWLER. Changing partitions?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, changing partitions and all that sort of work which is rendered necessary by reason of the building being required for post office purposes.

Mr. FOWLER. Are you taking in any additional offices?

Mr. FIELDING. The post office, customs house and a number of other offices were all in this old building. It was a building constructed before confederation. Now that the new customs house has been

built, the customs staff has been moved over to the new building and the old building is being entirely remodelled for the accommodation of the post office and also some other departments ; for instance, the Finance Department, which has an office in a private building in the city, is to be moved into this building and in so far as possible all the offices which have been distributed throughout the city will be consolidated in these two buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is entirely a revote.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC BRANCH LINES.

On the order,

House in Committee on Bill No. 51, an Act respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company (reported without amendment). —Mr. Crawford.

Mr. GRAHAM. Stand.

Mr. HENDERSON. If the objection to going on is that the promoter is not here, I waive that objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. I want it to stand. There are questions arising on this that I want to look into.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister is aware that I gave notice of an amendment, which will be found in the Votes and Proceedings of the 21st inst. It is somewhat to the same effect as the provision which we incorporated in the statute of 1904 when we were granting additional privileges to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, that we could on certain terms take over certain branches; so that the government, when they resumed possession of the eastern division, if they should resume possession, at the end of fifty years, would have the right to take over such branches as are built in connection with the eastern division. I would be glad if the minister would consider it in the meantime.

Progress reported.

RELIEF OF EDITH MAUD ROSARIO GAMMELL.

House in committee on Bill (No. 139), for the relief of Edith Maud Rosario Gammell.—Mr. Galliher.

Mr. LENNOX. I suppose that the committee to whom was referred this case have taken into consideration the evidence perhaps more fully than the Senate Committee did. I called attention the other night to the fact that the evidence that was presented to us from the Senate did not appear to be very satisfactory, and that view was concurred in by some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who are not present to-night. I do not belong to that committee and do not know what their procedure is; but as the matter was before the Senate Committee, there were to my mind two serious defects in the case. One was that there was no proper identification of the husband. Taking it as clearly established that improper relations were shown to have existed between a certain man and a lady, it was not definitely shown that the man referred to was the husband of this Mrs. Gammell, although she speaks of him as her husband. Aside from that, the evidence produced was to my mind of the most unsatisfactory kind. It was the evidence of a constable and some one who accompanied him, and it was not explained how they were able to proceed to the point they spoke of without being detected by the other party. I would not believe their evidence for the purpose of determining the ownership of a barrel of apples. It is possible that the members of the House of Commons Committee have satisfied themselves by further investigation; but if they have not, I venture to say that this thing is going through on very unsatisfactory and inconclusive evidence.

Mr. GALLIHER. This Bill is in my name. I may say that I do not know very much about the facts and nothing about the people. I happened to be on the Private Bills Committee when it went through there, and I have also read the evidence. There is something in what my hon. friend opposite says. Still, after all, I think the fact is pretty clearly established that the man with whom the lady was found was certainly not her husband, whoever her husband may have been. With regard to how the people got there without being seen, that would probably depend a good deal on the preoccupation of the individuals themselves as they took their evening stroll. For my part, although the evidence is not as direct as possible, it leaves no doubt in my mind that the woman is entitled to the relief she claims. I may say that there was no further evidence adduced before the committee.

Mr. LENNOX. I submit to my hon. friend's superior judgment in the matter.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 124) for the relief of Andrew Walker.—(Mr. Guthrie).

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Halifax immigration building—renewals and repairs in connection with heating, plumbing, &c., $1,800.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for certain repairs to the heating apparatus. The total cost is $4,800 and there has been expended, under a previous vote, $3,000. We are asking for a revote of $1,800 to complete.

Halifax immigrant detention building, $7,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is required to complete the building under construction. It is for the treatment of immigrants suffering from trachoma and other kindred diseases. It was put under contract October, 1905. The dimensions are 115 by 51. Total probable cost, $72,106.91. It has been all paid for with the exception of this $7,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thought that we deported the diseased immigrants.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They have to be detained until they can be deported and there must be a place in which to treat them. They have to be treated in a humane manner. In some cases they might be detained until they recover.

Halifax military buildings, Wellington barracks—re-construction of married men's quarters, $45,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This amount was voted last session but no part of it has been used so that this is a revote. This work is urgently requested by the Department of Militia.

Mr. BLAIN. Will tenders be called ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. There cannot be very much urgency when the whole amount voted last year remains unexpended. Why was this work held over ? Is there any special object in keeping it on hand until this year ? This money should have been spent when parliament ordered it. We are not supposed to vote money for the mere pleasure of voting it. Why has the minister allowed this work to stand over ? If it was so urgently required, why was it not done last year ? Is the money to be spent this year ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We intend spending the money this year. It does not always follow that when parliament votes money for a specific purpose, it is absolutely essential that the money should be spent. In view of the financial conditions the world over last year, one can well understand that we should incur only such expenditure as was absolutely necessary.

Mr. HENDERSON. Suppose there should be no elections this year, will the money be spent just the same ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The question of an election has never been thought of in this connection.

Mr. LENNOX.

Mr. ALCORN. Is there a larger garrison at Halifax now than when the imperial authorities had charge ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would have to refer my hon. friend to the Minister of Militia for that information.

Mr. ALCORN. It is difficult to understand why this expenditure should be necessary now when the accommodation was sufficient for the imperial troops ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is not for a new building but for a reconstruction of the old one.

Mr. HENDERSON. Were the barracks burnt down ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, but they had become very dilapidated.

Halifax—new public building, custom-house, $12,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As hon. gentlemen will see, this is a revote of $12,000, to make provision for the amount estimated to be spent during the fiscal year in the erection of a public building in Halifax for the purposes of the customs. I need not go into a description, but may say generally, that it is a large and fine building.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Including electric wiring, heating, elevator, furniture, &c., the cost will be $325,015.25.

Mr. BLAIN. Who is the contractor?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Keefe, of Halifax.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the contractor done his work satisfactorily to the architect?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not entirely so. Some objections have been raised. At my request the chief architect has sent a member of his staff to make a thorough investigation, and, in the meantime, an amount is held back.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the trouble ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I suppose the hon. gentleman would not wish me to go into the details. A number of objections are made, none of great magnitude. For instance, there is an objection to the way the windows are hung and a number of matters of that kind.

Mr. HENDERSON. What was the estimated cost of this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My deputy informs me that it was $300,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. And this has already been exceeded by $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, the estimate of $300,000 was for the bare building, whereas the figure I have given of the building complete includes electric wiring, fittings, furniture, elevator, heating, and so on.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would draw the minister's attention to a point that has frequently been discussed in this House in past years in connection with the construction of buildings of this kind. I, for one, and others also, have insisted, when a vote is to be taken for a public building, that the minister in charge shall give an estimate of the total cost, not merely for the construction of the building, but covering also the heating apparatus and fittings, and so on, so that we may know exactly what we are doing, and keep a proper check upon the expenditure of the minister. From the little information I have, this seems to be one of the cases where the amount necessary to complete the building will far exceed the original estimates. Already more than $25,000 over the estimate has been spent, and now we are asked for another vote of $12,000. Next year, possibly, we may be called upon for a further vote for furniture, and for extras possibly. I presume the minister was not personally responsible for the expenditure on this work, but, of course, he has to assume responsibility for the acts of his predecessors. I wish to make our position clear in this matter. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is very fond of charging hon. members on this side with objecting to public works, especially public works in the province of Nova Scotia. I want the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) to distinguish between objection and criticism. We do not object to the construction of useful public works, for we recognize that expenditure on this service is necessary and will be necessary in time to come. We approve the construction of public works that are essential for the purposes of the country. But we are ready to enter our very strong protest against any extravagance or waste, or, if the minister will pardon me, graft, in connection with the construction of these buildings. This is the reason why we want to have a careful estimate made before any money is voted for the construction of a new building. We find it necessary, owing to the largely increasing expenditure, to put checks upon it. What we object to is not expenditure that is called for by the needs of the country, but careless and extravagant expenditure. As the items of supply are discussed from time to time, the hon. minister will understand why it is that we hold him strictly to account for any over-stepping of the estimate of the cost of a public building. There is no reason why an architect should not estimate almost to a nicety, the cost of a building such as this. A few years ago, we endeavoured to get the Minister of Public Works to erect in small country towns for post office purposes buildings that, probably, would not cost more than $8,000 or $10,000. Hon. Mr. Tarte, when Minister of Public Works, declared his intention of providing such buildings. He made an attempt, commencing, I believe, in West Huron, with the town of Clinton. He proposed to erect there a building on the principle I had suggested, being not only a building for the post office, but a residence for the postmaster, thereby saving the expense of a caretaker. But I understand that when the matter went to the architect he refused to draw the plans and said they were not in the habit of drawing plans and specifications for buildings of less than $10,000. Were I Minister of Public Works—which I do not expect ever to be—I would ask the architect, in such a case, to step out, and would put another man in his place, for I think the minister is the man to be responsible for the expenditure and not the architect. Of course, I find no fault with the officer who is here to advise the minister to-night. Probably that may be the custom. But it is a custom we must try to get over. The architect must be ready to lay before the committee a careful and correct estimate of the total expenditure of the building, and then it will be the duty of this committee, year after year, as we are voting money, to see to it that the expenditure is kept within that line. If this is done, I think the Minister of Finance will not encounter the difficulty in furnishing the money for these public works which he has indicated. I was a little surprised when the minister made this confession a few moments ago that the reason why an item of $45,000 was not expended was that the Minister of Finance realized that, owing to danger of money stringency, it was better to allow the work to remain unfinished than to undertake the expenditure. I had an idea that this country was big enough and rich enough to carry through any proposition approved by parliament, and I think so yet. When matters of this character come up again, especially on a first vote, the minister will hear from me on the subject.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the hon. gentleman, while well intentioned, is too exacting when he insists that there should be at the beginning a very full estimate as to the cost of the work. There should be a general estimate undoubtedly at the time these estimates are prepared. Even in the case of the public work now under notice, detailed plans could not be prepared; it would not be the part of wisdom to prepare detailed plans before the appropriation was made. Therefore, the first estimate must necessarily be a preliminary estimate. It need not necessarily on that ground be far from the facts, for it should take into account of course lighting, heating and other items of expenditure. But where you prepare detailed plans later, it is possible that you will find the original estimate is somewhat exceeded, and if the amounts are not too large, I do not think would be any ground for criticism. With regard to the more general question of expenditures, it may happen that

after we have appropriated the money there are seasons when things are running smoothly and when the Minister of Finance would have no reason to forbid the various spending departments to use the moneys which have been appropriated for the public service. But if it should appear that the expenditure was running high and the revenue was running lower than usual, it would be the part of wisdom in the Minister of Finance to say to his colleagues: Well, although this appropriation is supposed to be at your disposal to deal with in any way you like, you had better hold part of it up until the following year. I think that would be a wise course to pursue under such circumstances.

Mr. HENDERSON. In this case no part of the appropriation has been expended, no effort was made to go on with the work. With reference to what the Finance Minister has said about the impossibility of estimating exactly what a building will cost, my plan would be that the minister should say to the architect: We propose to erect a public building in the city of Halifax, or wherever it is to be erected. for a specific purpose; it may be a custom house, it may be an armoury, it may be a post office. We propose to spend on that building the sum of $100,000, and that sum must complete the building in its entirety. It must furnish the site, it must put up the building, it must furnish the heating, lighting, fittings and everything else required. He says to his architect: I want you to draw a plan and prepare specifications for a building that will cost $100,000 and not one dollar more. If the architect finds, after working out his details, that the building is going to cost a little more than that, then it will be his duty to shave it down, to revise his calculations, and come within the limit of the amount the minister has directed him to expend on that building. I remember years ago when Hon. Mr. Sutherland was Minister of Public Works drawing his attention to this matter in a case that occurred in the city of London, where an estimate for an armoury had been exceeded, if I remember rightly, some $75,000 or $80,000 over the appropriation voted by parliament. I laid down this very principle, and Mr. Sutherland heartily endorsed it. I have no doubt that the Minister of Public Works to-day, if he thinks the matter over, will see a great deal of wisdom in it, and I think he will find less trouble in the erection of these buildings and keeping them within the estimated cost if he adopts some arbitrary plan like that. At the same time, I think he will get over the difficulty that the Minister of Finance has pointed out, about a building costing a little more than was originally intended. Let the architect make some allowance for such extras as might reasonably be expected, and hold him responsible for keeping within the amount that is to be expended on that building.

Mr. BARKER. I cannot help expressing my extreme surprise at the remarkable statement made by the Minister of Finance. We are now told plainly that when this government comes down with a proposition to parliament to build certain works, no matter what we are told as to the estimated cost, we are not to rely upon that, it doesn't amount to a row of pins. You do not expect your officers to know what to think or to estimate. Just give parliament something to go upon and we will start out. I say that such preaching from the Finance Minister can have no other result than the waste, plunder and extravagance that we have seen for years under this government. The officers of the Department of Public Works are present and are listening to the Finance Minister. The architect hears the Finance Minister of this country standing up and giving him practically authority just to shuffle off the figures. No matter whether we are right or wrong, just give us something to throw out to the House and we will go on with the work. Now, that is so extravagant a proposition that I wonder the Minister of Finance is not ashamed to stand up and make it. Why, such a proposition would disgrace any municipal council. The idea of a municipality going to work to build a municipal structure, and without ascertaining what that structure was going to cost, committing the municipality to the work, going on and putting $10,000, $20,000 or $30,000 upon it. Now, you have begun it you must go on with it, though it cost you $100,000. I hope the hon. gentleman spoke without any consideration and simply to get the Minister of Public Works out of a possible hole he was in, because I think the hon. gentleman knows a great deal more about business than one would imagine from that statement. Surely there cannot be anything plainer than that before a minister controlling a department would recommend his colleagues to construct a particular public work, he would take the utmost care with his officers to find out what it would cost before he dared to come before his colleagues in council to get their approval. He should be able to tell them what it would cost; he might not be able to guarantee the expenditure to a dollar. But what do public companies, what do municipalities, what do governments do who have any care for their reputation? They get from their engineer a carefully prepared estimate of the cost of the construction in detail; they add a percentage to that to cover all possible contingencies, say ten or fifteen per cent. The engineer or architect who would lead his company into expenditures that would ultimately upset all their calculations would get his walking ticket very quickly. But

this government could not dismiss an architect no matter how far he might be out, because the Finance Minister says: Oh, we do not expect him to be correct; we simply get something to go upon, to start with. They would rather he did not estimate too closely because as it is they can come session after session and say: We only got $50,000 from you and now we want $100,000 more. I think it is an outrage upon the House that we should be asked to vote money on an estimate which according to the words of the minister of the department goes for nothing.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Who said that?

Mr. BARKER. Because the Finance Minister says that we must not pay attention to that estimate, we cannot be accurate so we need not pay attention to the estimate, but simply vote what is asked for. Over and over again we have been asked to vote fifty per cent, sixty per cent or 100 per cent more than we have been told the work would require, only to be told afterwards that it was simply a rough estimate to start with, and that it could not be expected that the officers would know from the beginning the probable cost. That is just what the architect is for. Here is an architect who is building a post office. He has probably had 20 samples of that very building all through the country and should not have the slightest excuse for not coming very close to the proper figures in his estimate; but if he is told, as the Minister of Finance says, to go ahead, he will not take the trouble to be accurate, he will simply put in any sum, it would be quite superfluous for him to make an accurate estimate as he can have all he wants added to his original estimate. The Minister of Public Works says that there was an estimate for this building, but they did not put in the wiring. He might just as well say that they did not put in the gas pipes, or the cement that was provided long before the completion of the building. The wiring forsooth. I venture to say that we will probably have this up next year with a request for several thousands more to put in the patent steel desks. The argument of the Minister of Finance will be quite as effectual next year or five years hence, we will have something in addition to the original estimates under the name of furniture. This year it is wiring; I suppose the next time it will be door knobs, window panes or something of that kind.

Mr. FIELDING. What the Minister of Finance thinks will be judged from what he said and what is in 'Hansard' and not from the extraordinary distortion of his words we have heard from the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker).

Mr. BARKER. I am pretty accurate.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. member is not accurate, and if any one takes the trouble to consult 'Hansard' and to read the extraordinary statement the hon. gentleman has made, he will see that the hon. gentleman was not accurate. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) to whom I was replying, said that the Minister of Public Works in asking a vote for a public building such as the one now asked for at Halifax, should lay before the House full and detailed plans and estimates of the building, and condemned the minister for not producing such plans. I stated that my hon. friend had a purpose in that which was legitimate and commendable, but it was not well to push that contention too far. I said it was not the practice and it had never been the practice of any government, when a first vote is taken for a public building, to come forward with all the detailed plans. It would not be the part of wisdom to undertake the detailed plans of a public building before parliament had made an appropriation.

Mr. BARKER. Why not?

Mr. FIELDING. It has never been done, I do not think it is possible.

Mr. BARKER. It should be done.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not agree. If we could all be as wise as the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) it would perhaps be better but that is impossible.

Mr. BARKER. How is he to get tenders for the building if he has not plans?

Mr. FIELDING. At the time you are asking for an appropriation you are not asking for tenders. I am not speaking of the time when you ask for tenders, but of the time when you take the first vote in parliament, months before tenders are asked for. Of course when tenders are asked you must have detailed plans down to the finest point. But when application is made to parliament for the construction of a building of a certain character in a certain place, I do not think it is reasonable to ask a department to have detailed plans for presentation. It has never been done and I do not think that any sensible man would ask it. When you come to call for tenders that is the proper time to have detailed plans and specifications made. If it turns out that the original preliminary and general estimate, which should include wiring and all these things, turns out to be less than is required, it does not prove that the architect is incompetent or that the minister neglected his work.

Mr. BLAIN. I see at V—36 an item:

Department of Customs, duty on bronze coat-of-arms, $435.

Would the minister explain that?

Mr. FIELDING. I remember that a coat-of-arms was included in the plans for the building, and the contractor suggested that

he should be allowed to bring it in free of duty. I know my own view was that as he had tendered to put in a coat-of-arms, therefore he should pay duty. I thought the Department of Customs should make him pay that and I think they did.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The item, as it is worded, shows that the duty was paid.

Mr. BLAIN. By whom ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. By the contractor.

Mr. FIELDING. It would be paid I take it for granted, to the contractor, as a part of the general cost, but he would have to pay the duty to the customs.

Mr. FOWLER. Would that be charged against him ?

Mr. FIELDING. It should be and I suppose it was.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would probably be paid by the Department of Public Works and charged to the contractor.

Mr. BLAIN. I cannot understand why it should be in this book any more than 100 kegs of nails supplied to the contractor.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My deputy tells me that the duty was paid by the department. The department at the time insisted that the contractor should pay it. There was a long argument and finally it was decided that under the circumstances the department should bear the duty. It was not paid by the contractor.

Mr. FIELDING. If that statement is correct I must withdraw what I said. I know the contractor mentioned the matter to me and I told him that he would have to pay the duty. I never heard of the matter since. I supposed that he had paid it.

Mr. BLAIN. The contractor tenders for the coat of arms upon the building and he decides to purchase this coat of arms in New York. May I ask the minister how much the coat of arms cost or how much the contractor's tender was ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My deputy says that the ground upon which the contractor made the claim that he should not pay the duty was that formerly goods for the government came in free.

Mr. FIELDING. It was so formerly.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contractor urged that he did not suppose there would be any duty upon the coat of arms.

Mr. BLAIN. How much did it cost when the duty was $435 ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman would know pretty nearly as well as I would.

Mr. TAYLOR. About $1,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Probably, or perhaps more than that.

Mr. FIELDING

Mr. BLAIN. At what rate of duty would this be admitted?

Mr. FIELDING. It would be 20 to 25 per cent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At all events he did not suppose the government would exact the duty. That is the argument he made and the minister at that time yielded to the argument and allowed the duty.

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid that I misled the committee, because I supposed that he would be required to pay the duty. That was the impression I had and I did not know that he had persuaded the department to adopt his view until the statement was made by my hon. friend.

Mr. BLAIN. Why did he not purchase this coat of arms in Canada?

Mr. FIELDING. Are these goods made in Canada?

Mr. BLAIN. I think they are.

Mr. FIELDING. I think not.

Mr. BLAIN. With all due respect to the hon. the Minister of Finance I am sure they are.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. gentleman say where they are made in Canada?

Mr. BLAIN. In Toronto. I had something to do with the purchasing of one myself although not so extensive as this.

Mr. FIELDING. Would it be suitable for a large building?

Mr. BLAIN. For the court house in my own town.

Mr. FOWLER. St. John, New Brunswick, is another place where they make them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect tells me that it could not be got in Canada at that time.

Mr. BLAIN. If it could not be got in Canada the architect should have changed the plan so that it should be manufactured in Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am quite sure that it would have been obtained in Canada if it had been possible because the artist who made the model was a Canadian. He obtained it from the United States.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice that a clock was purchased at a cost of $2,080. It was also brought in from the United States for this building. May I ask the minister if the duty was paid on this clock by the government or the contractor?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect tells me that the duty on the clock was paid by the contractor and he also tells me that there was no clock of that description manufactured at that time in Canada.

Mr. TAYLOR. What about the British preference ?

Mr. BERGERON. Who was the contractor of the building ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. M. E. Keefe.

Mr. BERGERON. How much has he received ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contractor has received $251,928. While I am upon my feet I may say that I am sure that if my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) had wished to make any argument in regard to the chief architect's estimates being exceeded he certainly was very unfortunate in taking the case of this particular building, because it happened in this case that the chief architect made his estimate before calling for tenders and after he had prepared his plans and his estimate was $300,000 exclusive of the site. As a matter of fact the building will be completed with the additional $12,000 which we are asking for and the total cost of the building will only be $325.000, which includes site, inspection and everything, showing that the chief architect was only $1,000 out of the way.

Mr. FOWLER. That is not an answer at all to the remarks made by my hon. friend from Hamilton and which were replied to with so much heat by the hon. the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding). I do not know why the hon. the Minister of Finance found it necessary to work himself into such a passion, such a rage. Whether it was actual rage that he felt or only simulated passion that he exhibited I do not know. Certainly my hon. friend from Hamilton did not distort the early statement that was made by the hon. the Finance Minister. It was a very unfortunate statement in view of the fact that the chief architect was here listening to him because it seemed as if it were a warrant to him to pursue the ordinary slipshod methods which have been hitherto pursued with respect to estimates for public buildings. Why there should be a different mode of procedure adopted for the conduct of a work by the government from that which would be adopted by a corporation or municipality with respect to the construction of public works is something I fail to understand, and I do not think the Minister of Finance, in his violent philippic, made it at all clear why there should be this difference. Why should it not be possible for the chief architect, who has a large staff regularly employed in his department, besides the outside staff that he employs, including several persons of his own name—I do not know whether they are his own relatives or not, before coming to this House to ask for an appropriation, to make a closer estimate of the actual cost ? Instead of that we find in every one of these public works that the cost is far in excess of the original estimate. I remember a somewhat famous case of a public work in the province of Quebec, a work known as the wharf at Grande Vallée ; the first estimate we had was the exceedingly moderate sum of $5,000, and yet we paid out about $75,000 before we got through with that work. Now, I understood that this $75,000 of work at Grande Vallée has been carried away and is not in existence. However, the purpose for which that wharf was built having been served, I suppose the government did not care what became of the wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Who told the hon. gentleman that yarn that it has all been carried away ?

Mr. FOWLER. I have the statement of my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor).

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does he say that the Grande Vallée wharf has been carried away ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Part of it fell into the river and a great deal of expenditure was necessary to replace it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member for Kings and Albert said just now that it had been carried away.

Mr. FOWLER. The Minister of Public Works does not think anything about a portion of this work falling into the river because they are so accustomed to their works dropping into the river that it does not excite comment.

Mr. BERGERON. The object was attained ; the limits were sold.

Mr. FOWLER. It was necessary to carry a certain county in Quebec and there was only one man who could carry it for the Liberal party. So, an arrangement was made whereby this gentleman was to have a wharf built at Grande Vallée in order that he might dispose of certain limits which he had purchased and which though valueless without this wharf, might be given value and might be disposed of. The bargain was carried out ; the county was carried ; the wharf was built. Now it does not make any difference whether it drops into the river or not, because the limits were sold after the wharf was built.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is my hon. friend aware that the Deseronto people are carrying on large lumbering operations there ?

Mr. FOWLER. I do not know ; I think not. But it does seem to me that the minister has not done himself proud by the stand he has taken on this question. He has had to change his position in regard to this coat of arms, and he will find it necessary to change his position with respect to the duty on the clock, because I take it that was paid by the government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know.

Mr. FOWLER. At any rate, the duty on the coat of arms was paid by the government, and the Minister of Finance said he thought improperly so.

Mr. BERGERON. At page V—36 of the Auditor General's Report there is this item: 'Schulze, C. G. & Co., Est. 1 to February 16, on $2,080 contract for clock and $268.80 duty.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. That does not show that the government paid the duty.

Mr. FOWLER. If would look as if the duty was paid by the government and was charged against the contractor ; but as far as the coat of arms is concerned, the duty was paid, and the Minister of Finance says it should not have been paid.

Mr. FIELDING. Generally speaking, I think the admission of various articles for the government free of duty has been a source of much embarrassment, and in the tariff as it now stands we have insisted that everything shall pay duty, even when a department imports the goods. I recollect the contractor saying that he thought this coat of arms ought to be free of duty. I said that I thought it should pay the duty. He evidently went to the department and was able to satisfy the department on the general principle that goods for the government ought to be admitted free of duty.

Mr. FOWLER. The other people who tendered would naturally expect to pay duty, and therefore this contractor was given that advantage over them. It does seem a funny thing that you had to go to the United States to get the coat of arms of the country cast in bronze. Surely there are brass founders in this country who can cast a coat of arms.

Mr. BLAIN. I have some information about the manner in which this work was done, and I want to read a paragraph :

The floors of the building——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. gentleman tell me from what he is reading ?

Mr. BLAIN. From private information which I have, that is good information, I may say.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. gentleman kindly let me know from whom the information proceeds ? It would be valuable to me. I am very desirous of getting information of that kind.

Mr. BLAIN. I am equally anxious to communicate the information to the minister. The only question in which my hon. friend and I are interested is whether these statements are correct or not. The hon. gentleman has already opened the door by saying that the department is not satisfied with the work done by Mr. Keefe. Was the contractor paid any extras on this work ?

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He has not been paid any extras on this work.

Mr. BLAIN. Will he be paid any ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He has a claim against the department which has not been recognized so far.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it decided that his claim will not be paid ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have asked the chief architect to send one of his staff to Halifax to examine the building, and into the complaints that have been made. The matter of the balance of the contract is under consideration, and his claim is also under consideration.

Mr. BERGERON. It is not settled one way or the other ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the amount of the claim for extras ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not remember at this moment.

Mr. FOWLER. The item on page V—36 of the Auditor General's Report says that $268.80 of duty was paid, and $1,560.80 was paid on account.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It seems from this account very clear that the contractor paid the duty, and he received an estimate on both. The duty is added to the cost of the clock.

Mr. FOWLER. Why would the duty be mentioned there at all ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is there because it shows the payment made to the contractor, who is paid on progress estimates. The duty is added to the contract price.

Mr. FOWLER. If you add the duty to the contract price, would not that be making the government pay it ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all. What apparently took place was this. The contract price was $2,080. Adding the duty, $268.80, would make about $2,340, and upon that the Public Works Department made a payment of $1,560, leaving a balance due the contractor of about $800.

Mr. FOWLER. Why should the duty appear in the public accounts at all if it was not paid by the department ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not my hon. friend understand that if the contractor agreed to furnish the clock for $2,300 including the duty, the department would pay him the amount required for the duty ? No doubt, in making this contract, he would take the duty into consideration and regulate his price accordingly.

Mr. FOWLER. Why should the word 'duty' be there at all if the duty was paid by the contractor ? Surely you have some

information as to what the price of the clock was. What was the contract price ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have said that the furnishing of the clock was not included in the contract for the building but there was a separate contract. The Schultze Company agreed to furnish the clock at a certain price with the duty added, and the amount of the duty would be added to the contract price of the clock.

Mr. FOWLER. Is the government not paying for it ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it is paying the duty in the price of the clock.

Mr. FOWLER. In what respect does this differ from the coat of arms?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The coat of arms was in the original contract. That is the difference. Suppose the coat of arms had been ordered separately and Mr. Keefe had said he would take $500 for it and the duty, if the duty were $100, that would have to be added to the contract price. In one sense the government would be paying the duty but the duty would be added to the contract price. If the government buys the article, it pays the duty because the duty is added to the price. A merchant always adds the duty to the price when selling his goods.

Mr. FOWLER. When this contract was made, there would be no question at all about the duty because the contractor would buy the clock in Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No such clocks are made in Canada. It had to be imported and the duty paid on it.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the minister say that the contract price was so much and the contractor was to add the duty and would be paid the duty ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell at the moment.

Mr. FOWLER. We should have that information. The chief architect does not appear to know much about it. It is rather strange that these clocks could not be made in Canada.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the meaning of the words 'less draw-back $8.80' ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell my hon. friends what they mean, but I suppose the meaning is this. The amount of the contract was $2,080 and the amount of duty $268.80 or about $2,300 altogether and the amount paid on account was $1,568.80. Then the department always keeps back a certain percentage as an additional security for the completion of the contract, and that $8.80 would be the amount kept back.

Mr. FOWLER. If your chief architect cannot invent a better explanation than that, he is not very expert.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is not the chief architect's statement but my own supposition.

Mr. FOWLER. I am sorry you cannot do better than that. Just imagine $8.80 kept back as security for the carrying out of the contract. Well, we will let it go at that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a certain percentage kept back, and the $8.80 may have been required to complete the percentage.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the percentage ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Usually 10 per cent.

Mr. FOWLER. 10 per cent on what amount ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This $8.80 may have been required to make up the 10 per cent. Will my hon. friend make a better excuse ?

Mr. FOWLER. I would suggest that this was 10 per cent kept back on the price of the pendulum.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it a new building entirely ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. You have bought a great deal of furniture from Brander, Morris & Company. How many employees are there in that building ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know, but in a city like Halifax there is a large business done in the customs.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this used for the customs ?

Mr. FIELDING. Chiefly but there are other offices as well.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The exports were $7,000,000 last year and the imports $6,500,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Where was the customs done before?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the building now to be used for a post office.

Mr. BERGERON. What has become of the furniture in the old building? This is all new.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry to say I cannot tell my hon. friend.

Mr. BERGERON. We are buying new furniture all the time and do not know what becomes of the old furniture.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume it would remain in the old post office building.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister deserves a good deal of sympathethic treatment. He is new to his position and evidently does not know much about this, and he is not getting any assistance from his officers who are here. I do not know whether it is because these gentlemen are equally ignorant. What the minister had better do is ask

the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, in order that he may obtain some information which he can then give to the House. Here is this matter of the clock. They do not seem to know the contract price or whether the government paid the duty or where the clock was purchased. Then the minister cannot explain what this drawback of $8.80 means. I think the deputy minister might hunt up this information and be in a position to give it to the minister who could then inform the House when we meet again.

Mr. BLAIN. Having made the statement that the contractor did not do the work satisfactorily to the department, I want to draw the attention of the minister to this letter which I have received:

The floors of the building sagged shortly after its construction owing to the beams not being set well into the wall. One floor, through which an elevator has to pass, projects over three feet into the space which should be left open to accommodate the elevator. As this projection is three feet beyond the lower floor, it would require a corkscrew elevator to reach the top floor of the building.

Do any of the complaints which the department has against the contractor refer to any of the items I have read or is it another matter that the department objected to?

Mr. PUGSLEY. After reading the report of the expert sent to Halifax to examine the building, I should think that the gentleman who wrote that letter had been making himself familiar with the corkscrew, for it is a most exaggerated and unfair statement. The report of the architect does not bear out the statements made.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister has said that the contractor did not do his work satisfactorily to the department. As a proof of that, we have the fact that the department held back some of the money. This article goes on to say:

The woodwork in the office desks has come to pieces in parts of the building. The roof was badly constructed, and Keefe charged for extras in the work which should have been included in the original contract. I think there is no place made for connection with the water mains.

It says also:

The people in the city of Halifax are generally disturbed about the manner in which the contractor has carried on his work.

I would like to know from the minister how much money has been kept back? Also, does the department intend to allow extras to this contractor who has done his work in such an unsatisfactory manner?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have already stated that an expert has been sent from the department to Halifax to examine the building. His report has been received, and, while it shows that in quite a number of particulars the contractor has not carried out the specifications, yet the defects are not of the exaggerated kind that the statement given by my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) would lead the committee to believe.

Mr. FOWLER. Was there a clerk of works?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Did he report that the work was not right?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. FOWLER. Who was he?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Bush.

Mr. FOWLER. What is his business?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is an architect.

Mr. FOWLER. What salary did he receive for this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He was to receive 1½ per cent on the cost of the building. There is quite an amount held back pending the consideration of the report. We have refused to consider the claim for extras in the meantime.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this inspector still employed in the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. FOWLER. He is dismissed? Has he been paid his 1½ per cent on the cost of the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not in full.

Mr. FOWLER. How much is left?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could not say at the moment just how much, but it is a substantial amount.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman will look it up?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will write my hon. friend a letter, giving the facts.

Mr. BERGERON. I would call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the following item on page V—36 of the Auditor General's Report:

Robertson, Wm., & Son: steel beams, &c., 1,805 pounds at 7½ cents; ladders, $20, $155.38.

How could you put steel beams in a building when the contract has been given for the whole building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have it looked up.

Mr. FOWLER. Who is the contractor?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Keefe, of Halifax.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that the local member?

Mr. FIELDING. He was years ago, but is not now.

Mr. STANFIELD. I would call attention to an item on the same page, V—36, covering a charge for hot water heating apparatus complete, $4,798; another charge for four hot water boilers at $375; headers complete two at $128 and valves $180, then additional heating apparatus as per tender, and also alterations in heating apparatus. I do not pretend to be an architect, but I believe there is no reason for making such changes in heating apparatus as these, or for having additional tenders for heating apparatus for a building of this size. I would like the minister to ask his architect for an explanation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am informed that the post office authorities decided to occupy the basement for the purposes of the post office, which necessitated a change in the heating apparatus. The building is a very large one, and, for such a building, the total cost of heating equipment is not at all excessive. The building is four storeys in height and fronts on three streets, with a frontage of 106 feet on one, 86 feet on another and 107 feet on another.

Mr. BERGERON. Did the lot belong to the government or was it bought?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was bought for $24,000.

Mr. BERGERON. From whom?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From Mr. Corbett, of Halifax. This is known as the old city market site.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister has stated that the inspector did not direct the attention of the department to the fact that the contractor was not doing his work according to the specifications. Who did direct the attention of the department to this point?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In addition to the gentleman who specially represented the government on this work, we have a resident engineer at Halifax, who, in the discharge of his duty, gave some information with regard to the building which, we thought, necessitated a very complete examination, and so we sent an architect to make that examination.

Mr. FOWLER. I see that the sum of $3,900 has been paid for wiring. Is that the wiring alone, or does that include fixtures?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That includes fixtures.

Mr. FOWLER. Has the minister the contract there to show what it required?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will get my hon. friend the contract. The contractors in this case were Messrs. J. A. Dunn & Company, of Halifax.

Mr. HENDERSON. A few moments ago the minister stated that I had made a mistake in selecting the present item as one upon which to apply the plan I suggested with regard to estimating for public buildings. If I was at all in error in selecting this item, the minister himself is responsible, he not having given the full information to which we are entitled. This shows the necessity of having much more explicit information than is given in these discussions. The minister should familiarize himself thoroughly with all these items so as to be able to give the fullest information. I am glad to know that the minister is able to construct this building within the limits of the estimate. But unfortunately the building is not yet completed, and if there are to be a few more clocks and other extras, possibly he may find his estimate exceeded.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not find any fault with my hon. friend. I intended in this matter, as in respect to all other items, to be as explicit as possible. But the hon. gentleman must remember that I have not been many months in the department. There must be at least a thousand works going on under the control of my department from one end of the country to the other, and it is impossible for me to have everything at my fingers' ends.

Mr. FOWLER. On page 4, part 3, of the Public Works report, it says: 'C. E. W. Dodwell, resident engineer and superintendent of public buildings, supervised this work.' Is that the gentleman who called attention to misdoings on the part of the contractor?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. The resident architect, Mr. Bush, has he done other work for the department besides this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think this is the first time he has been employed by the department, in recent years at all events.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not find any payment to this architect, Mr. Bush. How much has been paid him on account?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Bush's services extended over some three or four years, and he has been paid between $3,000 and $4,000 on account.

Mr. BENNETT. There is no part of it charged up in this year's Auditor General's report.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He was paid in previous years. I may say that Mr. Bush has been making a claim upon me for the remainder of his commission, and I have deferred payment until the matter was looked into.

Mr. CROCKET. How long was the work in course of construction?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract was made on April 16, 1902, to be completed on

September 15, 1904. There was a good deal of delay.

Mr. CROCKET. Was there any penalty for failure to complete the contract within the time ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think not.

Mr. CROCKET. Is it not usual for contracts to contain a penalty clause ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not usual. Security is taken, of course.

Mr. BERGERON : What was the cause of the difficulty with Mr. Bush ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I felt that Mr. Bush was not as attentive to his duties as he ought to be, he did not give as close inspection to the building as I thought he ought to hav. iven. That is the objection I am making to the payment of the balance of his account. He is claiming somewhere in the vicinity of $1,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Was Mr. Bush appointed engineer on the recommendation of the local members, as the minister stated this afternoon was the custom of the department ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know.

Mr. CROCKET. Is it not possible to get that information ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think not. The minister must take the responsibility of the appointment.

Mr. ALCORN. Were there any defects in the building alleged to Mr. Bush as the reason why he should not be paid in full, and what were the defects ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell at this moment.

Mr. ALCORN. An hon. gentleman has stated that some defects were pointed out to Mr. Bush, what were the others ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman read what purported to be a letter, but I do not know whether the letter was intended as a joke or as an extravagant representation of the actual condition of affairs.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me this matter ought to be allowed to stand, because the minister has not the necessary information. It seems there has been a great fraud perpetrated upon the public with respect to the building of this custom house in Halifax, and it is a matter of considerable importance.

Mr. PUGSLEY. All I ask is a revote of $12,000.

Mr. FOWLER. The whole thing involved very much more, $300,000. Although the contractor was not erecting the building according to the contract, he has been paid all except $12,000. The minister must have the certified cheque still in his possession and should penalize the contractor. We would like to see all the correspondence between the department and Bush who has so grossly failed in his duty as inspector. If the employment of architects results in this way perhaps it would be as well to continue the old practice of employing tailors and shoemakers as inspectors. It would look almost as if there were collusion between Bush and the contractor. Although you have a resident engineer and a resident architect and presumably sent an architect from the department to inspect for progress estimates, still the work has been so improperly performed that even the department has been forced to take notice of it. I think the item should stand until we have full information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the hon. gentleman's request is unreasonable. We are asking for a revote of $12,000. Since I became minister the contractor has not received one dollar nor has Mr. Bush. I started investigating immediately the matter was brought to my attention. I sent down a first-class architect from the department who has made a thorough examination. His report does not corroborate the previous reports I have received ; it is to the effect that while there are certain not very serious defects in connection with the roof, the hanging of some of the windows, the flooring in one of the rooms and the cuttings for the elevators, these are so far as I now remember, substantially the only objections he makes. I am taking the matter up, I am responsible in connection with the chief architect for fully protecting the public and surely nothing would be gained by postponing the passing of this vote. This committee could not give the proper time to the correspondence and therefore it must be left to the minister, and I hope my hon. friend will recognize that it is desirable to get along with public business and to proceed reasonably with the estimates.

Mr. FOWLER. Could any one imagine a responsible minister advancing such a reason as that. Even if this committee could not take the time, what is the Public Accounts Committee for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is quite open to the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. FOWLER. Yet we would not have had any information that there was anything wrong if it had not been for a letter received by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain). The minister should at least have brought the two reports he has received from the architects. It would take a much shorter time to discuss it if the minister had been completely frank with the committee. As I understand, it is notorious in Halifax that the building is be-

ing badly built and that Bush is in collusion with the contractor to represent everything as all right when it is all wrong. The opposition have a duty to perform in this House; they should not allow money to be voted unless they are satisfied it is being properly expended.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my hon. friend will see that the proper place to take this up is in the Public Accounts Committee. If that committee feel disposed to take it up, I shall see that all the papers are sent there; but what cause is there to leave this over?

Mr. FOWLER. If it comes before the Public Accounts Committee this session I will be satisfied.

Mr. BERGERON. You will have to move to get it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It can easily be got at because there were payments made in 1905-6 and 1906-7 and these are before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. BLAIN. The department has withheld $12,000. May I ask if that is $12,000 on the original contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think I said $12,000; I said I was not sure of the amount.

Mr. BLAIN. Is that part of the money of the original contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. What proportion of it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell my hon. friend the exact amount to-night.

Mr. BLAIN. This is a very large contract and the committee would like to know how much the department has withheld of the original contract. The total amount of the contract is over $300,000. Was there more than one contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was a contract for fittings also.

Mr. BLAIN. Did Mr. Keefe have that as well?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Has Mr. Keefe any other contract with the government in Halifax?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the name of the architect that the department sent down to make this report?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. W. H. Wright, assistant chief architect.

Mr. CROCKET. Did the report of your own architect state what amount would be required to make good these defects that the minister has referred to?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The report will speak for itself; I cannot recall now whether it states any definite amount or not.

Mr. CROCKET. Is this $12,000 which is being asked for to pay the balance under the contract for that building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have to pay for putting in the elevator yet.

Mr. CROCKET. Is not that included in the original contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. BERGERON. Is Mr. Wright the second officer who was sent from the department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is the second one and he only went a few days ago.

Mr. BERGERON. Who was the first gentleman to make the report?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Dodwell, of Halifax. I may say that Mr. Dodwell sent me a confidential report. He has not had special charge of the building. Special charge of it was given to Mr. Bush. Mr. Dodwell, as resident engineer, has a general supervision of the building. He has made a confidential report on the subject. Then, I sent for Mr. Keefe and talked matters over with him after which I decided to send Mr. Wright down to make a thorough examination of the building.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister ought to be able to state what portion of this sum is to be devoted to the original contract. Under the minister's statement with regard to the report there is no liability on the part of the government to pay the contactor a further sum. He has failed to complete his contract and there are these serious defects which he has spoken of and which will require a considerable amount, I should think, to make them good. I think the minister ought to be able to state what portion of this sum is to be paid to the contractor.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am unable to state what will be the result of the consideration of the report or of the negotiations, but we certainly must have some more money at once to complete the work that is absolutely essential in the building. We have to instal an elevator and that will cost several thousand dollars.

Mr. CROCKET. How much will the elevator cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Several thousand dollars.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then the contractor must have got all his money.

Mr. ALCORN. It is apparent the government has a good deal to conceal in this matter. I understood the minister to say that this building was to have been completed four years ago. That four years, I assume, have been occupied in correspondence between the government and the ar-

chitect, or the person to whom the contract was first given. I asked the question a short time ago what were the defects in construction pointed out by the government to the architect as the reason why the balance of the contract price was withheld. The minister did not answer that question but contented himself with making some remarks upon the statement of my hon. friend from Peel. I would like an answer to that question.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The report which I have just received is a confidential report from Mr. Dodwell. That being a confidential report I could not give the details of it to the contractor, but I told him that I had been informed that there were a number of important defects in the construction of the building.

Mr. ALCORN. What were these defects?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I told him they were important defets. I did not enter into the details, but I said that I would send an arctitect from the department down to Halifax and would give him an opportunity of going over the building with the architect so that he would have the most complete fair play as I did not want to do the contractor any injustice. It is just a few days ago that the report was presented to me. Now, my intention is to have a copy of the report sent to the contractor and also to Mr. Bush. I would be very glad indeed if the Public Accounts Committee would find it convenient to take up these matters. That is the place where they should be inquired into. All the correspondence would be submitted to the committee. That would be much more convenient than attempting to consider the correspondence before a committee of the House.

Mr. ALCORN. The minister says there has been a report?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. ALCORN. It is a report in regard to the public business and I fail to see how that would be confidential as regards this House. I think we have a right to know what the report contains. The minister says that he is about to send a copy of the report to the contractor.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am speaking of Mr. Wright's report; it is not confidential.

Mr. ALCORN. In what sense could a report on a public work be confidential? I think this committee has the right to know the contents of that report.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That will be a matter in the judgment of the Public Accounts Committee. I am rather inclined to think that the Committee on Public Accounts would say that if an official of the department who was not specially charged with the supervision of this building wrote a confidential report, it should not be produced. Personally I have no objection, but we must respect the confidence of this gentleman. I have, myself, the utmost confidence in the report of Mr. Wright, and I think that the committee, having regard to his high standing as an architect, would also have confidence in his report. That report would be submitted to the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. BERGERON. I am sure that my hon. friend has every possible confidence in Mr. Dodwell, and if it had not been for that gentleman, it is probable that we might never have heard anything about that building, and we would have paid the full amount the contract calls for. It is difficult to know whether this report should be disclosed if it is confidential. The public owe a great deal to Mr. Dodwell for having first found out these conditions and having been the cause of saving the money of the country. But, there is a great deal of difference between the report of Mr. Dodwell, who is not interested, and who has had no communication with the contractor, and the report of Mr. Wright, who may be a first-class architect, but who goes down there, meets the contractor, and we can see immediately the work of the contractor, because the report of Mr. Wright does not deal at all with the information given by Mr. Dodwell. It is a question whether it would not be a good thing to have the report of Mr. Dodwell, so that we could compare the two reports.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no justifiable reason why it should be private. It deals with the expenditure of public money, and therefore this House is entitled to it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was not at my suggestion that it was marked confidential. I received this communication from Mr. Dodwell, who I presume felt it to be his duty, as an official of the government, though not specially charged with looking after this building, to give me certain information, and it is for the Public Accounts Committee to say whether that should be produced.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the minister should have said that as this was a public work, the report had no right to be marked confidential, and this House is entitled to see that or any other report made in connection with it.

Mr. ALCORN. This committee is now asked to vote this large sum to complete this building, and it appears that two reports have been made on certain defects in the building. I am quite unable to see in what sense, as regards this committee or parliament, either of these reports can be said to be confidential. It is a new doctrine to me that parliament can be denied

information simply because some outside party chooses to mark a paper as confidential. It is for the minister to say whether information so conveyed to him is confidential as between him and parliament. Was this report so marked paid for ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. ALCORN. The other report was paid for, I presume ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was made by an official of the department, whose expenses of course were paid, but there was no other charge.

Mr. ALCORN. That report ought to be here.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It seems to me that the proper course would be, if it is thought desirable in the public interest that the matter should be investigated, for the Public Accounts Committee to take it up. That committee would have power to summon Mr. Dodwell and Mr. Bush to give evidence under oath, which of course could not be presented to this committee.

Mr. BERGERON. Suppose the majority of the committee refused to subpœna Mr. Dodwell.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot conceive such a thing possible. I am sure the committee would be most willing to investigate this matter, as I have noticed every desire on its part to investigate every public matter.

Mr. SPROULE. The item then should be allowed to stand until it is investigated ; because after the money is voted, the government need not care.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The purpose of this vote will be to pay for the electric elevator and certain blinds and fittings which are necessary to put the building in shape so that it can be used by the customs authorities. I may say that there will be no money paid either to Mr. Keefe or Mr. Bush until the Committee on Public Accounts have a reasonable time to take the matter up; but we want to complete the furnishing and pay for the elevator.

Mr. ALCORN. The hon. minister admits that this item, at all events a part of it, is necessary for examination by the Public Accounts Committee. In that state of affairs it seems highly improper to pass the item here.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the minister is to spend all of this $12,000, $7,000 for an elevator and the rest for furnishings, what money is due to the contractor ? He must have got all his money. Does the minister hold the contractor's cheque which is put up with his tender ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. There is security, but I do not know just the amount of it. The hon. gentleman must have misunderstood me, as it was several thousands, not $7.000, that I said were required for the elevator. There will be still quite a balance of the $12,000 which we are asking for.

Mr. BLAIN. Mr. Keefe has two contracts with the government—the original contract and a further contract for fittings. Surely the minister can state how much is due on each of these contracts.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The fittings have been paid for in full, $7,400. There is no fault to find with them. The balance is in respect of the main contract.

Mr. BLAIN. Was the contract for the fittings entirely satisfactory to the department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister states that Mr. Dodwell was not charged with any duties in connection with this building. Is that correct ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Dodwell is a resident engineer ; he looks principally after the construction of wharfs and works of that kind coming under the engineering department. But in the performance of his duty he is supposed to keep a general oversight of the erection of buildings as well. In this particular case there having been a resident architect employed as inspector, he did not feel it his duty to personally supervise the erection of the building.

Mr. CROCKET. But as a matter of fact, the report which the minister received from this gentleman came in the ordinary course of his duty as resident engineer at Halifax. Under these circumstances it seems to me that there can be nothing whatever in the claim that this report is confidential. As one member of this committee, I think we are entitled to have that report before this item is passed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it would be very much preferable for the Committee on Public Accounts to take it up, if it desired to do so, and subpœna both Mr. Wright and Mr. Dodwell, and then Mr. Dodwell could give under oath his view of the building and any defects which he found in it.

Mr. BLAIN. The contracts for the fittings having been fully paid for, does the minister say there is no truth whatever in this statement that the wood work in the office desks is going to pieces in parts of the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not heard of that at all.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the clerk of the works or the architect not reported on defects in the fittings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. SPROULE. If the minister undertakes that all these papers will be sent to the Public Accounts Committee and the committee be authorized to go into the whole subject we might allow the item to pass on that distinct understanding.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will send before the Public Accounts Committee all the contracts and progress reports from time to time and the correspondence in the department relating to the building, the report of Mr. Wright, and then, of course, I would suggest that the committee should subpœna Mr. Wright and Mr. Dodwell.

Mr. SPROULE. We could only go into what appears in the Auditor General's Report, but this comes up to a later date. If a motion be made that this committee be instructed to take this up, they can take it up to any date we may order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Even without a motion there will be no objection to investigate right up to date.

Mr. BERGERON. What about the legal firm of Quirk, Gammon and Snap in the committee?

Mr. FIELDING. They are on the other side of the House.

Mr. CROCKET. Will the hon. minister bring down the contractor's claim for extras ?

Mr. ALCORN. Will he undertake that there will be no obstruction to go into the whole matter fully ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There will be none on my part, and I do not think there will be any on the part of any member of the committee.

Mr. ALCORN. There will be none on this side of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nor on this side.

Mr. ALCORN. Will the minister bring down the confidential report?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think the committee should ask me to promise this. It would be better to subpœna Mr. Dodwell. His testimony under oath would be better than his report.

Mr. ALCORN. The committee should have his report in order to know the particulars on which to examine Mr. Dodwell.

Halifax—quarantine station on Lawlor's island—winter hospital, electric plant repairs, &c., $16,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. $10,000 of this is a revote. I could give the particulars if desired.

Mr. BERGERON. I see that the same firms who were engaged in furnishing the government in the other buildings in Halifax are still employed here. There is not much use asking for tenders. The same contractors usually do the work. We have the firms of Rhodes, Curry & Co., Longard Bros., Frank Reardon all through the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Four tenders were received in reply to public advertisements. I do not wonder at Rhodes, Curry & Co. getting many contracts, because they are the largest building contractors we have in the lower provinces. I am not quite sure that they are not the largest in Canada. They have large works at Amherst where they employ over 1,500 men, and I can well understand that they can do work cheaply. They are very large builders of cars as well. Not long ago they erected a great many buildings at Sydney. Longard Bros. are a very reputable firm also. At all events the lowest tenders were accepted.

Inverness public building, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is only a revote of $10,000 to complete this building. It was placed under contract July 26, 1906. It is a building of 2½ storeys high with an annex. It is built of brick on stone foundation with stone trimmings. It is required for post office and customs purposes.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the contract price ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $14,559.

Mr. BENNETT. Does that include heating?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the total probable cost, including heating, boilers, electric wiring, fittings, furniture, &c., exclusive of the site, is $22,950.

Mr. CROCKET. Who is the clerk of works?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. McIsaac. He gets $3 per day.

Mr. BERGERON. How much does he get altogether?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The date of the contract was 20th July, 1906, and the date of completion was 1st November last year.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the building ocmpleted now ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Pretty nearly.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the meaning of the drawback of $896.27 ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the percentage retained until the work is completed. Suppose that under the estimate there will be $20,000 to the contractor, 10 per cent is kept back as a further guarantee for the completion of the work.

Mr. CROCKET. Is Mr. McIsaac, the clerk of the works, a mason or a carpenter?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not sure which, but I understand he is a practical man.

Mr. McLENNAN. He is a carpenter.

Shelburne public building, $10,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will it cost to complete this building ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Including heating, electric wiring, fixtures, &c., $35,686.

Mr. BERGERON. Will this vote finish it ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The work is just beginning. So far, $1,790 has been spent. The site cost $1,500, and other expenses, such as printing, advertising, legal services, survey of site, &c., cost $290.

Mr. BERGERON. Who was the legal adviser ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are appointed in the Justice Department and I have not the names at hand.

Mr. STANFIELD. The legal expenses seem to be very high.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This $290 covers other expenses as well as the legal services.

Mr. STANFIELD. But at page V—37 of the Auditor General's Report, I find a charge for legal services, R. T. MacIlreith, Halifax, $76.85.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There would be the search of title, and there might be other things which would easily run up a bill of $76. I hardly think that such a bill would be out of the way.

Mr. FIELDING. The $1,500 purchases the corner lot on which the building is to stand. But there is a lot adjoining which is required in order to give it a decent size, and that is being expropriated.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The legal bills are always carefully taxed by the officials of the Justice Department. That is something my department has nothing to do with.

Mr. STANFIELD. What is the size of the lot bought from Mr. King?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is 73 feet by 31 feet.

Mr. STANFIELD. Is it vacant or is there a building on it ?

Mr. FIELDING. There is a very old house on it, which will have to be removed.

Mr. CROCKET. The statement is made that the bills for legal services are strictly taxed by the Justice Department, but I am in a position to state that the opposite is the case. I had occasion to examine some bills presented to the Railway Department by Mr. MacIlreith for the examination of titles in connection with acquiring a property at Halifax. He examined 35 or 40 titles and presented a separate bill for each title. I found, on examination, that he charged the Department of Railways more than once for the same day's search. In one case, he charged the same day no less than six times. There were over twenty days that he charged twice, a number he charged three times, others he charged four times and one he actually charged six times, at $15.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not informed as to the case to which the hon. gentleman refers, but I have here a complaint of one of the agents of the Minister of Justice about the very close way his bill has been taxed by the department.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this building for a post office ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Custom house and post office.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the population of Shelburne ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is under 2,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is it necessary to make a search of title in Nova Scotia ? Is it different from Ontario, where you can go to the Registry Office and the registrar will make an abstract of title ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it is different. In some of the counties of Ontario, they have adopted what is called the Torrens system, and under that system it is not necessary to search titles as is done in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. In these provinces it is necessary to search back to the original title.

Mr. TAYLOR. In Ontario the registrar does that where the Torrens system is not in vogue. I have had a great deal to do with the examination of titles. I send to the registrar for an abstract of title which will cost $2, $3 or $4. The lawyer looks that over and for that and comparing the deed $10 is an outside price—it costs only $5 in many cases. I am agent for one of the largest loan companies in the country and have paid $10 for this service in connection with many mortgages—never more than $20. Yet here is $79 paid to a lawyer to go into a registry office, pass a title and draw a deed. This is simply throwing away the people's money for the benefit of political favourites.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In Nova Scotia and New Brunswick no prudent man will buy a property or take a mortgage without having a solicitor examine the title. I certainly should feel that the government had been derelict in its duty if it did not employ a solicitor to make a thorough and careful search of title.

Mr. TAYLOR. But the registrar furnishes the abstract, and he is responsible if he makes a mistake.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not the law with us.

Mr. CROCKET. With regard to the sums paid to Mr. MacIlreith, I have now in my

hand an abstract of Mr. MacIlreith's accounts for the services for which he charged the Railway Department in connection with the taking over of the land at Halifax for the roundhouse. He charged for no less than 182¾ days' searching in connection with these titles, most of them at $15 and some of them at $10, billing the department for no less than $2,842 for searching alone. I find there are 106 days on which a day or a part of a day's searching is charged. In case of 55 of these more than one day's time is charged. In one case the same day is charged no less than six times ; one day charged 5½ times : one day five times, one day 4½ times, two are charged 4 times, eight 3 times, four, 2¾ times, four 2½ times, one 2¼ times and 23 days are charged twice. In three other cases he managed to get in 1¾ days' time in one day. and in five others 1½ days' time. I think that will give the committee some idea of the care that the minister states was exercised by the Department of Justice in taxing the bills of Mr. R. T. MacIlreith. These bills, I may explain, were presented separately, and that is the way in which he managed to multiply and duplicate these charges for the same day. Instead of showing the bills as presented separately, I have made up a bill showing the various services for which Mr. MacIlreith charged the Railway Department on one day, the 30th of August. This is the way his bill would read for one sample day, taking these items out of the separate accounts and putting them into one account for one day's service:

August 30, 1905—

To search at office of registrar of deeds, Mary Graves property, all day..	$10 00
To search at office of registrar of deeds, heirs W. J. Robertson property, all day..	15 00
To search at office of registrar of deeds, Thomas Spry property, all day..	15 00
To search at office of registrar of deeds, Ritchie & Manger property, all day..	10 00
To search at office of registrar of deeds, Thomas Ritchie property, all day..	10 00
To search at office of registrar of deeds, estate W. J. Ritchie property, 3 hours..	7 50
To search at prothonotary's office, Thomas Spry property..	5 00
To search at probate office, Thomas Spry property..	5 00
To search at probate office, Mary Graves property..	7 50

All on the same day. He charged on August 30 against the Railway Department no less than six day's searches at the office of the registrar of deeds, besides charging for searches at the prothonotary's office and the probate office, amounting to $85. But he seems to have had an opportunity during that day of performing some other duties, and on the same day he makes these additional charges:

To letter to W. K. Thompson, James Graham property..	$0 50
To letter to W. B. McKenzie, James Graham property..	0 50
To attendance on J. K. Hubley.. ..	2 50
To interview with agent of Mrs. Katherine Kennedy..	2 50
To interview with Mrs. Mason as to acceptance of Crown office..	2 50
To interview with Mr. O'Sullivan when asked for increase..	2 00
To letter to W. B. McKenzie re estate W. J. Ritchie property.. ..	0 50
To preparing abstract of title, estate W. J. Ritchie property..	2 50
To drawing deed W. J. Ritchie property..	5 00
To letter to A. J. Rothwell..	0 50
To letter to W. B. McKenzie..	0 50
To attendance on J. A. McDonald re C. H. Wallace property..	2 50
To letter to Miss West..	0 50
To letter to W. B. McKenzie re Miss West property..	0 50

Making a total in connection with these properties on that day, of $105.50. But in addition to that he managed to appear in the police court on the same day and make the additional charges which we have here.

To prosecuting defendant Wm. Overy in King vs. Overy, for trespassing on Intercolonial Railway at North Street station..	20 00
To prosecuting defendant McPhee, in King vs. McPhee, for trespassing on Intercolonial Railway at North Street station..	20 00

Making his total bill for that day's service no less than $145.50. Now Mr. MacIlreith, I may say, is a lawyer who has but one partner, the firm name, I think, is MacIlreith & Tremaine. In the Public Accounts Committee it transpired that his office staff consisted entirely of himself, his partner, an office boy and a girl typewriter. That will give the House some idea of the care that is exercised by the Justice Department in taxing solicitors' bills, which has so impressed the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. MICHAUD. This question was discussed in the Public Accounts Committee, and it transpired that this gentleman employed outside lawyers to assist him.

Mr. CROCKET. The hon. gentleman's statement is entirely unwarranted, no such statement was made in the committee. It is true that Mr. MacIlreith was examined as a witness, but he professed to know nothing of this matter. He said the business was all done by his partner, and he suggested that on some occasions he might have employed another solicitor. But when he was asked if it was possible for his firm to have had six different solicitors working in the registry office on the same day searching titles to adjoining properties, he was compelled to admit that there must have been

some mistake. After the examination which took place in the Public Accounts Committee, a trial took place in the city of Halifax in a suit brought by Mr. MacIlreith against the Halifax 'Herald,' and in the course of this trial this question of searching titles was fully gone into. Mr. Treamine was examined, and the evidence which he there gave bore out the statement which I now make that Mr. MacIlreith duplicated and multiplied these charges against the department without any justification whatever.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me unreasonable that the country's money should go this way without the slightest effort on the part of the government to get return for it. It is an absolute fraud on the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This was in the Department of Railways, there is no suggestion that it was in the Public Works Department.

Mr. CROCKET. But it is the same gentleman who, I see, received in connection with the transfer of this property in the Finance Minister's constituency, $76.85 for searching titles last year.

Mr. SPROULE. Titles that probably cost about $2. I have been engaged in real estate for twenty-five or thirty years, and I have not employed a lawyer twice to examine titles. I can get an abstract of a title from any registry office, and it won't cost above $2.

Mr. CARVELL. You are a fortunate man.

Mr. SPROULE. A single abstract of title for a single property will only cost 25 cents. If there are several of them it goes up, but I could get half a dozen of them for less than $2.

Mr. CARVELL. I wish we had some system like that in New Brunswick. I can assure my hon. friend that when he goes to the maritime provinces, he will not get any title searched for $2 ; I advise him not to ask a registrar down there to give him an abstract of title, or at least not to purchase on such an abstract. In Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, titles will run back 100 years ; the original grant may have been divided and subdivided a hundred times, and there may have been a dozen conveyances. There is no such thing as a Torrens system in the maritime provinces.

Mr. ALCORN. There is a statute of limitations and there is no necessity to go back 100 years.

Mr. CARVELL. You might have to go back 40 years or even 60. As to getting an abstract of title from the registrar it is not his business to prepare an abstract and he may not know if it is a correct one or not. It is his business to register the deeds, &c., and he might not know if the copy of an abstract was correct. What would the hon. member think of a minister who would take a conveyance with an imperfect title ? My hon. friend would be the first man to find fault. If it were simply the searching of an ordinary title, if there were no complications and there was a continuous chain from the Crown to the present owner, probably $76 would be a good fee, but I have no doubt there are complications, the property may have been sold and resold, and I am sure there is not a lawyer in this House who would not say it would be unwise for any person to buy a property without a thorough search of the title. In my own experience recently I found a mortgage 20 years old that was undischarged and the parties concerned dead, so that I had to get administration to have the thing cleared up. I will not state that I would charge $76 to search a title, but this charge is not stated to be for the searching of a title ; it is for legal services ; that includes many things besides searching titles. If this government do not squander any money in worse extravagance than this, there will not be much complaint.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know the system in Nova Scotia.

Mr. CARVELL. That is the trouble ; he does not know ; there are a few things the hon. gentleman does not know.

Mr. SPROULE. With us a company like the Canada Permanent will mortgage a piece of property of 12 or 14 lots, they will examine the titles, make searches and everything else and draw all the writings, paying all expenses, for about $25.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have never paid more than $20.

Mr. SPROULE. I have had it done as low as $9, and never paid more than $30, although there were as many as 12 pieces of property in the same mortgage.

Mr. CARVELL. You cannot do that in the maritime provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. It is regarded as a fair charge with us ; these are the Toronto lawyers' charges, and if the maritime provinces are worse, God help the country.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not like to see the lawyers run down too much. Making money seems to be a disease with them in the maritime provinces. We had Lodge buying land for $5,000 and selling it to the government for $13,000, and Pearson buying it for $16,000 and selling it to the government for $45,000. The head of a department should have his eyes open when he has to do with any one down there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think the gentlemen down below are very much worse

than those up above. I would trust the people of the maritime provinces as much as any one in Canada. I think human nature is about the same in all parts of the country. I did not know that doctors were so jealous of lawyers and I am surprised to hear my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) talking in this way.

Westville public building, $13,125.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision for a public building there. It is to be a nice building 61 by 30·6.

Mr. BERGERON. Are these buildings all alike ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, there are changes in the design depending on the location and the size of the place.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the population of Westville ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was 2,300 at the last census. It is probably over 3,000 now.

Mr. FIELDING. While the census should be right this is a large mining town, and I should say its population is considerably above that. It is the centre of a large coal mining region in Pictou county.

Mr. BERGERON. All that has been done is to purchase a site.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the buying of a site up to November 14, 1907.

Mr. BERGERON. Bought from whom ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Acadia Coal Company.

Mr. BENNETT. What will be the total cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $25,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Does that include fittings ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That includes every thing.

Mr. STANFIELD. Are the plans completed ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and the contract is let.

Mr. STANFIELD. Who has the contract ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Munroe, of New Glasgow.

Mr. STANFIELD. What does the contract consist of ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract is for $12,995. That does not include heating and boilers, electric wiring, fixtures, fittings, lock boxes, sidewalks or fencing.

Mr. STANFIELD. Does that include painting ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. STANFIELD. $25,000 will complete it in its entirety ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is expected that that amount will complete it.

Mr. BENNETT. Exclusive of site ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Including the site.

Mr. CROCKET. What rental is paid for the present post office in that town ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We pay $120 a year for the post office. This is intended for other purposes as well, I think. The revenue for nine months of last year from the post office at this place was $2,264 ; money orders, $24,277.15 ; money orders paid $10,359.

Yarmouth public building—improvement, $4,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is required for the erection of a clock tower and the purchase of a clock in connection with this public building and also a number of alterations and improvements.

Allow me to go back to the Antigonish public building. The hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) was desirous of getting the details of the expenditure of $2,224.90 which was the amount paid for printing and advertising and the salary of the clerk of the works. The details are as follows :

A. McGillivray, clerk of works, services.

The sum of $2,224 paid for printing, advertising and clerk of works services, covers the following items taken from the Auditor General's Report for the fiscal years 1904-05-06-07, and from the accountant's books for 1907-08:

Auditor General's Report for 1904-05—page 46—V.		
Clerk of works—A. McGillivray—services, June 16-30, 15 days at $3..	$ 45 00	
Advertising..	110 95	
King's Printer's account.. ..	47 02	
		$ 202 17
Auditor General's Report for 1905-06—page 43—V.		
Clerk of works—A. McGillivray—services, July 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906, 365 days at $3..	$1,095 00	
King's Printer's account.. ..	10 32	
		$1,105 32
Auditor General's Report, 1906-07—page 34—V.		
Clerk of works—A. McGillivray—services, July 1, 1906, to March 31, 1907, 274 days at $3..	$ 822 00	
Payments under $50: Smith's work, $29.28; coal, $5.33; photographic work, $3.. ..	37 61	
		$ 859 61
Chief accountant's books.		
Expenditure for sundry services up to October 31, 1907....	57 00	
Total..		$2,224 90

Mr. SPROULE. What were the dates in the second year mentioned ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From July 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906, $1,095.

Mr. SPROULE. For services ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For services.

Mr. SPROULE. That would be paying him $3 a day including Sundays and all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, that is true.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you pay your employees in that way ?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, why not ? He probably did as much instructing on Sunday as on any other day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is paid by the month.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it the rule to pay for Sundays ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The rule is to pay him at the rate of $3 per day for the whole year.

Mr. FOWLER. Then you had better change that rule.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think it is the rule generally. I have known of such cases but I never know of them having been paid for Sundays. They are paying inspectors $3 a day but they are only paid for six days in the week.

Mr. WM. JACKSON. Is a clerk of works the same as an inspector under the department of Public Works ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. WM. JACKSON. Do you pay your inspectors in Ontario, when you hire them by the day, for Sundays ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could not tell at this moment.

Mr. WM. JACKSON. You can go through the Auditor General's Report from one end to the other and you will not find one inspector getting paid for Sundays. If an inspector in the province of Nova Scotia is to get pay for Sunday work we have many people in Ontario who are not getting all out of this government that they could get. I think it is unfair for an inspector, paid by the day, to receive pay for Sundays. It is bad enough to pay him when he is not working half the week, but if you are paying inspectors in Nova Scotia for every day in the week, Sunday included, there are some inspectors employed by the Department of Public Works in Ontario who do not receive that.

Mr. SPROULE. In this case there is not a holiday omitted. It is unlikely that this work was going on during holidays or even in the winter, much less that the work was continued on Sunday. When I was recommending people for these positions I know that they were paid $3 a day but I never knew that they were paid for Sundays or holidays. This is a fraudulent method of taking money out of the country. It is not likely that this inspector worked on New Years day or Dominion day. It is reasonable to suppose that he went to church on Sunday. If that is the system which is carried out it is well that the Christian people of this country should know to what extent Sunday observance takes place under this government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have just asked the chief architect and he says that sometimes they are paid for the whole month and sometimes they are not. I notice also a difference in the wages paid—in some cases they are $3.50 a day, and in some cases $3. It may be that in the case of the man paid $3.50 a deduction is made for Sundays. I say frankly that in my judgment they ought not to be paid for Sundays.

Mr. CROCKET. When the allowance is on a monthly basis, what is the usual allowance ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It varies so as to give from $3 to $3.50 a day. In the western country I think the payment is somewhat larger. I am inclined to think that it would be better to pay them simply for the working days.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend has no rule. If he looks at page V—37 of the Auditor's General Report he will see that the inspector of works at Lunenburg, D. J. Mullarkey, has been paid $4 a day for 31 days, Sunday and every other day. At Sydney the clerk of works, D. A. Gillis, is paid 3 per cent on the amount of the contract. So it all depends on the value politically of the clerk of works. If he is worth $3 a day to the party he will get it ; if he is worth $4 a day, he will get that ; if he is worth more he will get a percentage.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Mullarkey is a special inspector. His headquarters are in Ottawa and he is directed to go to different parts of the country on special work. I am inclined to think that it would be better to pay these inspectors for the actual working days.

Mr. SPROULE. Are we to understand that the minister will establish that practice in his department in future ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think I can say that that will be the practice in the future. At all events, in the case of any new inspectors appointed that will be the case.

Mr. FOWLER. I think the government should not violate the Act passed a year or so ago in respect to Sabbath observance as they are doing by paying men for Sunday work.

Georgetown, Prince Edward Island, public building, $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Has any contract been let ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for purchasing a building. We can purchase a lot of land and a building upon it for the sum of $2,500. It is a very excellent bargain. The building is well situated for post office and customs purposes, and we purpose making certain improvements in it so that the total cost will not exceed $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT. This afternoon my hon. friend from Kings (Mr. Fowler) gave the minister a reputation for being very profligate in the dissipation of public moneys, and I am afraid that as a result there may be inordinate demands on the hon. gentleman by our hon. friends opposite. There has lately been published the report of the Civil Service Commission, and I would like to direct the minister's attention to a passage which he will find in that report on page 43 :

> The commissioners of 1892 drew attention to the practice of building custom houses, &c., in small towns. With regard to this the Deputy Postmaster General at that time stated that not only did it tend to increase the charge to the department, for the reason that by moving to a public building, the postmaster had to give up his own business, but in other ways by the employment of caretakers, &c., &c., it largely added to the cost of the service. Your commissioners think it desirable again to bring under notice the observations made in 1892.

That is a question that has been discussed in this House for a great many years—the erection of public buildings in small towns. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when in opposition took strong ground on that score. By reason of the fact that small places are mentioned in these estimates for the erection of public buildings, the hon. minister will be no doubt assailed by his supporters for further amounts to be brought down in the supplementary estimates, though I have been successful, if I can congratulate myself, in staying the minister's hand to some extent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not able to recall any instance.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, he rather came down on those dredging contracts lately.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not in consequence of anything the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman came down anyway. I want to direct the attention of the minister to what has been going on in the past twelve years in regard to the construction of public buildings in small places. The minister will not be assailed as past ministers have been by his colleagues in the ministry importuning him to erect buildings in their riding, as they have already been very successful in that respect. The Minister of Agriculture has a very respectable public building erected in the town of Knowlton in his riding ; the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has succeeded in having one erected in his constituency ; the Postmaster General has succeeded in having one in his riding ; while the Minister of Finance has been doubly lucky in having two in the constituency he represents, and the Minister of Militia has one in his riding also. These buildings have all been erected in comparatively small places. What is the result ? The rank and file say : If the ministers have been so successful in their demands, what is there left for us? Now, I am going to read a list of some of these comparatively small places in which public buildings have been erected, with their population and the amount paid formerly for rent, fuel, light and attendance in premises used for postal and other government business :

	Population.	Paid formerly for rent, fuel, &c.
Markham	967	$ 90
Glencoe	1,034	90
Parkhill	1,430	90
Whitby	2,110	135
Leamington	2,451	150
Kincardine	2,885	150
Simcoe	2,627	210
Renfrew	3,153	195
Alexandria	1,911	120
Bowmanville	2,731	180
Knowlton	760	60
Cookshire	2,400	75
Farnham	3,099	....
Plessisville	1,586	75
Marieville	1,306	45
Nicolet	1,318	75
Acton Vale	1,175	20
Shelburne, N.S.	1,445	45
Westville	2,274	90
Kentville	1,731	....
Liverpool	1,937	60
Inverness	1,890	60
Antigonish	1,838	60

Here is a list of about twenty places at each of which a public building has been erected, and the aggregate cost of all these buildings is in the neighbourhood of $600,000 to $650,000. What is the result ? All the wants of the public were formerly met in these places out of an annual expenditure of $1,578, whereas now we have to pay some $42,000 a year. Take the expenses of these public buildings. Each one must have a caretaker at about $400 per annum ; fuel, $150 ; light, $200 ; and interest on the capital invested, $1,200. It will cost over $2,000 yearly to maintain each of these buildings. And the minister will be importuned to construct a large number, more especially when we find ministers of the Crown deeming it their duty to ask that such large expenditure be made in their ridings. These things do not appeal to the public. I see the Minister of Railways present and that recalls to my recollection the fact that in the last election held in Centre York, there

was a meeting in the village of Markham at which the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) showed the plans and specifications of a new building which the government were going to put up there. But in spite of this appeal of the ministers, the people there actually went back on the government by some thirty votes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That shows how self-sacrificing we are to give these public buildings where they do not affect the vote.

Mr. BENNETT. But the ministers are not self-sacrificing at their own expense. This is done for the purpose of parading the public money before the people and geting them to vote for the government because of the local expenditure in these places.

Mr. GRAHAM. Does the hon. gentleman say that the plans were exhibited at that meeting ?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. BENNETT. I can get the report in the newspapers of that meeting. Senator Campbell was present and announced that he had the plans and that the building would be a magnificent one, and he gave that as an earnest of what they could do.

Mr. MILLER. Does my hon. friend say that the cost of maintaining each of these buildings is $2,500 per year ?

Mr. BENNETT. I find it would run to about $2,000 a year. Some of them run to more than that. The building at Bridgewater cost some $40,000. It is time that these huge expenditures should be stopped. If the same amount of money had been invested a few years ago in transportation, the country would have had some benefit. There is a list that will startle the average man throughout the Dominion. All that money is sacrificed simply out of a desire to gain political advantage. What necessity is there in a village like Markham with some 967 people, for a public building where formerly they had good post office accommodation at a total cost of $90 per year. But the country has to launch into a large public building, to maintain which it will cost $2,000 per year. It is high time that a protest should be made against spending money in this ridiculous way in these small places.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think we ought now to rise.

Mr. FIELDING. At the rate we are going, it will take a good many days yet to go through the estimates.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is not our fault.

Mr. FIELDING. It is your side who are taking up the time.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. gentleman will look into the matter, he will find that more time has been taken up by members supporting the government.

Mr. FIELDING. Not on the estimates.

Mr. TAYLOR. It has been taken up by the ministers and their supporters more than by the opposition.

Mr. FIELDING. Has not three-fourths of the speaking to-day been on the side of my hon. friend ?

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister occupied fully one-half the time himself.

Mr. FIELDING. He has to answer questions.

St. John, New Brunswick, Dominion buildings—improvements, repairs, &c., $4,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for repairs to the custom house, post office, &c.

Mr. CROCKET. Is that done by day's labour or by contract ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The amounts are all small ones and the work is done by day's labour.

Mr. CROCKET. Is there an inspector on works of that kind ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have the superintendent of buildings there.

St. John military building—addition to stores building and wagon and gun shed, $6,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What is this estimated to cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The estimate is $33,044.93.

Mr. BENNETT. Was there a contract in this case?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, after public advertisement.

Mr. FOWLER. How much more will be required to complete it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $19,875.

St. John quarantine station, Partridge island—to complete water service, &c., $2,500.

Mr. FOWLER. How much has been paid on account of that water service? It seems to me we have had a vote for that every year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This $2,500 is to complete the work. I made a statement concerning it on a former occasion. The total probable cost is $54,988.91.

Mr. FOWLER. Are you boring?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. There is a water pipe laid from the mainland. A trench had

to be excavated and the pipe laid. There was an accident to the pipe which added to the expense. The hon. member for the city of St. John (Mr. Daniel) is familiar with the case.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this under contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is done under the direction of the resident engineer. It is to give a fresh-water supply to Partridge Island.

Mr. CROCKET. How long has the work been going on?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Since 1904.

Mr. FOWLER. Did they try boring an artesian well?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and struck salt water at a great depth.

St. John quarantine station, Partridge island—site for steam sterilizer; dwelling for boatman; improvement and repair to existing buildings, &c., $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide a steam sterilizer and also a cottage for the orderly. This is asked for by the director general of public health, Dr. Montizambert.

Mr. FOWLER. Does not the government own Partridge Island? Why then do they need to procure a site for the steam sterilizer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is needed merely to provide the site—to build up the walls to make a level site for the building. This is a rocky island and the site for the building must be prepared.

Tracadie lazaretto—laundry and sanitary works, $6,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the lazaretto where lepers are taken care of. It is in Gloucester county. This money is to provide a laundry and septic tank.

Mr. FOWLER. How many lepers are there now?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I believe there are thirteen. This is a wonderfully well conducted institution, and deserving of being very carefully looked after.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the minister know if the lepers are decreasing or not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) could probably tell the committee better than I.

Mr. TURGEON. The number is decreasing so far as the locality is concerned. But Dr. Smith, the surgeon of the hospital, was sent to the west a month or so ago to bring in another case.

Mr. FOWLER. Are these all the items for New Brunswick?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the hon. minister intend to have an item for a public building at Hillsborough in the supplementary estimates?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If it is decided to erect a public building at Hillsborough to which I have been urged very strongly by Hon. Mr. Osman more especially, as well as by some other residents there, of course, it will appear in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. FOWLER. As a representative of the district, I have for a number of years urged the erection of a public building there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not heard from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) on the subject.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) has not been Minister of Public Works all the time.

Mr. CARVELL. What is the population of Hillsborough?

Mr. FOWLER. Greater than that of most of the places where these buildings have been provided. This building would serve between 3,000 and 4,000 people.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A very prominent and influential citizen (Hon. Mr. Osman), called upon me in addition to corresponding upon the subject, and said that if the government would erect a building there, the company with which he was connected would give the site free. He urged very strongly favourable consideration of the matter. I have said that, as minister, I was disposed to take a very favourable view of the case, recognizing that it was desirable to give to the people the necessary accommodation. For I do not take the view taken by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) on this subject. Judging from the complacency with which my hon. friend from King's and Albert (Mr. Fowler) listened to that hon. gentleman, I thought that he coincided with his views. It came to me as a matter of surprise that my hon. friend should urge the providing of a building for Hillsboro. Another reason for my surprise was that, though I have been minister since August last, I have not had the pleasure of receiving any communication, written or verbal, from the hon. gentleman on the subject.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. minister speaks of the complacency with which I regarded the remarks of the hon. member for East Simcoe. I was merely copying the complacency of the hon. minister himself, and surely he does not object to hon. members modelling themselves on his pattern. I have urged the construction of a public building at Hillsborough every session since I first had the honour of representing the county of Albert. With respect to providing buildings in these small towns, it seems to be a principle adopted by this govern-

ment. That being the case, I fail to see why a place of the importance of Hillsborough should not be recognized, since it is far more important than the great majority of the places that have already received public buildings. There is a considerable revenue in Hillsborough, there is a custom house, it is a customs sub-port, and a post office would accommodate a very large number of people, both in the village and in the surrounding country. Among all the places that have been favoured this year there is not a solitary place with better claims for a public building than Hillsborough. I do not know what the minister's reason was for trying to make out that I had not been doing my duty by making a request for the erection of this building. If it was with the desire to injure me with my constituents his policy will entirely fail, because my constituents in that portion of the district I represent are fully aware of the fact that I have repeatedly urged upon the government the erection of this building. I think the Finance Minister at one time was acting Minister of Public Works, and he as good as promised me that this town would receive proper consideration. I am glad that his promise is likely to be carried out.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not remember the promise, but on general principles I am in favour of erecting these buildings. I only make this request, that when the speech of the hon. member for East Simcoe about the terrible expense of these buildings, is distributed, as I have no doubt it will be widely distributed, I think the hon. member for King's and Albert (Mr. Fowler) ought to arrange that his very effective reply should go with it.

Mr. BENNETT. My hon. friend from King's and Albert takes this ground, and I take the same ground, that if the government is going to throw thousands of money away indiscriminately, then the most deserving places should be first regarded.

Mr. FIELDING. That is a change of ground. My hon. friend stated solemnly that it is time this expenditure was stopped ; that is a solemn duty he imposes upon us. I do not agree with him. He warns us that we must not do it any longer ; then the hon. member for Kings and Albert gets up and says, don't mind my hon. friend from Simcoe but give us a building in Hillsborough.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will be a good idea for the hon. member for Simcoe to pick out all these places like Hillsborough, Markham, Pictou, Actonvale, and a number of other small towns in Ontario and Quebec, and move a resolution that it is against public policy and against public interest that public buildings should be erected in these places. That would be a courageous and manly course to take. Let him try that and see where he will be.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister of Public Works was not in the House a few years ago when we spent a whole night discussing an appropriation for the little town of Dunnville. The opposition then declared that no public buildings should be erected in small places unless they were justified by the population and the post office revenue.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the limit of population ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I think 3,000 was the suggested limit. But here is a public building costing $25,000 in a small village of 900 or 1,000 of a population, and very little revenue ; while other towns with 3,000 or 4,000 and over are left out. There should be some system adopted. The revenue should amount to so much and the population should be so much before the government expends public money there. That was the policy adopted by the opposition.

Mr. FIELDING. And I think my hon. friend voted against the very thing he now proposes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend has been in parliament a good while. Now let me call his attention to what I think is just about as laudable a thing as the Conservative government ever did, and that was the erection of a public building in the thriving town of Sussex when the population I am sure was not over 800.

Mr. FOWLER. Oh, yes, the population then would be about 1,600.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Even so that would be about 1,400 less than the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) says it should be.

Mr. CARVELL. Does the hon. gentleman think there are 1,500 people in Sussex now.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, 2,500.

Mr. CARVELL. It has grown a great deal in the last year, then.

Mr. TALBOT. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) says that the erection of public buildings, such as custom houses, post offices and so forth, should be dependent upon the revenue derived therefrom. I may say to him that in 1896 when the Liberal party came into power, for three years I had been applying to the Minister of Railways and Canals to have a station in my village, St. Michel de Bellechasse. In election after election we had been promised this station, but as the parish judged it proper to give a majority against the government then we did not get the station. Finally I came to the Minister of Railways and Canals and told him that I would like to have a station in my village.

Well, he said, there is no revenue, the revenue last year was only $350. I pledged myself that if a station costing $1,200 or $1,500 was built, within a year the revenue would amount to over $2,000. The station was built, and in my parish where there was then a revenue of $280, we have this year a revenue of $7,000, owing to the existence of this station.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the Minister of Public Works to say that he could not subscribe to the principle that had been in vogue heretofore with regard to the erection of public buildings. I think it would be well for him to lay down what he regards as the proper principle. I have held the view for many years, while our friends were in power as well as during the last 12 years, that wherever a convenient and suitable public building can be rented at a much less amount than it would cost to pay the interest on maintenance charges for a public building, that, in the interest of the country, it is desirable that a public building should not be erected in such a place. I do not care whether the place is large or small. I would make no difference in that regard. It is not a good principle and is no evidence of economy or desire to economize when public money is spent on the erection of a public building in a small village or town of 1,000 or 15,000 inhabitants. We would have to pay for the building say $10,000; on that the interest would be about $450 per annum, the care of the building about $400, heating about $100, lighting about $75, insurance about $25, and repairs about $50 a year. That is an annual expenditure of about $1,000, when in many cases a good and suitable building can be rented for not more than $100 to $125 a year. To that you would have to add probably $50 or $60 for fuel and light, and the people would have as good service as with a public building for which you would have to pay out $1,000 a year. Take Owen Sound for instance. A post office building is now being erected there for the first time. It is a county town of over 10,000 inhabitants, but has never had a public building up to the present time. The people asked for one occasionally but were not pushing for it, because a good building could be rented for very much less. In the adjoining town of Meaford, of about 3,000 inhabitants, they have never had a public building erected for post office, custom house or inland revenue, but have rented a building at a very moderate price. In Markdale, the village in which I live, with about 1,200 inhabitants, the rent paid for a very good post office is, I think, $125 with $60 for heating and lighting. Durham with over 3,000 has no public building. The minister is coming in as a new member of the cabinet. He is at the head of a very important spending department, and he should take this into his consideration and lay down some principle, letting the House and the country know that he has made a departure upon good, safe business lines and desires to save the money of the people while giving them all the convenience they require in the matter of public buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think one could properly lay down a fixed rule that there should be no public building erected in a town unless it has a population of 3,000 or more.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not go that far because there are places where you cannot get buildings ; but I say you should rent where you can procure a suitable building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I spoke of the public building erected in the very enterprising town of Sussex, because knowledge of it came to me as I was brought up in that locality. That building was regarded by the people as a very great improvement. It created a local pride among the people who saw this not expensive but nice building erected by the government. The county in which it is erected has not received any federal expenditure for wharfs, dredging, etc., as it is entirely inland. With an inland town where no money is expended for any purpose except the postal service, if you have a thriving town of only 3,000 or even 2,000, and the people feel that they would like to have a public building or some little expenditure, I do not think it is improper that their wishes should be met in that particular. Suppose we were to limit the erection of post offices and other public buildings to the larger towns the result would be very discouraging to the people who are living in smaller towns. They would see money being spent for dredging and the building of wharfs in other places and it would be discouraging to them. If money was being expended in the county for wharfs, &c., you might well say to them that for the present they should wait a little before asking for a public building. Therefore, I think it is impossible to lay down a hard and fast rule. Take the west where towns are springing up rapidly, where a town with a population of only 1,000 to-day may be full of hope and full of possibilities and the people ask a public building, is it not a reasonable encouragement to the people that a public building should be erected for post office and customs purposes ? Many applications have been made to me from the people of different towns urging that public buildings should be erected. While I would not erect buildings in towns of very small population, yet I would be very reluctant indeed to say that no public building should be erected in a place which has not more than 3,000 population or even 2,000. Take the town of Hillsborough ; the hon. member for Kings and Albert said

that if the rule were fixed at 3,000 or even at 2,000, a public building could not be erected.

Mr. TAYLOR. Revenue should count as well as population.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If we were to be governed entirely by revenue what would we have to do ? Take the case of Montreal ; we are asked to erect a post office building there. It is going to be very costly, it will cost nearly half a million dollars in addition to the site. A plain building, absolutely without ornamentation, a building which might suit the purpose, I suppose, might be erected for half that money. What are we expending in these cities large sums of money for ?—for the purpose of erecting buildings which are beautiful, and to which people will look with pride and pleasure. It is because we take a pride in the community and seek to move along with it and gratify the feeling of the people that this money is spent. Money which is spent for the purpose of beautifying a building, making it more comfortable and convenient for the people to transact their business in may be regarded by some people as money wasted. Yet, it is not wasted. When the government, in a small and thriving town, where the people have no other expenditure of public money, erects a small building which is a good specimen of architecture and in which the people take pride it is doing something to help them in their efforts to advance the community residing in that locality. I am not prepared to say that it is a waste of money, or that it is something to be condemned. I am a great believer in doing what is reasonable in the various sections of the country to encourage the people living in the smaller towns to take a pride in the places in which they live, and I would not say that there should be a fixed rule as to the population of the places in which we could erect buildings or that the question of revenue should be the sole consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not mention either of the rules that the minister talks about. He has been talking round the question for a quarter of an hour. The minister argued that it is a matter of pride with various communities that they should have public buildings in their midst. Let us apply that to domestic life. Suppose that the hon. Minister's wife has a pride and an ambition which prompts her to want a bonnet costing $100 and the minister's finances will not justify him in making the expenditure ; would he apply that principle to the expenditure of his own money ? Would he spend his own money in the same lavish way that he spends the country's money ? If he is not prepared to do with the country's money as he would do with his own he is not following the best and safest guide. Another argument is that many of these places, being inland places do not get much expenditure and that they are entitled to public buildings. I presume that the expenditure of money in these places helps to carry elections. If that be a sound principle then I say let us divide the money up equitably among all these places.

Mr. FIELDING. That is socialism.

Mr. SPROULE. No, it is not socialistic at all. The Minister of Finance is just a little too previous.

If it is fair and proper that because these constituencies have no general expenditure within their bounds they should have public buildings, then I say they are entitled to their full share just as well as others. They have a perfect right to claim it and it is due to them that they should get it. If the minister follows out that principle I do not see how he can refuse it to all. He says we cannot follow any hard and fast rule. I did not ask that any hard and fast rule be followed. He says that we cannot regard a mere fixed population. I did not ask that a mere fixed population be regarded, whether it is 3.000, 4,000 5,000 or 10,000. I pointed to a town of 12,000 where there is no post office yet and another of 3,000 and smaller places along the line. I did not name a fixed population but I did lay down this rule that whether a place is large or small, if a public building can be secured in a central locality for the needs of the people at a smaller amount of money than that which would be required to pay the interest on the money that would be put into the erection of a public building, caretaking, heating, and maintenance, I did not see any justification for spending more money to supply the needs of the people in any place when we could supply the needs of the people for less money.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You put it down to the bare question of dollars and cents ?

Mr. SPROULE. I put it down to the principle of saving the peoples' money. If you can give the people the conveniences that they require for less money by renting a building than erecting a building. then I would rent a building. There are some places where you cannot rent a building. I can understand that in many places in the west you could not rent a building and under those circumstances the government would be justified in erecting a building. When you cannot rent and provide the people with the conveniences they require go on and build, but if you can rent a suitable building for less money than it costs to erect a building I do not understand by what principle of economy you would be justified in expending a larger amount.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will be taken up on Monday ?

Mr. FIELDING. We will proceed with Supply and take up the estimates of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.10 a.m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, April 27, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

MEAFORD HARBOUR.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 158) respecting Meaford Harbour. He said : The object of the Bill is to legalize a situation which has existed for some years and has created some disturbance. The township of St. Vincent was at first the authority which had the power to deal with this harbour which is on Georgian bay. Later on, in 1874, if I remember well, the town of Meaford was incorporated with the harbour within its territorial limits. The municipal authorities of the town assumed that the fact that the harbour was within the boundaries of the town gave them sufficient authority to deal with the harbour, to make necessary improvements and to levy taxes. I understand that some work had been carried out by the municipality on this assumption that they were acting within their right. As some doubt has been raised as to their right to carry out these works and levy taxes, they have approached the department and asked that legislation be introduced to legalize what has been done and to declare that for the future, the harbour shall be vested in the town of Meaford.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DREDGING AT MIDLAND, TIFFIN AND VICTORIA HARBOUR.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) if tenders have yet been advertised for in connection with the dredging anticipated to be done during the coming season at Midland, Tiffin and Victoria Harbour.

Mr. SPROULE.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I can only say that I have given the necessary directions for the calling for tenders, and I assume that the advertisements are out. If not issued, they are in course of being issued.

QUESTIONS.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—CLAIMS SETTLED.

Mr. DANIEL asked :

How many claims for damages to property, or personal injury or loss or damage on the Intercolonial Railway have been settled since January 1, 1908, what is the nature of the claims so settled, the amount of damages claimed in each case, the settlements arrived at, and the names of the persons settled with?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The answer to this question is sufficiently large to make quite a bulky return. If my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) will allow me to lay it on the table, I will do so, instead of spending the rest of the afternoon in reading it.

Mr. DANIEL. Certainly.

PROPOSED JAPANESE COLONY IN THE WEST.

Mr. RALPH SMITH asked :

Referring to page 6650 of unrevised 'Hansard' of April 8, 1908, wherein the Hon. Mr. Lemieux made the following statement:

Mr. LEMIEUX. Since the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) has referred again to the number of Japanese who wish to settle near Calgary as agriculturists, I may say, in order to show that the Japanese authorities are living up to their agreement with Canada, that a few days ago the Canadian Pacific Railway Company applied to the Dominion government in order to ascertain if something like 300 Japanese would be allowed to enter the Dominion and take up land in the Northwest. The Canadian Pacific Railway authorities pointed out that the Japanese government would not object to issuing passports to the intending Japanese immigrants; but the Japanese government had stated that they could not issue passports unless the Dominion government would agree to it. That shows plainly that the Japanese authorities are living up to the agreement arrived at during the month of December last.

1. What was the date of the Canadian Pacific Railway's application to bring in Japanese immigrants?
2. By whom was the application made?
3. What were the exact terms of the application?
4. What was the complete answer of the government to such application?
5. Have any other applications been made by the same company, or any other company, for such a privilege?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Minister of Labour) :

1, 2 and 3. The following letter was received :

(At Ottawa), March 25, 1908.

Hon. Frank Oliver, M.P.,
Minister of the Interior, Ottawa.

My Dear Sir,—A Japanese gentleman contracted with us last autumn for the purchase of a considerable area of land in the irrigation block with a view to cutting it up into small farms for Japanese settlers. He now cables from the Philippines that he has made arrangements for the emigration of two hundred Japanese farmers this year, but that the Japanese government is not disposed to grant passports unless Dominion government approves of the settlement of these people in Alberta.

Will you kindly inform me what view the government take of this proposition? Our correspondent asks for cable reply, and I shall be glad if the matter can receive early consideration.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) C. DRINKWATER.

4. The government replied as follows :

Ottawa, March 30, 1908.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your letter of March 25 regarding approval by the government of the settlement of a number of Japanese on irrigation lands near Calgary, I beg to say that if the arrangement to which you allude is in the nature of a contract for the furnishing of labour this government cannot approve of it, and therefore cannot ask the Japanese government to grant the necessary passports.

As announced in parliament, however, you are no doubt aware that a certain number of Japanese domestic servants and farm labourers may be given passports for Canada. Within the number agreed upon of these classes the Dominion government has no objection to offer to the Japanese authorities issuing the necessary passports.

I notice that you speak of your correspondent cabling from the Philippines that he has made arrangements for the emigration of two hundred Japanese farmers this year. If by this it is meant that these are Japanese coming from the Philippines, I beg to point out if they are Japanese citizens that the order in council of March 28 would in any case prohibit their landing in Canada.

Yours respectfully,
(Sgd.) FRANK OLIVER.

C. Drinkwater, Esq.,
Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Ottawa.

5. This is the only application made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or any other.

DEFALCATION IN MONTREAL POST OFFICE.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. Was a defalcation discovered in the Montreal Post Office lately? If so, what was the amount stolen?

2. In which department of the Montreal Post Office did the offence occur?

3. Was an investigation held, and what was the report?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. Yes. A young man employed in the Montreal post office was arrested for having stolen $202.42, who, when brought before the judge, pleaded guilty, and was sentenced to a period of four years in the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary.

2. The offence occurred in connection with the amounts collected at the Montreal post office from newspapers for postage.

3. An investigation has been ordered, but up to date no report has been received.

TUG BOAT 'LORD KITCHENER'

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. In what service does the Department of Public Works or the Department of Marine employ the tug boat 'Lord Kitchener'?

2. At what rate per day or hour is the remuneration paid?

3. What amount has been paid by each department for the tug boat during the calendar years 1906, 1907 and 1908 to date?

4. Who is the owner of this boat?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minster of Public Works) :

1, 2 and 3. The tug 'Lord Kitchener' was employed by this department as follows : in April, 1906, the tugs 'Lord Kitchner' and 'Lord Roberts' were employed together to tow the dredge 'New Dominion' and scows from St. John to St. Andrews, N.B. The payment for the joint service was $150, lump sum. The tug has been employed towing scows of dredge 'W. S. Fielding' from Lunenburg, N.S., to St. John N.B., at the rate of $125 a day ; reached destination Friday (24th).

4. John E. Moore.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Marine and Fisheries Department employed boat in Bay of Fundy lighthouse and buoy service.

2. Under charter party dated April 11, 1907, rate paid was $125 per day, all found. Under second charter party dated November 11, 1907, rate was $85 per day, including captain and first engineer, the department finding remainder of crew, fuel and stores.

3. 1906.

1907	$21,762.19
1908	14,053.49
	$35,815.68

4. John E. Moore.

DREDGE 'FIELDING.'

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What is the date on which the dredge 'Fielding' arrived in St. John?
2. How many days' work has been done by this dredge since that date, and at what points?
3. What other dredging work is being carried on by the government in St. John harbour or vicinity, by what parties, and has such work been let after public tender?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. 25th February, 1908.
2. (a) 25.
(b) Superintendent of dredging reports that dredge removed a shoal patch of about three hundred feet in length inside the bell-buoy from fifteen feet to a depth of twenty-one feet low water. Then commenced about seven hundred feet outside bell buoy west of centre line of channel at thirty feet at low water and laid moorings and worked in about five hundred feet two hundred feet wide west of centre line, now continuing inward.
3. (a) Dredging at Sand Point and Rodney slips.
(b) G. S. Mayes and Dominion Dredging Company.
(c) Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. From the 25th to what date ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To Saturday, I presume.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS —CONTRACT FOR CEMENT.

Mr. J. D. REID—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Has the Montreal Harbour Commissioners lately given a contract for cement?
2. If so, was the quantity 30,000 barrels? If not, how many barrels were contracted for?
3. To whom was the contract given?
3. Is it a fact that this order is to be imported from Belgium ?
5. Is the government aware that there are cement manufacturing industries in Canada, making first class cement?

Hon. L P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). There is no information in the department in regard to this matter. We have written to the board in Montreal to supply us with information, and when it is received I will be glad to answer the question.

POSTMASTER AT MATTAWA, ONT.

Mr. WHITE—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Who is the postmaster at Mattawa, Ont.?
2. When was he appointed and what salary does he receive?
3. Does he give personal supervision to the duties of his office?
4. Where does he reside?

Mr. BRODEUR.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. Noah A. Timmons.
2. Appointed 1st March, 1902. Salary and allowances, $1,305.
3 and 4. The work of the office is efficiently performed by the postmaster's three assistants, but the postmaster, who is at present living at Haileybury, does not personally supervise it.

DREDGING IN THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Are there still any claims pending in connection with the dredging done in the province of Quebec during the season of 1907?
2. If so, who are the claimants and what is the total amount of said claims?
3. Is there a claim in said connection by Henry W. Prendergast or the St. Lawrence and Great Lakes Dredging Company? If so, what is the amount, and why has it not been paid?
4. Is there a claim regarding said dredging in the province of Quebec in 1907 by E. A. D. Morgan or the General Construction Company? If so, what is the amount, what is it for and why has it not been paid?
5. Is there a claim in said connection by L. Cohen & Son? If so, what is the amount of said claim, and what is it for?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. Yes.
2. St. Lawrence and Great Lakes Dredging Co.. ..$9,888.33
L. Cohen & Son.... .. .. 806.40
$10,694.73
3. Yes ; $9,888.33 as above.
Payment delayed owing to complications between contractor and certain creditors in whose favour powers of attorney to receive moneys had been filed.
4. No.
5. Yes. $806.40 for dredging at Port St. Francis in November, 1907.

FAIR WAGES SCHEDULE ON DREDGING.

Mr. VERVILLE—by Mr. Calvert—asked :

1 Is there a fair wages schedule attached to all contracts on dredging?
2. If not, is it the intention of the government to attach one in future contracts?
3. Is the government aware that it is stated men working on dredges last season were not paid their wages?
4. Is it the intention of the government to take measures so as to guarantee such payment in future?

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1 and 2. No wage schedule is attached to dredging contracts, but a proviso inserted to the effect that the contractor agrees

and binds himself to pay to the workmen engaged in the said work, such wages as are generally accepted as current in each trade, for competent workmen in the district where the works are to be carried out.

3. No information in the department.

4. Should representations regarding specific cases be made, the department would take matter up with a view to assisting the employee.

RAILWAY FROM NORTH SYDNEY TO SYDNEY MINES.

Mr. STANFIELD asked :

1. What is the length of the branch railway from North Sydney to Sydney Mines?
2. What is the total cost to date?
3. What was the cost of the right of way?
4. What amount was paid for land damages?
5. Are there any claims outstanding unpaid? If so, what is the total amount?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. 2·7 miles.
2. $136,479.02.
3. $24,442.69.
4. $4,238.
5. Yes ; $7,015. Now in process of settlement.

CUSTOMS EMPLOYEE AT WINDSOR.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

1. Is one Michael Dillon employed at Windsor, Ontario, by the Customs Department?
2. If so, when was he appointed, and what is his salary and duties?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Michael Dillon is not employed at Windsor by the Customs Department.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The name in this question should be Michael J. Walsh instead of Michael Dillon.

Mr. PATERSON. That is the difficulty. Bring up the question again with the right name, and I will make inquiry.

LAND SITE FOR SANDWICH POST OFFICE.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

From whom was purchased the land site of the Sandwich post office, and what price was paid for it by the government?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). From A. T. Healy for $1,700.

CUSTOMS OFFICER AT WINDSOR.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

1. Is one J. A. Pepin connected with the customs at Windsor?
2. If so, when was he appointed, what was his age at the time of appointment, what is his salary, and what are his present duties?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. Mr. J. A. Pepin is not connected with the customs at Windsor. Mr. Joseph N. Pepin is an officer of customs at that port.
2. First employed in June, 1907, appointed by order in council from 1st January, 1908 ; age 64 years ; salary $700 a year. His duties are those of a preventive officer of customs.

WHARF AT SCOTCH TOWN, NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. WILMOT—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. Has application been made to the Department of Public Works for the construction of a wharf at Scotch Town, Queen's County, New Brunswick?
2. If so, has the department ordered a survey of site and specification for building a wharf at this locality? If so, what is the nature of such report?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. Yes.
2. (a) Yes. (b) For a wharf, 470 feet long to 7 feet depth of water, the cost will be $4,900.

FRITZ CIRKEL, MINING ENGINEER.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. Is Fritz Cirkel, of Montreal, in the employ of the government of Canada?
2. Has the attention of the government been called to a recent advertisement about the 26th of February last, in the Montreal 'Herald,' which quotes a report of this gentleman and describes him as follows:—

Fritz Cirkel, Esq., of Montreal, consulting mining engineer and mining expert to the Dominion government, who lately made an inspection of the said property, concluded his report as follows:—

3. Is this gentleman mining expert to the Dominion government, as represented in this advertisement?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue) :

1. Fritz Cirkel has for four years been temporarily employed by the Mines branch.
2. No, but the director of mines had his attention called to an advertisement in the 'Bulletin' issued by the Canadian Mining Institute, in which Mr. Cirkel is represented as 'mining expert to the Dominion government.' The director has already called the attention of parties concerned to the advertisement and requested that it be withdrawn.
3. Mr. Cirkel has for four years been employed temporarily as outside expert doing special work. He is the author of the following reports for the government : 'Mica, its occurrence, exploitation and uses,' 'Asbestos, its occurrence, exploitation and uses,' 'Graphite, its properties, occurrence,

refining and uses,' 'Iron ore deposits of the Ottawa Valley, Quebec side,'* 'Chrome iron ore deposits of eastern townships.'*

*The last two reports are not yet ready for distribution.

MAIL CONTRACT, DIGBY TO WESTPORT.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked :

1. What is the name and residence of the person carrying the mail between Digby, Nova Scotia, and Westport, Digby County, Nova Scotia?

2. Is said carrier under contract to carry the mail? If so, when were tenders called for, and at what date do they expire?

3. If the present contract expires June the 30th, does the government intend to give the customary three months' notice to people wishing to tender?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. Estate of the late W. H. Eldridge of Sandy Cove, Digby county, Nova Scotia.

2. (a) Yes. (b) In June 1900. The contract was renewed in 1904 and expires 30th June, 1908.

3. A renewal of the contract has been offered to the widow of the late contractor, who is now performing the service.

DREDGING AT CHICOUTIMI.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Was any dredging done at Chicoutimi last season? If so, who were the contractors, and were tenders invited for the work?

2. How many tenders were received, and who were the different parties tendering therfor?

3. What was the rate paid per yard, what was the nature of material dredged, and to what depth was dredging done?

4. Who was the local inspector of the work?

5. How much was the total sum paid to the contractor for work so done, and was such amount in full of all work? If not, what balance is due to the contractor for said work?

Hon. W. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. (a) Yes. (b) General Construction Company. (c) Yes.

2. (a) Three. (b) General Construction Company, M. Connolly, Dominion Dredging Company.

3. (a) 34 cents. (b) Mud, clay, sand, chips and sawdust. (c) 12 to 15 feet at Chicoutimi ; 15 to 25 feet at Chicoutimi wharf.

4. H. Magnan.

5. $14,070.78, paid in full.

NEW BARRACKS AT TORONTO.

Mr. MACDONELL asked :

1. Has the Militia Department approved of the plans, &c., for the new barracks at Toronto? If so, when and what is the cause of the delay in the Public Works Department?

2. How many officers, non-commissioned officers and men, respectively, are being provided with living accommodation outside of the barracks, and for what reason?

3. What has been the total annual expenditure for such purposes for the last three fiscal years, including the present year?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence) :

1. Plans of eleven of the buildings required for the new barracks at Toronto were forwarded on March 7, last, by the Department of Public Works to the Department of Militia and Defence for final approval. These plans are now being considered, and will be returned to the Department of Public Works in a few days.

2. Officers and warrant officers, 16 ; non-commissioned officers and men, 74. These are compelled to live out of barracks as there is no accommodation for them inside, pending the erection of new barracks.

3. Annual expenditure for allowances to officers and men in lieu of quarters : Fiscal year—

July 1, 1905 to June 30, 1906..	$10,535 20
July 1, 1906 to March 31, 1907..	8,149 20
(Nine months.)	
April 1, 1907 to March 31, 1908	13,125 60

No payments have as yet been made for the current fiscal year.

TRAP-NET LICENSES.

Mr. STANFIELD asked :

1. How many trap-net licenses in the district of John A. Weber, Chester, Nova Scotia, have been taken out in the year 1906?

2. How many trap-net licenses in the district of John A. Webber, Chester, Nova Scotia, have been taken out in the year 1907?

3. What are the names of those who paid for these licenses?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. No trap-net licenses were issued in this district in 1906.

When the decision of the Imperial Privy Council on the Fisheries Reference secured to the provincial governments the property interests in the fisheries, which involved the issue of leases and licenses for fishing privileges, it declared the clause empowering the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to issue licenses, to be ultra vires, where the right already existed by law.

The department, however, by tacit admission and tentative arrangement with the local government continued to issue licenses as formerly, pending final settlement of the question.

A gradual disposition grew up among the fishermen in this district to interpret the law for themselves and to fish trap-nets without licenses, and eventually a decision was rendered in the county court denying the right of this department to issue such licenses, which strengthened the hands of the fishermen in their contentions.

The department held, however, that subsection 7 of section 47 of the Fisheries Act, chapter 45 of the revised statutes, was to be interpreted as a prohibition of a method of fishing, not necessarily involving the abstract question of proprietary rights; but merely giving the minister authority under certain conditions to legalize the operation of a trap-net, which was prohibited by the Act without his permission, whereas section 8 authorizing the minister to grant licenses as such, essayed to take power of a proprietary character.

Hence while he may not grant a license in the proprietary sense of the word, he could by special license or permission authorize a trap-net license, which trap could not be legally operated without his authority.

In 1906 the fishermen did not take out licenses, and early in 1907 the officer asked what course he was to follow for that year, and he was instructed to compel the fishermen to take out licenses, or remove their trap-nets with the assistance of one of the fishery protection cruisers.

2. Eighty-four trap-net licenses were issued in the year 1907.

3. William Levy & Co., Amos Fleet & Co., John Roast & Co., Benjamin Levy & Co., Jacob Seaboyer & Co., Gabriel Levy & Co., Cyrus Young & Co., Simeon Young & Co., Isaac Newton & Co., Joshua Mason & Co., David Baker & Co., Jeremiah Levy & Co., Alvin Cross & Co., Stephen Cross and Benjamin Heisler, Wesley Young & Co., Stephen Cross and Benjamin Heisler, Hibbard Baker and Frank Baker, Wesley Young & Co., Harry and Arthur Publicover, Harry and Percy Young, Ellis, Cross & Co., Alexander Wilson and Albert Cross, Reuben and Howard Mason, Dennis Pearl and Sebastian Cross, Charles Cross & Co., Willis Levy & Co., Stephen Cross and Benjamin Heisler, Daniel Awalt and Co., Alexander Wilson and Hezikiah Slaughenwhite, Reuben Fleet & Co., Colin Heisler and Rufus Wilson, Ozen Hubley, David Baker & Co., Ernest Covey & Co., David Baker & Co., Ephriam Meisner and Joseph Pearl, Harris, Publicover & Co., Colin Heisler and Rufus Wilson, Nathanial Levy & Co., Stanley Langille & Co., Reuben and Stephen Cross, Alexander Wilson and David Young, Daniel Baker and Zenas Rodenhiser, Denis Pearl and Joseph Wilnoff, Robert Schnare & Co., Albert Levy & Co., David Gates & Co., Charles Nass & Co., James Boutilier & Co., Willis Boutilier & Co., David Moland, George and Henry Gates, Albert Young, James Heisler and Samuel Ernst, Albert Young & Co., Austin Cleveland, M. Cleveland & Co., Albert Young & Co., William Gates & Co., B. and E. Publicover, James Sawler & Co., Thomas Misner & Co., David Cleveland & Co., Harvey Young & Co., Zenas Misner & Co., Harvey Young & Co., Wesley Young & Co., Amos Stephens & Co., William Manuel & Co., T. Roast & Co., Frank Baker & Co., Alvin Cross & Co., George and Sydney Coolen, Salem Coolen & Co., William T. Hornish, James W. Morash, William L. Hornish, Jackson Young & Co., William D. Jollymore & Co., Levy Coolen & Co., Salem Coolen & Co., Alfred Jordan & Co., Joseph Dominic & Co., Isaac Ray & Co., Jeremiah Dominey.

SALE OF HOMESTEADS.

Mr. LAKE asked:

1. To whom and under what terms, specifying by homestead, sale, or otherwise, were the even-numbered sections in township 13, range 13, west second meridian, disposed of by the government?

2. Were any sections or parts of sections marked in the books of the Interior Department as 'reserved' for any person at any time? If so, for whom and for what reasons were they so reserved?

Hon. F. OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Township 13, range 13, west 2nd meridian.

NE¼ 2, homestead, W. G. Raper, patented 28th August, 1906.

NW¼ 2, homestead, Leonard Knapp, patented 4th January, 1907.

SE¼ 2, homestead, A. G. Raper, patented 11th August, 1906.

SW¼ 2, homestead, A. P. Knapp, patented 5th November, 1906.

NE¼ 4, homestead, Wm. Morgan, patented 27th March, 1906.

NW¼ 4, half-breed scrip, Donald McLeod, patented 31st July, 1902, Jas. Gardiner and D. J. Wilson.

SE¼ 4, homestead, Patrick Curran.

SW¼ 4, halfbreed scrip, Sara McLeod, patented 31st July, 1902, Jas. Gardiner, et al.

NE¼ 6, halfbreed scrip, Angus McLeod, patented 14th August, 1902, Jas. Gardiner and D. J. Wilson.

S½ of nw¼ 6, halfbreed scrip, Donald McLeod, patented 31st July, 1902, Jas. Gardiner et al.

N½ of nw¼ 6, halfbreed scrip, Angus McLeod, patented 14th August, 1902, J. Gardiner et al.

S½ of se¼ 6, halfbreed scrip, F. Desriviers, patented 12th August, 1902, Jas. Gardiner et al.

N½ of se¼ 6, homestead, Wm. R. McLellan.

SW¼, homestead, Wilbert Lloyd, patented 20th January, 1906.

Section S. Hudson Bay Company. title passed 4th April, 1884.

NE¼ 10, homestead, Stewart Houston, patented 1st May, 1905.

NW¼ 10, homestead, J. S. Houston.

SE¼ 10, homestead, J. A. Shortell, patented 23rd February, 1907.

SW¼ 10, homestead, E. J. Knapp, patented 31st January, 1907.

NE¼ 12, homestead, R. S. McDonald.

NW¼ 12, homestead, A. W. Wright, patented 19th October, 1907.

SE¼ 12, homestead, G. J. McDonald.

SW¼ 12, homestead, patented 28th September, 1906, Robt. Blakely.

NE¼ 14, homestead, Wm. Borkowski, patented 12th September, 1906.

W½ 14, sale, Wm. G. Livingston, patented 30th December, 1902.

SE¼ (w½) halfbreed scrip, Mary Pendygrasse, patented 13th April, 1903, Douglas Peterson.

E½ of se¼ 14, halfbreed scrip, Peter Badger, patented 13th April, 1903, Douglas Peterson.

NE¼ 16, halfbreed scrip, Louis Deschambault, patented 15th April, 1903, Douglas Peterson.

NW¼ 16, halfbreed scrip Henry Deschambault, patented 15th April, 1903, Douglas Peterson.

W½ of se¼ 16, halfbreed scrip, Henry Deschambault, patented 15th April, 1903, Douglas Peterson.

E½ of se¼ 16, halfbreed scrip, Louis Deschambault, patented 15th April, 1903, Douglas Peterson.

SW¼ 16, halfbreed scrip, Peter Badger, patented 15th April, 1903, Douglas Peterson.

E½ of ne¼ 18, halfbreed scrip, Z. Lepine, patented 5th September, 1905, C. M. Weiss.

W½ of ne¼ 18, halfbreed scrip, Marie E. Breland, patented 19th December, 1902, Jas. Porter.

S½ of NE¼ 18, halfbreed scrip, D. Desriviere, patented 20th November, 1902, J. Porter.

N½ of nw¼ 18, halfbreed scrip, M. Ross, patented 28th November, 1902, J. Porter.

SE¼ 18, halfbreed scrip, David Desriviers, patented 20th November, 1902, Jas. Porter.

N½ of sw¼ 18, halfbreed scrip, Alex. House, patented, 27th May, 1903, Jas. Porter.

S½ of sw¼ 18, halfbreed scrip, Lina Breland, patented, 20th July, 1903, Jas. Porter.

NE¼ 20, halfbreed scrip, P. J. Fleury, patented 20th February, 1903, D. Paterson.

NW¼ 20, halfbreed scrip, Patrice J. Fleury, patented 20th February, 1903, D. Peterson.

Mr OLIVER.

NE¼ 20, halfbreed scrip, J. B. Corrigal, patented 8th June 1903, D. Peterson.

W½ of sw¼, halfbreed scrip, Patrice J. Fleury, patented 20th February, 1903, D. Peterson.

E½ of sw¼, halfbreed scrip, John B. Corrigal.

Section 22, sale, Wm. G. Livingston, patented 16th September, 1903.

NE¼ 24, homestead, Chas. Gardner.

NW¼ 24, halfbreed scrip, R. D. E. J. Bruce, patented 22nd November, 1902, Jas. Porter.

SE¼ 24, halfbreed scrip, Z. Lepine, patented 5th September, 1905, C. M. Weiss.

N½ of sw¼ 24, halfbreed scrip, R. D. E. J. Bruce, patented 22 November, 1902, Jas. Porter.

S½ of sw¼ 24, halfbreed scrip, Ewen McDonald, patented 5th May, 1903, Jas. Porter.

NE¼ 26, homestead, Arthur Draper, patented 6th March, 1906.

W½ and se¼ 26, Hudson Bay Company, title passed 4th April, 1884.

Section 28, sale patented 16th September, 1903, W. G. Livingston.

NE¼ 30, halfbreed scrip, Elizabeth J. Kennedy, patented 20th February, 1903, D. Peterson.

E½ of nw¼ 30, halfbreed scrip, Elizabeth J. Kennedy, patented 20th February, 1903, D. Peterson.

E½ of nw¼ 30, halfbreed scrip, Elizabeth J. Kennedy, patented 20th February, 1903, D. Peterson.

W½ of nw¼ 30, halfbreed scrip, Isidore Parenteau, patented 20th February, 1903, D. Peterson.

SE¼ 30, halfbreed scrip, Isidore Parenteau, patented 20th February, 1903, D. Peterson.

SW¼ 30, halfbreed scrip, Isidore Parenteau, patented 20th February, 1903, D. Peterson.

Section 32, sale, Wm. G. Livingston, patented 16th September, 1903.

NE¼ 34, homestead. M. Hack, jr.

NW¼ 34, homestead, Conrad Schneider.

SW¼ 34, homestead, Richard Schmidt, patented 25th March, 1907.

SE¼ 34, homestead, L. A. Barnett, patented 18th April, 1908.

NE¼ 36, homestead, J. J. Olmstead, patented 10th May, 1906.

NW¼ 36, homestead, Walter Olmstead, patented 7th May, 1906.

SE¼ 36, homestead, J. R. Annis, patented 7th February, 1906.

SW¼ 36, homestead, W. A. Olmstead, patented 12th April, 1906.

2. Yes. Sections 22, 28, 32 and w½ of section 14 were reserved in 1902 for Mr. W. G. Livingston, of Winnipeg, to whom they were subsequently sold under order in council of 4th June, 1902.

Section 16, 20, 30 and se¼ of section 14 were reserved in 1902 for 30 days for Mr. William Peterson, of Regina, to have half-breed scrip located thereon.

LANDS APPLIED FOR UNDER IRRIGATION REGULATIONS.

Mr. HERRON asked:

1. What lands, if any, situated between Bow and Belly rivers, and within ranges 15 and 24, inclusive, west of the fourth meridian, have been applied for under irrigation regulations by Mr. Aylwin or others?
2. When were such lands first reserved for such purposes, and are they still reserved from settlement?
3. What steps, if any, have been taken by Mr. Aylwin or others to develop such lands, and what has been the expenditure made by such parties in connection with such development?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. F. P. Aylwin applied to purchase townships 14, 15, 16 and 17, range 16; townships 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17, range 17; townships 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16, range 18; townships 13, 14, 15 and 16, range 19, west of the 4th meridian, all west of the Bow river, excluding a belt of two miles along the river.

M. S. Rutherford applied to purchase townships 12 and 13, range 13; townships 11, 12 and 13, range 14; townships 12, 13 14 and 15, range 15; townships 12, 13, 14 and 15, range 16, west of the 4th meridian.

John Cowdry applied to purchase townships 12 and 13, range 12; townships 11, 12, 13 and 14, range 13; townships 11, 12, 13 and 14, range 14; townships 11, 12, 13 and 14, range 15; townships 12, 13 and 14, range 16.

E. H. and A. C. Ross applied to purchase townships 12 and 13, range 12; townships 11, 12 and 13, range 13; townships 11, 12, 13 and 14, range 14; townships 12, 13 and 14, range 15; townships 12, 13, 14 and 15, range 16, all west of the 4th meridian.

2. The only lands reserved were those applied for by F. P. Aylwin, which were reserved on the 20th May, 1907.

3. Mr. Aylwin has expended $593.70 to cover the cost of having his survey of this irrigation scheme checked and examined by the Commissioner of Irrigation.

PAYMENTS ON ACCOUNT OF ROSS RIFLE SINCE JANUARY 1, 1908.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked:

1. How much has been paid to the Ross Rifle Company by the Militia Department since January 1, 1908, and what are the dates of such payments?
2. Which payments are made for completed rifles and which on progress estimates?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence):

1. $45,098.18 has been paid since January 1, last.

Date of Payment.	No. of Rifles delivered.	Amount of Payment.	——
1908.		$ cts.	
Jan. 4..	500	3,125 00	Final payment
" 18..	200	1,250 00	"
" 24..	100	625 00	"
" 25..	300	1,875 00	"
" 29..	200	1,250 00	"
" 30..	100	625 00	"
Feb. 3..	100	625 00	"
" 7..	500	3,125 00	"
" 14..	200	1,250 00	"
" 15..	300	1,875 00	"
" 19..	200	1,250 00	"
" 22..	300	1,875 00	"
" 27..	300	1,875 00	"
Mar. 3..	200	1,250 00	"
" 7..	300	1,875 00	"
" 18..	600	3,750 00	"
" 23..	100	625 00	"
" 25..	.....	4,473 18	Progress payment.
" 28..	500	3,125 00	Final payment
April 3..	400	2,500 00	"
" 9..	200	1,250 00	"
" 14..	400	2,500 00	"
" 18..	200	1,250 00	"
" 25..	300	1,875 00	"
	6,500	45,098 18	

2. The payment of March 25, 1907, amounting to $4,473.18 is the balance of 75 per cent progress payments on the total number of rifles ordered, all the others are final payments.

HEATH POINT LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Did the government give a contract for rebuilding or work on Heath Point lighthouse tower, to E. A. Wallberg or the Steel Concrete Company? If so, what was the contract price?
2. Has the contract been completed?
3. How much has been paid to date on said contract?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Yes. $6,095.
2. No.
3. $3,000.

LESSEES OF GRAZING RANCHES.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. What are the names and addresses of the lessees of grazing ranches Nos. 2861, 2860, 2867, 2810, 2811, 2816, 3075, 2921, 3035, 2971, 2945, 3056, 2944, 3070, 2963, 3097, 3196, 3205, 2955, 2973, within the tract described as

townships 12 to 19, inclusive, in ranges 15 to 21, west of the fourth meridian?

2. What are the names and adresses of the present holders of these ranches?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

7. What was the total cost of the work?

8. Who was the inspector of the work, and how much has he been paid to date?

Hon. Wm. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1. M. Keefe.

Ranche No.	Grantee.	Address.	Present Holder.	Address.
2861	John Cowdry	McLeod, Alta	John Cowdry	Macleod, Alta.
2860	Samuel Young	"	Samuel Young	"
2867	John Cowdry	"	John Cowdry	"
2810	Frank Levasseur	Pincher Creek	Frank Lavasseur	Pincher Creek.
2811	E. B. Stone	London, Ont., and Lethbridge.	E. B. Stone	London, Ont., and Lethbridge.
2816	H. L. & E. A. Robertson	Bassano, B,C.	Cancelled 13-3-'08.	
3075	W. H. Moore *et al.*	Care of J. C. Scott, Toronto.	W. H. Moore *et al*	Care of J. C. Scott, Toronto.
2921	Victor A. Morgan	Lethbridge	Victor A. Morgan	Lethbridge.
3035	W. R. Hull	Calgary	W. R. Hull	Calgary.
2971	John E. Reid	Brooks, Alta	John S. Silcox	Brooks, Alta.
2945	John Lavell	"	John Lavell	"
3056	J. M. Williams	Bowville, Alta	J. M. Williams	Bowville, Alta.
2944	F. B. Park	Bassano, B.C.	F. B. Park	Bassano, B.C.
3070	Henry S. Jones	"	Henry S. Jones	"
2963	J. B. Kelly & A. L. Palmer.	Medicine Hat	Patrick Burns	Calgary.
3097	J. E. James & W. L. Messurier.	Bassano, B.C.	James & Messurier	Bassano, B.C.
3196	C. M. Fletcher	"	C. M. Fletcher	"
3205	P. Burns & Co.	Calgary	P. Burns & Co	Calgary.
2955	H. O. Bredin	Bassano, B.C.	H. O. Bredin	Bassano, B.C.
2973	J. L. Marion	Lethbridge	J. L. Marion	Lethbridge.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY STATION AT TRURO.

Mr. STANFIELD asked:

1. Does the government consider the sanitary conditions of the railway station at Truro suitable for the employees to work in, and are the same conditions suitable for the public?

2. Is it the intention of the department to commence the erection of a new station suitable for this important junction this year?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. The department is aware of the fact that the station buildings at Truro are old, but is not advised of any danger to the public health in consequence thereof.

2. The matter is being considered. Large expenditures have to be made in connection with the new freight yard, &c., at that place.

CUSTOMS HOUSE AT HALIFAX.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

1. Who was awarded the contract for the customs house at Halifax?

2. How many tenders were received?

3. Who were the tenderers, and the amount of each tender, respectively?

4. When was the work to be completed?

5. Were there any extras allowed the contractor?

6. Was the work of the contractor entirely satisfactory?

Mr. LENNOX.

2. Four.

3. Mr. Keefe, Halifax, N.S., $250,000: Sullivan and Langdon, Kingston, Ontario, $254,512; Rhodes, Curry & Co., Amherst, N.S., $254,795; S. M. Brookfield, Halifax, N.S., $292,244.

4. September 15, 1904.

5. Minor extras to extent of $728.07 were paid on the main contract on which the amount of $3,072 is still held.

6. No.

7. $317,732.85 (inclusive of site, $24,000). I take it for granted that my hon. friend did not intend to ask what would be the total cost when the work is finally completed, but what is the total cost to date, and the answer is framed accordingly.

8. (a) W. J. Busch, architect, (b) $4,130.95.

DREDGING AT MOUTH OF BECANCOUR RIVER.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

1. When were the dredging works at the mouth of the Bécancour river, in the county of Nicolet, done in 1907, commenced?

2. How many cubic yards were dredged?

3. At how much per yard?

4. How many days was the tug 'Alpha' employed in such dredging?

5. What sum per day was paid for the use of that vessel by the company to the government?

6. From whom did the 'Alpha' receive instructions or authorization to do its part of that work?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. June 8.
2. 101,962 cubic yards.
3. Sixteen cents.
4. From July 27, to September 3, 1907.
5. The company obtained the use of the boat on trial under offer of sale on condition that all expenses including wages, fuel board and supplies were paid during the period the boat was in their possession.
6. No special instructions were given other than as mentioned in the answer to No. 5.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—MAJOR HODGINS' CHARGES.

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

That the memorandum of the Chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners to the Prime Minister, of date the 23rd April, and laid on the table of this House on the 24th instant, and the papers accompanying the same, be referred to a special committee of five members, with instructions to investigate the matters and charges therein mentioned, and that the said committee be composed of Messrs: Carvell, Macdonald (Pictou), Geoffrion, Barker and Lennox, and that the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There should also be power given to the committee to examine witnesses on oath or affirmation as otherwise the committee would have no power to do so. I would suggest further if it is the intention to deal with all the matters and charges which have been put forward in the statements purporting to emanate from Major Hodgins which have appeared in the public press, that it should be so stated in the resolution. I observe that the memo. which has been placed upon the table of the House from the chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commission refers to an article contained in the Manitoba 'Free Press' and a similar article in the Ottawa 'Citizen.' In the press of British Columbia the statements of Major Hodgins were set out at very considerable length and in very considerable detail, so much so that the observations of the chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commission as to their vague and indefinite character would not seem to apply, because I observe that the Vancouver 'World,' after referring to the great weight which the words of Major Hodgins would carry in the province of British Columbia, uses this language:

We do not know that more serious charges of robbery of the public treasury have ever been brought before the public of Canada. There are no general statements made on hearsay, but specific allegations which can be proved or disproved, put forward by a man thoroughly familiar with the circumstances.

I would suggest therefore to the right hon. gentleman that there should be added to the resolution after the words 'therein mentioned' on the last line of the resolution as it appears on page 10 of the Order Paper, these words:

Or set forth in the statements purporting to emanate from Major A. E. Hodgins which have appeared in the public press.

These should be added so that we may be sure, in sending the matter to the committee that we are dealing with all the charges and matters which have been alleged by this gentleman who has occasioned the action which the Prime Minister has taken.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know that I would be justified at this moment in enlarging the motion which I have just brought to the attention of the House. The action which I have taken was upon the suggestion of my hon. friend who drew my attention to this matter, and we took action upon the reports which were available at that time. If there is any thing more it ought to be a matter for further consideration. I have never even seen the newspapers to which my hon. friend refers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not asking for any thing more to be introduced. In bringing the matter to the attention of the Prime Minister I referred to statements made in newspapers in eastern Canada, which as I understand summarized the statements made by Major Hodgins and which had appeared at greater length and in greater detail in the press of British Columbia. All that I am now suggesting is that the motion should be so framed as to include all the matters and charges which were actually mentioned or made and which were referred to but not set out in the press of eastern Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly, any statement that has been made though not actually stated in detail ought to be taken in, and as I understand it myself at all events, it is being included in the resolution.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. All I am in doubt about is whether or not the newspaper clippings attached to the communication from Mr. Parent contain the actual statements and charges put forward by Major Hodgins in British Columbia. In order to make that perfectly sure I was suggesting an amendment, not with the idea of adding any thing further but merely with a desire of including all the charges and statements that were actually made before I brought the matter to the attention of the government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The intention of the motion is certainly to deal with all the charges of Major Hodgins.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the Prime Minister be good enough to look at the motion and see whether he is quite sure of that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not having seen the paper I am sorry that I cannot express any opinion at the moment. Perhaps I had better allow the matter to stand until to-morrow.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I can furnish to the Prime Minister some British Columbia papers which contain the statement as originally made; he could look over these and see whether all these matters are covered.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion stands.

MEAT AND CANNED FOODS ACT.—AMENDMENT.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) moved third reading of Bill (No. 149) to amend the Meat and Canned Foods Act.

Mr. DAVID MARSHALL (East Elgin). I would like to ask the minister if he intends by this Bill to do away with the name of the packer on the label. I understand that is the intention of the Bill.

Mr. FISHER. I think the hon. gentleman's way of putting it is far too sweeping. It does not necessarily do away with the name of the packer, but it does permit the first purchaser from the packer to put his name on the label instead of the packer.

Mr. MARSHALL. Then I may tell the minister that is the greatest mistake he ever made.

Mr. FISHER. I did not make it. It was an amendment moved in committee, not by me, and adopted by the House.

Mr. MARSHALL. It seems a pity to put laws on this statute-book one year and change them the next year, when they are proper laws. The canning industry in this country is a large industry and is likely to increase. It seems to me there would be no object in improving the quality of the goods unless the name of the packer is on the label, and it certainly protects the consumer. I have some special labels here which I will send over to the minister so that he may see them. We do not object to a special label but I believe the name of the packer should be on the label in every case. Some times these goods are sent out and they change hands two or three times and if the name of the packer is not on it is a very easy thing for the man behind the counter to say even unintentionally they were packed by a certain firm when such might not be the case. In the interest of the business I would regret very much to see this change take place for I believe it would be a setback to the trade. I hope the minister will consider that well. We have no objection to the wholesale trade using special labels but we think the name of the packer is the best protection to the consumer. The Act of last year which provided that the name of the packer should be on the label was a good Act, and I was in sympathy with it and I regret now that it is proposed to change it. Speaking on behalf of the Canadian canners I may tell you that we are not sending 1,000 cases to the old country to-day except those which contain our own label and I say that is the best advertisement that the canned goods of this country can have. I again urge that the law should provide that the name of the packer should be on the label, if only for the purpose of protecting the consumer.

Mr. A. ZIMMERMAN (Hamilton). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Marshall) has not advanced one argument why the respectable and responsible Canadian wholesale dealers who have advertised and established the reputation of their labels for the past thirty years should not be allowed to use them as in the past. I can readily understand that the Canadian canners which the hon. gentleman represents would derive very great advantage from a law which provided that the name of the canner should be on the label. Now, the first object and design of this law is to protect the public. That is the object of the Act. The wholesale dealers always had canneries of their own until of late years when they have sold them out to the Canadian canners who have some thirty-five or forty canneries under their company at the present time. Two or three of these canneries have worked up great names for themselves in the past, but the public have no guarantee that they are getting the goods of these particular canneries even when they ask for them; the Canadian canners can take the canned goods of any of their canneries and place on them the name of the favourite cannery.

As to the question of responsibility, we know that the wholesale grocers are among the most substantial business concerns in Canada, much more responsible than many of the small packers. If the wholesale grocers are compelled to put the name of the canners on the goods, the effect would be to practically wipe out the whole business of the small canner as it would not pay the wholesale dealer to have his labels printed except in large quantity, and if the name of the cannery must be put on, then the wholesaler would practically be compelled to purchase his goods from the Canadian canners. In the past the wholesale

grocers have bought their canned goods from perhaps a dozen different canneries under their own special supervision. They are bound to have their goods of the very highest quality, and when the wholesale grocers put their own names on the cans it is a guarantee to the public that they are getting first class goods.

Mr. MARSHALL. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong when he says——

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not a question, that is the statement of fact.

Mr. MARSHALL. Does the hon. member know of his own knowledge that these special brands have been in use for 20 or 30 years?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I do.

Mr. MARSHALL. Name the label?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am not prepared to name the label.

Mr. MARSHALL. I thought you were not.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. But I know and you know that such firms as Balfour & Company, James Turner & Company, of Hamilton, have used their labels for many years.

Mr. MARSHALL. I do not know that and I am correct when I say that these special labels have not been used longer than seven years. I have the dates when their use was commenced, I know what I am talking about. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Zimmerman) does not really understand it; they have not been using these labels for twenty or thirty years. I am speaking of fruit and vegetable labels.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Marshall) should not interrupt another member who has the floor except with his consent. That is the rule.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The system of labels that have been used by the wholesale grocers——

Mr. MARSHALL. I would like to ask another question. In which way would the public be most protected, by having the name of the canner, the man who packs the goods, or the name of the wholesale dealer on the packages?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Unquestionably by having the name of the wholesale dealer. The wholesale trade have established a large business all over the country in their special brands or labels and the system has worked well. They have spent large sums of money on these labels and to require that the name of the packer should be placed on the can practically means confiscation of one of the most valuable assets of the wholesale grocer.

Mr. MARSHALL. Is the hon. gentleman aware that the canners allow the cost of these labels when they put them on? The wholesale man is not at the loss of the labels.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am aware that they allow a certain percentage. That is not the point.

Mr. MARSHALL. I understood his argument to be there was a great loss on the labels.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. No, I say the loss would be in the confiscation of a valuable advertised asset, an asset on which the wholesale grocer has worked up a large business during many years. That business has been established on a particular label, the trade have been well satisfied with the goods they have received, and now if you compel the name of the canner to go on these packed goods, it simply means confiscation of the wholesale grocers' most valuable asset.

Mr. SPROULE. Does it make any serious difference if you place on the label: Canned by so and so for such a wholesale firm?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Certainly, as practically every wholesale grocer would have to go to the Canadian canners to get his goods and they would be practically selling the same goods.

Mr. MARSHALL. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken; they would not have to go to the Canadian canners, for there are more goods packed outside of Canadian canners than they are packing. Why do they want these special labels put on certain packages? Because these goods have been before the public and have a reputation. When they send in their orders to the Canadian canners, they say: We want them labelled as packed at Aylmer—or some other point where the goods have a reputation.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. They certainly do it in their own interest, if they ask to have the name of the canner on, and in the future if the wholesalers want the name of the canner on, there is nothing to prevent it going on; but in the meantime the wholesale people have a large interest in their special labels, and it would be a very great injustice if they were compelled to put any other name on than their own. They are just as responsible if not more responsible than any canners in this country. This would simply mean that a great number of smaller canners would have to close down, the wholesale grocers could not go to the small canners and have their goods packed because they would have to sell on the packer's name and the small packer is not known in the country.

Mr. MARSHALL. Then why does the new packer always want to use his own

label ? Is it not because he wishes to get established, to get his goods out ? It is the new packer who wants to use his own label.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. All I can say is that the present system has been very satisfactory so far as concerns getting goods put up by the wholesale grocers under their own private labels. It has worked well, the public have been protected, the policy has been successful and under it a large special business has been worked up. It has also enabled the small packers to establish a successful business. If you insist on the packer's name going on all these goods, it is no more protection to the consumer than having the name of the wholesale grocer on them, and it means confiscation of one of the most valuable assets of the wholesale grocer in his special label.

Mr. MARSHALL. The hon. gentleman is mistaken entirely.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has exercised his right to speak on this motion.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I have had the floor——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman has also exercised his right.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON (Vancouver City). It seems to me that the hon. member for East Elgin, for whose opinion in this matter I have every possible regard, is unnecessarily alarmed over this suggested amendment. The section provides that these articles shall be marked with :

(a) The initials of the Christian names, the full surname, and the address, or, in the case of a firm or corporation, the firm or corporate name and address, of the packer.

and the amendment comes in here :

Or of the first dealer obtaining it direct from the packer who sells or offers the same for sale. Such dealer shall, upon request of the inspector, disclose the name of the packer of such article.

Let me tell my hon. friend (Mr. Marshall) the reason for this amendment. I received from the Wholesale Grocers' Guild of the province of British Columbia a resolution passed at the last meeting, pointing out that the majority of them had been operating on specific labels more particularly for canned salmon. For a number of years, it has been the custom for the wholesaler to go to a small packer of salmon and purchase his output. The packer does not label the goods, but they are labelled by the wholesaler with his own brand, and the wholesaler assumes full responsibilty for the purity of the article, and is held responsible under this amendment. Without this amendment, the packer would be obliged to put his name on the can. Now, John Jones may have been the packer last year——

Mr. MARSHALL.

Mr. MARSHALL. I think canned fish does not come under the operation of this section.

Mr. FISHER. Fish is subject to the provisions of the law under section 12.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I was pointing out that the wholesale dealer puts his label on the can. For instance, a man deals in what he calls the 'Sunset' brand of canned salmon, using that brand for years and buying his canned salmon, possibly, from four or five different canners. This is necessary for the reason that a good run of salmon in a certain river one year may mean a poor run next year, making it necessary for the wholesaler to go to a different part of British Columbia for his canned salmon next year.

Mr. MARSHALL. I understand you to say that he would not be able to use the same packer, and so his labels would be a loss. But you could overcome that by putting on a narrow strip 'packed by so and so' upon the label.

Mr. MACPHERSON. My hon. friend and I are working on the same lines ; we want somebody held responsible for the quality of the goods. But this is not a question of changing a label, but it is a question of maintaining a dealer's right in his own brand. A man may have built up a reputation for a certain brand of canned salmon. Under the present Act, he cannot operate in that way. Last year, for instance, the salmon was packed by John Jones ; this year it is packed by Smith and Brown. Cans thus differently marked might be put upon the same shelf, and my hon. friend will understand that this is a position that the wholesale grocers of British Columbia desire to escape. And I think that their position in the matter is very laudable and very fair.

Mr. MARSHALL. Are all the wholesale people in British Columbia in sympathy with this ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Yes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Are you not mistaken in that ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. I have received a letter from the Wholesale Grocers' Guild of British Columbia on the subject. I am sorry I have not that letter with me——

Mr. MARSHALL. The reason I ask is that one wholesale house in Vancouver particularly did not want this.

Mr. MACPHERSON. There may be one firm. But I have had several letters on the subject, including the one of which I speak, from the Secretary of the Wholesale Grocers' Guild which comprises practically all the wholesale dealers in British Columbia. Of course, my hon. friend wil understand that I am not working for any particular

grocer. I know that the wholesale grocers will be placed at a disadvantage or compelled to operate under the present section 12 of the Act.

Mr. MARSHALL. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question: If you were buying a case of Cross & Blackwell's goods, or of Heinz's or of Snider's ketchup, would not you want to see their names on the goods?

Mr. SPEAKER. I would remind hon. members in speaking, they must address the chair.

Mr. MARSHALL. I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but it is hard for me, apparently, to make myself clear, and this is a very important question.

Mr. MACPHERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Marshall) is right. If I asked for Crosse & Blackwell's goods, I would want to get what I asked for. Why? Because, in the course of a long period of years, they have built up a reputation for their goods.

Mr. MARSHALL. Well, here is a company that has been packing for twenty-four or twenty-five years. We have a reputation for our goods and do not want to give it away. Our position is just the same as that of Crosse & Blackwell.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I appreciate that. You put your label on the goods. You do not send out your goods under——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Macpherson) is doing exactly what I objected to a moment ago.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I beg pardon of the House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Marshall) does simply what the wholesale grocers of British Columbia are doing. If I know anything of the canning industry of Canada, I know that the people who have established a reputation for their labels desire to have their brands maintained. My hon. friend suggested that if I ask for Crosse & Blackwell's goods I want them. Yes, and if I ask for the Clover Leaf brand of salmon, I want it, irrespective of the identity of the actual packer. It does not matter that it has been packed by one firm and labelled by another. The firm that labels the goods is as desirous of keeping its business intact and not letting anybody else know where they get this canned salmon as Crosse & Blackwell are to keep people from infringing on their label. But my hon. friend will see that the present Act makes that impossible. I cannot see how any harm could accrue to the man who buys or to the canner, through this amendment relating to the 'first dealer.'

Mr. MARSHALL. But the harm is to the consumer, and it is the consumer we want to protect.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I took the stand last year that there should be the name of some responsible party upon the canned salmon. Until last year there was no responsible name upon the canned salmon, because, in many instances, the goods were packed, labelled and sent out without any individual name on the can.

Mr. ALCORN. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macpherson) reads the amendment, is it clear that the canner's label may be on the can or that of the first purchaser?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Yes.

Mr. ALCORN. Would the first purchaser be authorized to tear off the label of the packer and put on his own?

Mr. MACPHERSON. I fancy that he would come under the operation of the criminal code if he attempted to do that. Of course, I am not a lawyer.

Mr. ALCORN. This would seem to authorize it.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I do not think so. But the point I am trying to bring out—and I am sorry that this is not in committee, for I would like my hon. friend from Elgin to have the fullest opportunity for discussing it——

Mr. FISHER. Section 18 provides against the difficulty suggested by the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn).

Mr. MACPHERSON. Section 18 says:

> Every person who, not being an inspector, wilfully alters, effaces, or obliterates, or causes to be altered, effaced or obliterated, wholly or partially, any mark on any article which has undergone inspection shall incur a penalty of one hundred dollars.

That, I fancy, would cover. But what I am trying to point out is that the man who has established a reputation for a brand of canned salmon finds that brand practically wiped out under this law unless he can go into the canning business himself. If he is not in a position to do so, but goes into the open market, buys a pack of canned salmon, has it inspected and has his label put on it, that is a guarantee that the article is sound and fit for food.

Mr. SPROULE. As I understand it, there may be a failure of the catch, so that the dealer is not able to procure his supply from the same packer as in a former year, and may even be compelled to buy from two or three packers. What guarantee is there to the public that these different packs of salmon are equally good when they are packed without the direct supervision of the wholesale men?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Of course, the wholesale man comes under the operation of this Act. The wholesale purchaser is

going to be very careful, because he has established a reputation for his goods. He will see that nothing but the very best goods go out under his name. The hon. gentleman will understand that a man who has been putting up a particular kind of goods under a patent name, if he puts out an inferior article for only one year, it will injure the reputation of his goods for all time.

Mr. SPROULE. How do you determine that they are up to the standard?

Mr. MACPHERSON. There is a physical way of doing so. All canned salmon are inspected by a provincial officer in British Columbia. I went with him last year through some of the canneries, and saw some of the salmon condemned. The man who purchases has no trouble at all in ascertaining the character of the salmon by opening a can. The operation of canning salmon is down to such a perfect science that it is almost impossible for bad salmon to be put up—except possibly in a very bad year.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the hon. gentleman not think that the packer would be in a better position than the grocer to say as to the quality of the contents of the package?

Mr. MACPHERSON. They are all subject to inspection under this Act.

Mr. SPROULE. If they all come up to the one standard why should one be better than another?

Mr. MACPHERSON. The idea is this: If you are a wholesale grocer operating in British Columbia and you have established a reputation for a certain brand of goods, and are using your own label, naturally you will be obliged to keep your goods up to the highest possible standard. But under the present operation of the Act, you could not go to three or four different canneries and buy your whole output for that year, because in one case you would possibly buy the pack of Jones and Brown, and in another case the pack of Smith and Robinson, all carrying a certain class of brand.

Mr. MARSHALL. Does the hon. gentleman not think that the packer would be more particular if his own name were on the package than if he sent it out without his name?

Mr. MACPHERSON. I agree that the packer is going to be very particular. But we have many small packers who don't go into the market with their canned goods; they depend entirely upon the wholesale grocer for the sale of their goods. The hon. gentleman will understand that if the wholesale grocer is obliged to go to three or four different canners, under the present operation of this Act he is obliged to buy goods that are labelled by three or four different men, and if he put his own label on all those goods and sent them to eastern Canada he would soon receive a black eye.

Mr. FOSTER. They would have a double guarantee.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Possibly, and you cannot have the food you eat too well guaranteed. But the people have the guarantee of the responsible wholesale firm that these goods are pure, and they are also inspected by the government. They operate under this label and they are responsible for the goods.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the public not have the same guarantee from the manufacturer himself under the present Bill?

Mr. MACPHERSON. The question of vested rights comes in. These people have operated under this label for years. but under the strict operation of this Act they cannot operate under that label any more. Everybody has been protected under this Act, the wholesaler, the canner and the user himself. I think my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Marshall) is unnecessarily alarmed. I agree that we should have every possible guarantee, but there can be no better guarantee than is here provided. There are many reputable wholesale grocery firms in this country whose names are synonymous for purity of goods and for fair dealing. They have operated in British Columbia for thirty or forty years under one specific label, but buying from several different factories. How unfair it would be if the vested rights of these men in their labels were wiped out, and only the packer's name should be allowed to go on the label.

Mr. MARSHALL. How long has the canning business been in operation in this country?

Mr. MACPHERSON. I know they have been canning fish for thirty-three years, I withdraw the words forty years. In 1877 salmon were first canned in the Fraser river. It is a question of the vested rights that a wholesale grocer has in his patent label. He has been protected by this law, and the wholesale packer is not being at all molested.

Mr. MARSHALL. Who has the most money invested in this business, is it the man who supplies the label, or the man who builds a plant to put up the goods? We do not object to special labels, but we want the packer's name to be on the label. We will put on any label they require. but we say that in the interest of the builder, and to protect the consumer, the name of the packer should be on.

Mr. MACPHERSON. My hon. friend has got the wrong side of my argument. It is not a question of a label, the printing

of a label does not amount to much money; but it is a question of the vested rights of a man in goods that he has packed and sold for years. The person whose name is on the label is the man who is responsible under present conditions.

Mr. ALCORN. British Columbia methods in the canning business must differ from those obtaining in Ontario. The business in Ontario has not been in operation for thirty or forty years, and it is impossible for the wholesale men to have acquired any such vested rights as the hon. gentleman has referred to. In Ontario the canned goods business has only been in operation for about twenty years. When the packer of the goods has placed his own label on a package, in the lapse of years that label has acquired a large money value, and it appears to me that the effort now being made to place somebody else's label on the goods ought not to succeed. It would deprive the packers of this country of the large value that they have acquired in their labels. The hon member for Hamilton speaks of the responsibility of firms. This matter of labels being placed by wholesale firms on packers' goods, is a matter of recent years. The person responsible for the contents of the can is surely the packer who has placed his label on those goods. The hon. gentleman says that the label is for the protection of the public. Well, he argues in a circle. Ever since the business has been in existence the canner has placed his label upon the goods. The public have learned to value the goods by their acquaintance with these labels placed upon them by the canners. The labels put on by the wholesale men are a matter of recent years, and their value cannot be as great. The hon. gentleman evidently sees the force of that statement, and knows that the facts are as I have stated, because he adds that the wholesale dealers have in some instances established a canning business and have built it up, and says the public will be protected in getting the particular goods of these firms. That is precisely the case as I have put it. But the canners are the people who have the original vested rights. If there is any question of vested rights involved in this matter, it is the rights of the canner who, by lapse of time, has acquired a priority in such rights. They made the business. There was a time when there was no canning business in this country. The canners are the people who have made the business, spent the money, established the plants, gained a reputation for the goods they manufacture and established the value of their labels by trading with the public. Now, the wholesale dealers are endeavouring to take away that value which has been built up by long years of effort.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. It is just the reverse.

Mr. ALCORN. The hon. gentleman speaks of the wholesalers being the people who are responsible for the quality of the goods. How can they possibly give any guarantee of the quality of goods bought from a dozen different sources?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. They have all to be subject to the same inspection.

Mr. ALCORN. But there was a time when there was no inspection and when they bought the goods absolutely on the reputation of the packer. That is the reputation that the public desire to rely upon. They have learned to know these labels, they have learned to know the relative value of the goods, and they will be unfamiliar with the new labels put on by the wholesale men. The member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) says that it is a question of vested rights. I say: Yes, the vested rights of the packer. Surely the packers are the people who were on the scene first, they are the people who originated the business, and this is an attempt of the wholesaler to come in and take the benefit of the packers' years of work. I would certainly oppose in the strongest possible manner any amendment to the Act or any legislation which would have the effect of depriving the packer of the right to the full use of his labels and of his name for the purpose of placing his goods before the public. The public are entitled to the labels, they are acquainted with the reputation of the packer, these labels have a high money value to the packer and that money value ought not to be disturbed.

Mr. BLAIN. I beg to move, seconded by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Wm. Jackson):

That Bill No. 149 be not now read the third time but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for further consideration.

I suppose there will be no objection to allowing this Bill to go back to Committee of the Whole. There must be a considerable difference of opinion as to whether the Bill is a correct one or not, and I think it is a matter that the minister will consent to at once.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think this Bill ought to go back to Committee of the Whole. If any hon. members do not approve of any portion of the Bill they may move to strike out that clause.

Mr. SPROULE. No, this is the third reading.

Mr. SPEAKER. The only recourse is to move to refer it back.

Mr. FISHER. If the hon. member wishes to refer it back for a particular purpose I would not object at all.

Mr. SPROULE. It is for a particular purpose.

Mr. FISHER. But that is not mentioned in the motion; the motion is simply that the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SPEAKER. For further consideration.

Mr. FISHER. It means that the whole Bill shall be referred back for consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. There is only one clause of the Bill that there is any difference of opinion on.

Mr. FISHER. If the hon. gentleman wishes to move that this Bill be referred back for the purpose of striking out this particular amendment I have no objection, but if it is proposed to refer the whole Bill back for further consideration I would object.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. For the purpose of considering the amendment. It may not be desired to strike it out altogether, but to modify it in some way.

Mr. FISHER. That particular amendment?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, that is the only one we are discussing; refer it back for the purpose of further considering that clause, whatever it is.

Mr. MACPHERSON. It is an amendment to clause 12.

Mr. FISHER. Do you object to that?

Mr. MACPHERSON. I do not object to it. I am willing that the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Marshall) shall have every possible chance to express his views; still, I think he is entirely mistaken.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion, as I understand it, is:

That Bill No. 149 be not now read the third time but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of further considering the amendment to clause 12.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 12 of the Act provides that:

All articles prepared for food in any establishment and packed in cans or similar receptacles, or in any package whatever, shall be subject to inspection during the whole course of preparation and packing; and all such packages shall be marked with—

(a) the initials of the Christian names, the full surname and the address, or, in the case of a firm or corporation, the firm or corporate name and address of the packer.

And the amendment proposed is as follows:

Or of the first dealer obtaining it direct from the packer who sells or offers the same for sale. Such dealer shall, upon request of the inspector, disclose the name of the packer of such article.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, this is the clause striking the name of the packer from the label. I am anxious to have the name of the packer put on the label. I want to say a few words about the label. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Zimmerman) said that some of these labels had been used for a number of years. I have the dates here showing the periods for which some of them have been used. The 'Triangle' commenced to be used three years ago. The 'Tartan' brand is the oldest in use, this label having been originated seven years ago. I am speaking only of fruit and vegetable labels.

Mr. BLAIN. Are those a manufacturer's label or a wholesaler's label?

Mr. MARSHALL. These are what we call special labels. Every one of these labels has the name of the packer. I do not think that the Canadian canners are going to pack all these goods. They could not do it. I am speaking in the interest of the business. I am interested largely in the canned goods business, and I am anxious to work up the quality of our goods. There is no reason why we should not be packing all the vegetables and catsups consumed in this country. There is nothing, to my mind, that will improve the quality of these goods more than putting our labels on them.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The wholesale grocers do not object to the canners' name going on the goods. The packer is not compelled to sell to the wholesale grocer who insists that the name of the packer shall not be on the label.

Mr. MARSHALL. I quite understand that, but the wholesale man will come to us and say: If you do not use our special label we will not buy your goods.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. You are not compelled to sell to them?

Mr. MARSHALL. Not at all, but what we want to do is to improve the quality of the goods. The hon. member for Hamilton knows very well that when he was in the clothing business he had a reputation for clothes. I used to buy clothes from him myself, I wanted to see his name on the goods, and it was on them. He knows as well as he is sitting here that that is the proper course to take. But, some of the wholesale men are behind him; I do not know whether it is votes he is looking after or not; but he has taken a different attitude from that which he took last year.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. No, I have always taken the same stand on this question. It is a matter of great moment to the wholesale dealer, and I will tell the hon. gentleman that when a man has worked up a large business under a specific label or trade mark it would be an outrage to take it away from him.

Mr. MARSHALL. It is impossible to work up a very large business in three years.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The hon. gentleman is most unfair. He knows that there are lots of labels that have been used in this country.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mention them.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am not in a position to mention them, but the wholesale grocers from one end of the Dominion to the other are opposed to the Bill as it stands, and they have besieged members of this House with letters appealing to them to protect their vested interests in these labels. I think it is most unfair for the hon. gentleman to take advantage of his position in this House to represent his own business while the wholesale grocers, not being members of the House, are not here to defend themselves. I do trust that the hon. gentleman will not press this matter any further because the amendment is not interfering with him.

Mr. BLAIN. The objection I see to the proposed amendment is that it creates a monopoly on the part of the wholesale dealer.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Not at all; it is the other way on.

Mr. BLAIN. That may be my hon. friend's opinion.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. It is the other way on.

Mr. BLAIN. I have a label here which reads as follows: 'Triangle, James Turner & Co., Hamilton; put up expressly for us by the Canadian Canners', Limited.' If the amendment becomes law, James Turner & Co. will have the right to go to six different canning establishments in Canada and make an agreement for the 'Triangle' brand to go on each package.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. What would be the objection?

Mr. BLAIN. They would not be a uniform quality of goods because they were put up by six different canneries.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. But he is responsible.

Mr. BLAIN. The impression left on the consumer would be that all these goods were canned in the one establishment, when as a matter of fact they would be canned in six different establishments.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. And the Canadian canners to-day will put up the same brand in different factories.

Mr. BLAIN. But the canner's name would be on the label. Under the proposed legislation the wholesale man can arrange with the manufacturer, and the manufacturer's name would not go on the goods, and yet he would be responsible for the contents of the can.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The wholesale grocer is responsible.

Mr. BLAIN. The canner who puts up the goods is in a far better position to guarantee the contents than the wholesale dealer who never sees them.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. They are all subject to the same inspection.

Mr. LOGGIE. I appreciate what the hon. member (Mr. Marshall) says, but we must not forget that it is the practice all over the world for large wholesale houses to have private brands. If that be the practice in England, in Germany, in France and in the United States, there is good reason for favourably considering that we should follow it in this young country. One reason why the wholesale grocer wants his private brand is that when the brand is established he has control of his trade. Under other conditions a competitor may come in and quote the same brand, if it is not a special brand, at 2½ cents a dozen less, and the impression is given that all the other goods sold by that man are sold at a lesser rate than the competitor sells them at. That may be unfair competition. It is most important in the interest of the large packers generally that their brands should go to the public and that a demand should be created for them because of their quality. But it seems to me that no great wrong can accrue to the consuming public if a wholesale house of high standing undertakes to buy these goods from the packer and put his own name on them and become responsible. He will make sure that he buys from a responsible packer.

Mr. MARSHALL. If these goods turn out bad who is to pay for them?

Mr. LOGGIE. As a rule the wholesale grocer must make good to the retail grocer, the retail grocer must make good to the consumer, and the packer is supposed to guarantee his goods for six months.

Mr. MARSHALL. You are perfectly right, but suppose the wholesale man uses a special label on three or four different packs how can you adjust the claims if the name of the packer is not on the label?

Mr. LOGGIE. Every packer has a box mark and every package of goods is identified by the case.

Mr. MARSHALL. Yes, but some retail men take the goods out of the different cases as soon as they receive them, put them on the shelves and sell or destroy the case.

Mr. LOGGIE. That may be true, and it is not an exceptional way of doing business. We have not, however, had such a stringent law as is now proposed except during the past year, and I think we can fairly well take the risk we have taken for so many years. I realize it is important to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Marshall) that his goods should go to the consuming public under his own name, but is that any reason why some other packer who may not be as able as he is to do that should not be allowed to make a bargain with some large distributing house to put on their own label and be responsible to the consuming public?

Mr. BLAIN. Would it not be fairer for that other packer to put his own brand on his own goods ?

Mr. LOGGIE. There is nothing to prevent him from doing so.

Mr. BLAIN. But it allows the wholesaler who is not a packer to use a label which would lead the public to believe that he put up the goods.

Mr. LOGGIE. That is quite true, but all the same he has worked up a trade under that special brand and one reason for the special brand is that it prevents competition from another wholesale grocer.

Mr. ALCORN. Upon what principle of right or equity should a wholesale dealer be allowed to build up a value out of the goods of a canner who has created the value by his label being on these goods ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. He may not have created the value at all. It may be that it is the facilities which the wholesale man has for distributing the goods that creates the value.

Mr. ALCORN. The canners of Ontario are not depending on the wholesale trade for a market for their goods. There is one very large cannery in my county which deals with no wholesaler, keeps no travellers upon the road, sells their whole pack annually to one or two dealers in the larger centres and could sell them five times the amount if they had them.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I can quite believe that. This is not a question of canners and canners so far as I am concerned.

Mr. ALCORN. That is what it seems to be developing into.

Mr. MACPHERSON. My hon. friend is making it that. The canner has every right to place his name on the can, but the small canner who does not put his label on the goods has only the wholesale firms to look to for distributing them. The small man is protected in his interest. The hon. member says that some canners will never go to the wholesale house. The same thing occurs in the fish business, a certain brand of salmon that I have in mind will sell anywhere.

Mr. ALCORN. I cited that to show the value of the brand of that company. Those goods are sold upon that brand and upon nothing else.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Exactly and that is the reason I desire to have an amendment providing that the man who has established a brand but who is not a packer shall not have his label wiped out.

Mr. ALCORN. What about the canner who has used his brand for a number of years ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. This does not interfere with him. If I pack fish and desire to put my name on, this does not prevent me.

Mr. BARR. Suppose the wholesale man covers the packer's name with his label.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Then he comes under the criminal code and goes to jail, which is the proper place for him.

Mr. MARSHALL. The hon. gentleman seems to think I am speaking entirely for the company in which I am interested.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I do not think so.

Mr. MARSHALL. I am interested in the canned goods business, I am anxious to improve the quality ; I know what that means; immediately we get our standard up we can sell our goods. I want to stop American goods coming in. There is no reason why they should come in. Some of them are of better quality than ours, but to my mind nothing will stop their importation so quickly as putting the name of the packer on the goods. It must be remembered that there are some 40 packers outside the company in which I am interested. I am not speaking for my own company, I am speaking for the interest of the business. As a matter of fact the wholesale men have nothing invested in this business. You speak of their having so much invested, but that is not the case. This adoption of the special label is not desired by all the wholesale houses themselves ; we have letters from some of them asking me to oppose it. If you want to improve the quality of your goods be sure to have your name on. The Bill that passed last year, with some amendments, is a good Bill and I would be sorry to see it interfered with because to my mind as it stands it is a move in the right direction. This proposed new measure would be setting this business back ten or fifteen years.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Oh no.

Mr. MARSHALL. I am speaking as a practical man; I have been in the business 25 years and my whole aim has been to improve the quality of the goods. The goods I have been manufacturing for years have gone into the hon. gentleman's city and I know he has asked for that particular brand. Why? Because he knew the goods were right. That applies to all goods properly labelled. There is nothing that will improve the quality so quickly as placing the name of the packer on the goods. I am not talking in the interest of my company at all. I am talking in the interest of the whole canned goods business because I think it is in its infancy in this country. When the great Northwest fills up, where to-day we have 80 canneries, we will then have 180. I am sincere in what I say and I hope this Act will not be meddled with at all. I cannot speak too strongly on this question as I realize its importance.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I accept fully my hon. friend's statements, that he is not speaking for his canneries. I would not for a moment accuse him of that, his standing in this country is too high. But I know he is unnecessarily alarmed. I know a little about canned goods myself. I cannot speak from the practical standpoint of my hon. friend, but I know that there is no better canned fruit on the continent of America to-day than the Canadian. I was in the Santa Clara valley three years ago and met the canners there one afternoon. The statement was made there that the Santa Clara people did not put up some varieties of fruit and vegetables equal to those put up in the province of Ontario by the Canadian canners. I thought that was a very high tribute to Canadian canning. They did not speak of all classes of goods, but spoke especially of the very high class of our peas, peaches, and one or two other varieties. British Columbia possibly consumes more per capita of canned goods than any other part of Canada and there the Canadian packers have worked up a trade into which the Americans cannot cut. They are not getting in to-day excepting where the Canadians cannot supply the goods, as my hon. friend from Elgin knows. In the Dawson country, where so much canned goods are used, that applies fully; you cannot sell American goods if they can get Canadian. My hon. friend evaded the point I tried to make, I would have him understand that this amendment is as much in the interest of the small salmon packer as of the wholesaler. The small canner does not put his label on his goods, possibly he does not want to, and nine times out of ten he does not. The large canner does because he has his market, but the small canner depends on the wholesale man who has perhaps handled his output for years.

Mr. MARSHALL. Is the hon. member speaking of fruit and vegetables or fish?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Fish entirely.

Mr. MARSHALL. That is not the case in Ontario.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I appreciate that, the trouble is that Canada is a large country. The canners of British Columbia and of Ontario are in the same position of desiring to see good goods on the market, but what may apply to British Columbia may not apply to Ontario. That is the point I tried to make in regard to the operation of this clause on the canners of British Columbia. It will not hurt the canners so much although it will to some extent. I am trying to protect the man who has a reputation established but who is not a canner.

Mr. BLAIN. Does not my hon. friend think that the effect of this will be to increase the importation of American canned goods?

Mr. MACPHERSON. The United States cannot get a market in the District of Columbia when the Canadian canner can supply the goods. The hon. member for Elgin knows that.

Mr. MARSHALL. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken. If he goes to Bate's he will find American corn retailing at 25 cents a can. Why is that? It is packed by Warner & Company, of Maine, and is extra fine corn. He is entirely mistaken in saying that American goods are not consumed here.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I know they are.

Mr. MARSHALL. And they are sold at high prices. Our corn retails at 15 cents or two for a quarter, but Bate & Company are retailing American corn of the same size at 25 cents a tin.

Mr. MACPHERSON. But our corn comes into competition, it is selling at two for a quarter. The statement I make is that there are no better goods than ours manufactured on the continent. Take Alaska salmon and Rivers Inlet salmon. The Alaska salmon is cheaper to the merchant than the Rivers Inlet but he does not buy it because he knows that the Rivers Inlet salmon is a good, sound salmon; he is not afraid to stake his reputation on it and he cannot afford to take seconds and place his label on them. We have to compete against canned goods from the American side but in the West where the consumption of canned goods is greatest, where they come in competition, the Canadian goods have shut them out of the market. They are put up in a northern climate and are generally a better class of goods, and are possibly as well tinned as the American, because the canneries are very up-to-date. I do not think there is

any danger under the present Act or this amendment of any influx of American goods.

Mr. BLAIN. This amendment, I understand, is introduced at the suggestion of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson).

Mr. MACPHERSON. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. My information from the west is that the chief thought of the western dealers who are in favour of this amendment is that it will give them a better opportunity to import goods from the United States.

Mr. MACPHERSON. That is a side light I have never received and that is not an argument they advanced to me. I do not think it is so, as they are obliged to meet the Canadian tariff. And this clause does not make it any easier to get the goods in.

Mr. BLAIN. Does not my hon. friend think that will be the result if the amendment is passed ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. I really do not. This Act has been in operation for a year. The wholesale grocers say that section 12 has worked a hardship, and, in view of that fact, I desire to make this amendment to help them out. This Act respecting meat and canned foods is a splendid law. It was necessary in the best interest of the canner.

Mr. MARSHALL. Do you really mean that now ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. I have always been looked upon as being fairly frank in my statements. And I must tell my hon. friend that I mean every word I have said. I may be entirely mistaken, of course. I always give credit to my hon. friend (Mr. Marshall) for sincerity, and I think he should mete out to me the same measure of charity.

Mr. MARSHALL. I did not put it the right way. I think I know the mind of the hon. member (Mr. Macpherson) and that if he would tell the House just what he thinks about it, he would say that the label should be on. He is a practical man and knows that that is the only way to meet the case.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I agree about the placing of the label. That is the proper thing, an excellent thing ; it should be done, and will be done in nine hundred and ninety-nine cases out of a thousand. Possibly, after this law has been in operation for a few years, the men who are using the special labels will be eliminated. But this House has no desire, nor has my hon. friend (Mr. Marshall), to work a hardship on a man who has established a reputation for his label after years and years of labour.

Mr. MACPHERSON.

Take, for instance, Todd & Company, large operators on the Fraser river. Suppose that the Fraser river is a failure one year. Todd & Company have entered into a contract for so many thousand cases of canned salmon for the old country market. They are so many hundreds of cases short. They buy what they need from a small cannery. They are practical men, and, of course, they see to it that the goods are right. Every can of these goods is marketed on Todd & Company's label. The present operation of the law has the effect of wiping that out. Does not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Marshall) see the force of that statement ?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The same thing applies to other canners. The canners may go to a small independent canner and buy his output and put on it their own label and their own brand.

Mr. MARSHALL. That is true. We do that. But what does the small packer say? He may be only a beginner and trying to establish his own label. And he objects.

Mr. MACPHERSON. This does not prevent him from putting on his own label.

Mr. MARSHALL. I am not speaking of the case referred to by the hon. member (Mr. Macpherson) of which I know nothing. I know that it is the case here that we buy small packs. But we examine the goods.

Mr. MACPHERSON. That is what I say.

Mr. MARSHALL. And our name is on the goods—the name of some packer appears on the label. It does not matter who packs the goods ; I want to see the name on the label.

Mr. BARR. This is a question of great importance. It affects three classes of people—the canner, the wholesale grocer and the public. The law that was passed last year was a step in advance. We know that the public are very skeptical about canned goods and this has affected the business, and we believe that the law passed last year will improve the business. But, if we adopt this amendment, we help to create a monopoly by giving the wholesale merchant an advantage. If the small canners wish to protect their goods by putting on their name, they should be allowed to do so. Not only that, but, under this amendment, the wholesale merchant is likely to go to the small canner and say : We want to purchase your goods, but we will not do so unless you allow us to put on our label. Why should the small canner be forced to allow the wholesaler to use his own label and thus destroy the advantage of the canner ? We know that some canners do not produce as good goods as others. My hon. friend (Mr. Macpherson) suggested that Ontario produced the best,

that British Columbia did not produce always as good quality as other parts of the country.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I never said so.

Mr. BARR. The hon. gentleman said that Ontario produced the best goods. That being the case, if you facilitate the putting on of the wholesale grocer's label instead of that of the packer, the purchaser does not know who puts up the goods or where they come from. This tends to the putting up of goods of inferior quality, for the man who puts up the best quality is deprived of the advantage which he ought to have. The present law has not had time to work out its results, and we should be careful how we make changes. Certainly, changes should not be made at the instance of the wholesalers and at the expense of the canner and the consumer. It is very likely that the canners would not be so careful if they sold to the wholesaler as they would if they had to send their goods out to the world bearing their own name. And, just as soon as we find our own goods going down in quality, we find increased danger of importation from the United States and other countries. Therefore, it seems to me that the amendment, while it may be to the advantage of the wholesale grocers, is not in the interest of the canners or the public.

Mr. LOGGIE. The hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Marshall) says he buys goods from the small canner. Does he put on the small canners' labels, or the label of the canners' association ?

Mr. BARR. If there are two or three canners under the control of one concern, that concern might put its own label on the goods. But all are equally responsible, for their interests are identical and that interest is to build up their own brand. Though doing business in three places, perhaps, they are practically one.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. Since the interest of the wholesale grocer and the canner seem to be in conflict, would it not be well for the government to consider the idea of making a provision that the wholesale grocer may put on his own label, but at the bottom of the label there must be a line stating the name of the packer? Some of my relatives are interested in the canning industry, and they realize that when wholesale grocers have worked up a trade and use a trade mark they naturally want to keep it. It would not be right for parliament to take away from them the trade which they have worked up in fifteen or twenty years, and made profitable by advertising and using a certain brand. On the other hand, the canner always likes to bring his name before the public on the goods that he puts up. If he puts up a good quality of goods his name becomes an advertisement for them. Now, could we not devise some amendment under which the wholesale grocer could still put his name upon the can as well as the packer? Then in addition to the name of the wholesale grocer, these words could be put 'Packed by so and so.' We have seen that done already. I have myself packed maple syrup for different firms in Ontario, and along with the general label which those firms use I have added the words at the bottom 'Packed by so and so.' I think the wholesale grocers would accept an amendment of that kind. It would be an additional guarantee to the consumer. To-day the dealers are too eager to buy, and they buy from Tom, Dick and Harry as long as they can purchase at a profitable figure. In many cases people who have been putting up a high quality of goods for years cannot compete with certain people who come in to the business and undersell them. We have seen many wholesale firms who, by reason of their ignorance of the process of manufacturing, are imposed upon, and are not in a position to discern between inferior and superior qualities. Naturally they look to the quotations offered them by the manufacturer, and look no further. It often happens therefore that jobbers gather up an inferior article and dump it upon the public. I think it would be an additional guarantee to the consumer if the name of the packer were placed on the label, and that would do no injury to the wholesale grocer who has been using a registered trade mark for years. Many times the label is not a guarantee of quality because, as I have already said, the wholesale grocers are not always in a position to discern the inferior from superior article, because they are only purveyors or jobbers of goods made by the packer.

Mr. SPROULE. I still think it would be reasonable to add an amendment providing that the name of the packer should be put on the can, as well as the name of the wholesale firm that handles the product if he so desires it. That is often done. Then we would preserve the value of the name or reputation which the wholesale firm had built up during perhaps a long number of years, as well as the good name of the canner. Machine companies do that with reference to binder twine. The binder twine which is sold in the United States by the McCormick Company, much of it is manufactured by the Binder Twine manufacturers in Canada. They send a man especially to supervise the operation when the article is being manufactured, and it is made of a superior quality. The wholesale firm may have acquired a reputation for sending out a good quality, but I do not see why the manufacturers who produce that good quality should not share in some of the benefits as well as the seller.

Mr. MARSHALL. If the packer's name is not on the can he is not known to the

trade. The packer has his money invested in the plant, and it would not be fair to the man who has built the factory and put in the machinery if he were not allowed to put his name on the package. If we get the benefit of publicity in putting out high class goods, we will be able to keep our plant in better condition and to put up still better goods.

Mr. LOGGIE. The hon. gentleman said a little while ago that he bought the entire pack of small canneries; did he put the labels on each one of those canneries on the aggregate pack, or did he put his own label?

Mr. MARSHALL. We put our own label on.

Mr. LOGGIE. Then what is the difference between his relation to these purchased goods, and the relation of the wholesale grocer who puts his label on them?

Mr. MARSHALL. We are packers. We only buy from other canners when we are short. We do not buy these goods to speculate on, but only when we are short in filling orders and have to look outside. But we examine the goods thoroughly before we put our label on.

Mr. FISHER. I must say that I cannot see the value that is attached to the Shibboleth of a packer. The wholesaler is just as well able to judge of the quality of the goods that he did not pack as the packer himself.

Mr. MARSHALL. We send a practical man to examine the goods before we buy them, a man who thoroughly understands canned goods.

Mr. FISHER. The wholesale grocer is also able to send a practical man.

Mr. MARSHALL. It is only practical men who are capable of judging of these goods.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Marshall) knows of cases where goods were sent out from the canneries to the wholesale grocers, and were returned as not being up to the mark.

Mr. MARSHALL. The party who buys from the original canner is responsible. We would not be responsible for the party selling, but if we get a poor quality of goods we come back upon the original packer. We are responsible because we know the brand.

Mr. BLAIN. I think this is a matter that should receive the special attention of the Minister of Agriculture. He introduced a Bill in 1907, it has only been on the statute-book for twelve months. A very important alteration is proposed to be made in the Bill. The minister will not father the change. He has already stated that the amendment was not proposed by himself, rather shirking the responsibility for the change, and yet I suppose he has consented that the change shall be made. I would like to direct my hon. friend's attention to the fact that whatever responsibility there is for this change will rest upon the minister himself. I do not think he is doing justice to the people of Canada by consenting that legislation of this kind shall take place. If this legislation is passed it will be practically impossible to follow the goods back to the door of the manufacturer. For example, James Turner & Co. buy a thousand boxes of canned goods from six different firms, and, with the view of perpetuating their own name, they put their own labels upon them. Some of these goods are sent to one province, some to another and some are exported out of the country altogether. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if it would be possible for his department to trace these goods to the manufacturer when there is no manufacturer's label upon the goods? Neither the wholesaler nor the department would be able to trace these goods.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Why not?

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. gentleman state how?

Mr. MACPHERSON. The amendment provides that:

> Such dealer shall, upon request of the inspector, disclose the name of the packer of such article.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend states that, but, at the same time, the special guarantor is the wholesale dealer. He is allowing the wholesale dealer to take the place of the manufacturer and I think this is dangerous legislation.

Mr. ALCORN. In reference to the purchase of the pack of a small packer that arises in this way: Those who start canning factories in a small way are not usually people of capital. A number of those wishing to engage in the business come together and the first thing they do is to sell their pack. They must realize money on their first year's operations. They go to some large packer and make an arrangement with him by which he takes all their pack for that year Until they do that the bank will not advance one dollar to establish their business. Under the 12th section of the Act packages are required to be marked with the name of the packer and it is desired here to add:

> Or of the first dealer obtaining it direct from the packer who sells or offers the same for sale.

I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who has proposed this amendment, how he thinks it is going to work out practically. How is it going to operate in the ordinary course of trade? I think I can tell him how it will operate. The wholesaler will say to

the packer : I will take your pack for this season, or some specified part of it, but I will insist upon putting my name upon the label. The packer naturally does not desire it. He has worked up a large value in his label during the course of many years' business. That is the proposition which is made to him by the wholesaler and the wholesalers combine to enforce that condition in all their purchases. They will all insist upon putting their own label on the goods and not the label of the packer.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) said, in answer to my question as to how it was possible to trace the goods back to the manufacturer, that the packer would be compelled to put his name on the goods.

Mr. MACPHERSON. No, I did not say that.

Mr. ALCORN. The Act as it now stands says that :

All articles prepared for food in any establishment and packed in cans or similar receptacles, or in any package whatever, shall be subject to inspection during the whole course of preparation and packing ; and all such packages shall be marked with—

(a) the initials or the Christian names, the full surname, and the address, or, in the case of a firm or corporation, the firm or corporate name and address, of the packer.

And the amendment proposes to add :

Or of the first dealer obtaining it direct from the packer——

Mr. MACPHERSON. Read on further.

Mr. ALCORN——

—who sells or offers the same for sale.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Then go on.

Mr. ALCORN. The question then was as to how the packer could be traced and in answer to that the hon. member for Vancouver cited this part :

Such dealer shall, upon request of the inspector, disclose the name of the packer of such article.

But the packer's name need not be on the package at all.

Mr. MACPHERSON. That is quite true.

Mr. ALCORN. In the course of commercial dealing what will result from such legislation as this ? The result of this legislation will be to enable the wholesaler to put such pressure upon the packer as will compel the packer to allow his goods to go out altogether under the name of the wholesaler and thus entirely destroy the value of the label which the packer has established. The wholesaler can say : If you will not sell to me, or if your whole district will not sell to me, I will get some one else to put up a factory ; a few of us will combine together, put up a factory and wipe you out of the business altogether.

Mr. MACPHERSON. For twenty years or over we have been operating in this way proposed by this amendment.

Mr. ALCORN. You are talking altogether of fish and we are talking altogether of fruit and vegetables.

Mr. MACPHERSON. My hon. friend cannot see anything outside of fruit and vegetables. But, my particular point is that we have been operating in this particular way for years. The hon. gentleman suggests as a reason why I bring in this amendment that the wholesalers would have the privilege of combining and forcing down prices. The reason is not that, and no argument that I have used can be construed by any hon gentleman to mean that. The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Marshall) knows that I do not mean that and I take it that he is an authority upon these matters

Mr ALCORN Will the hon gentleman restrict his amendment to fish and fish products?

Mr. MACPHERSON. There is no reason in the world why there should be any specific line of demarcation between these two classes of goods that I can see. I do not know but that there are many wholesalers operating in connection with fruit and vegetables as well ; I cannot say that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would it answer the purpose if you changed the amendment in such a way as to provide that after the word 'packer' the following words be added: 'And any subsequent dealer who sells or offers the same for sale must add thereto his own brand or mark' ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. No, that would be making my amendment nugatory.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It would not make it nugatory. The strongest point of the observations which have been made seems to be that if any good will had been created in the trade mark of a wholesale dealer or exporter it would be desirable, if possible, to preserve that and, at the same time, pre serve the general principle of the Act by keeping the name of the packer upon the can. There are some cases in which the name of the man, who is not, strictly speaking, the packer, may properly be upon the can. I know that in Nova Scotia, for example, a man who deals in lobsters, sometimes has not his own factory at all. He has lobsters packed according to a certain specification which is carefully written out and embodied in the terms of a contract. He has the canning of these lobsters

inspected by men appointed by himself, so that, in effect, they are really canned under his own supervision although not canned actually in his own factory. Then his own label is supplied to the persons whom he so employs and it is put upon the goods. But, the amendment which is suggested does not apply to that case at all. It is the case in which a wholesale dealer buys up a pack which perhaps he has not examined at all. I think it is highly desirable to preserve the principle of the Act and have the packer's name on the can, and at the same time preserve the good will which has inured in that way to a wholesaler by having his name on the package as well. It seems to me that the two ideas could be worked out together.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I really cannot follow my hon. frend through that because that would result in the goods of a man who had made his label well known being obliged to carry two different names. I do not think that would be fair. My hon. friend makes a mistake in saying that the wholesaler does not inspect his fish.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I gathered that sometimes he did not inspect.

Mr. MACPHERSON. He would not jeopardize the good name of his firm by putting his label on a poor pack.

Mr. BLAIN. How is it possible to trace the goods to the canner?

Mr. MACPHERSON. My amendment says :

Such dealer shall, upon the request of an inspector appointed under this Act, disclose the name of the packer of such goods.

Mr. BLAIN. Suppose James Turner & Co., of Hamilton, buy 1,000 boxes from six different canning companies and they are all labelled under the name of James Turner & Co., how would it be possible to trace the packer after the goods are distributed throughout Canada?

Mr. MACPHERSON. I should not think there would be any difficulty. James Turner & Co.'s name is on the tin and the inpector would go to that firm and ask from whom they bought.

Mr. BLAIN. How would they know which of the six different establishments that tin came from?

Mr. MACPHERSON. He will be obliged under this Act to keep track.

Mr. BLAIN. What objection can there be to compelling the canner as well as the wholesaler to put his name on the label?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The wholesaler as a rule will buy the output of a factory, and it is the easiest thing in the world to keep track.

Mr. MARSHALL. But suppose James Turner & Co. buy part of their stock from the Canadian canners and part from the Homestead and the goods are distributed and three months afterwards claims are made, how can a distinction be drawn between the goods?

Mr. MACPHERSON. James Turner & Co. will be held responsible.

Mr. MARSHALL. Yes, but the claims all come back to the canner, and it is impossible to tell which canner the claim should come to unless his name is on the label. If a firm bought from one company it could be done, but where they buy from different companies it cannot be done.

Mr. ALCORN. To show the outrageous character of this proposition, it is merely sufficient to mention that the responsibility for making good faulty goods is on the packer ; he is the man who is to be made to pay in case anything goes wrong, but the proposition is to give the whole value in the label to the wholesale dealer. The packer's label is wiped out, but the packer must pay all the losses in the end.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like the minister to answer the question as to whether under this proposal it would be possible for the consumer of the article to trace the manufacturer of the article?

Mr. FISHER. That is a matter of opinion. I gather from what my hon. friend from Elgin said that in the past they have been able to do that when the packer's name was not on the label, and if that be so they ought to be able to do it in the future. I say that if they were able to trace the packers in the past before this Act came into force, they ought to be able to do it in the future. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) spoke about my duty in the matter. My duty is to try and see that this Act safeguards the public interest, and I thought it did so, but when I examined the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Macpherson) I thought it provided a sufficient guarantee for the public interest and having that belief, although I did not propose the amendment, I did not see any objection to its adoption if the committee wished to adopt it. It was not in the original Act, and were it not for the representations of the wholesale trade generally of Canada—I think I may say from the Atlantic to the Pacific—I would not have known there was any objection to the original Act. It seems to me that there is a perfect safeguard for the public whether the amedment is passed or not, and that being so it does not matter to me very much personally whether the amendment passes or does not pass. The other night the committee approved of the amendment.

I said then, as may be found in 'Hansard,' that I did not see any objection to it in the public interest, and as the committee has adopted it I would prefer it to remain and shall vote, if it comes to a vote, to sustain the opinion of the committee. I wish to say a word to my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Marshall). He has stated that the Canadian canners purchased canned goods from other canners and put their label on them, and in my opinion that gives away his case. He may not agree with me in that, but that is my view of it. It does not seem to me to make a bit of difference whether it is a canner or a wholesaler who puts his name on goods he does not himself pack. I grant that if the Canadian canners pack the goods themselves their names might be an additional guarantee over and above what the wholesaler who does not himself pack the goods could give. But if the Canadian canner buy from another canner goods which they themselves do not pack and put their mark on these goods they are doing the same as the wholesale grocer does when he buys his goods from another canner and puts his mark on them. I cannot see any difference. My hon. friend says that they are practical canners and would inspect the goods. The wholesaler is just as well able to employ a practical canner to inspect the goods he buys as are the canners and is just as likely to do so. My hon. friend (Mr. Alcorn) said the difficulty was that the man who established a new cannery would be at the mercy of the wholesale trade. He said the new cannery could not sell its own goods because it was not known, and I understood him to mention that it would then sell to another cannery or packing house. I cannot see that that differs in any way from selling to a wholesaler, and I do not think that they are any more in the power of the wholesaler than of the old established cannery.

Mr. ALCORN. I gave that as the method by which these purchases are made, the trade reasons that arise why these goods are bought in that way. It is not an ordinary transaction.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think it makes any difference whether the wholesale or another packing house buys from the small cannery. In both cases they are goods produced in the new cannery by beginners and the wholesaler puts on them his guarantee that he will be responsible for the quality of the goods. In another case an old established cannery puts its mark on. It seems to me that the guarantee of the wholesale house of the quality of the goods is no better and no worse than the guarantee of another canning house. The hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) asked the hon. member for Hamilton about Crosse & Blackwell. He knows perfectly well that Crosse & Blackwell do not themselves pack one-hundredth part or a one-thousandth part of the goods on which they put their name. They buy goods put up in Canada, have them sent to England and put the Crosse & Blackwell mark on them, and the Crosse & Blackwell mark carries them all over the world. Crosse & Blackwell are in England, a packing house, but as far as the trade of the world is concerned, they are a wholesale house and not a packing house. They buy fruits from British Columbia, California, Ontario, and Nova Scotia, vegetables from Ontario, they send them to England and put the Crosse & Blackwell mark on them and that mark carries them all over the world, just as a wholesale house in Hamilton, Montreal or Toronto might buy goods in different parts of Canada, put their name upon them, and in that way guarantee the quality of the goods. My hon. friend's reference to Crosse & Blackwell was rather unfortunate for his argument.

I am not going to argue one way or the other. I did not introduce this amendment because I did not know it was necessary. When it was brought forward by my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) and shown to be necessary in the interest of a very large class of the community, I examined it to see whether it was going in any way to injure the public interest. I found that to my mind it would not and therefore accepted it and agreed to it. Having accepted it, and agreed to it, and the committee having accepted and agreed to it, I confess that no argument has been advanced why it should not be accepted and if it comes to a vote I shall have to vote for the retention of the amendment.

Mr. MARSHALL. When the Bill was first introduced was its object not to improve the quality of the canned goods of the country ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. MARSHALL. To my mind you have taken the back-bone out of your Act.

Mr. FISHER. I cannot see that. If I thought that I would not support it.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I desire to ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) a question. Section 12 provides that articles prepared for food and packed shall be marked in certain ways. Subsection (b) provides that such goods shall be marked with

(b) a true and correct description of the contents of the package:

Provided, however, that if it be established to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council that such marking would hinder the

sale of any said articles in the British or foreign markets he may exempt such articles from the provisions of this section.

Have any regulations been made with respect to canned lobsters or other fish under subsection b of section 12?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I would like to explain that, in the maritime provinces, and especially in the province of Prince Edward Island there are several men who buy canned lobsters from the packers. They instruct the packers how to put up these lobsters, the work being done according to formulae furnished by the buyers in Europe, especially in France. The goods are labelled with the brand of the man who buys from the packer. I do not think it would be advisable to change that method of doing business.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question. Do I understand him to say that in England they require that the cans shall be sent there without labels?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I do not know that. But I know that the practice in the maritime provinces and especially in Prince Edward Island is as I have described it. And these men who buy from the packers have established a trade. The goods are put up under the inspection of these men. I think it would be unfair to change their methods of business. I would agree with the hon. member for Vancouver city (Mr. Macpherson) so far as the packing of fish is concerned. It may be that a different method should be followed with respect to fruits. But I have some knowledge of the fish packing business, and, so far as that is concerned, I would agree with the amendment proposed.

Mr. J. D. REID. I was not here during the earlier part of this discussion. But, as I understand, the amendment makes it unnecessary to have the name of the original packer on the can.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The packer or the first dealer.

Mr. J. D. REID. Under this amendment the wholesaler can write to the packer telling him to put up so many cans and label them, 'Packed for such a wholesale firm.' And the name of the original packer does not appear. But, is the wholesale man held entirely responsible for the quality of the goods? Would he be liable to prosecution if the goods were not as required by law?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. With the additional safeguard that, if required, the wholesaler must disclose the name of the packer.

Mr. J. D. REID. But whom would you prosecute in a case of that kind? There was a case in Montreal last year where some 50,000 cans, of salmon I think it was, led to a good deal of trouble. I think some people were poisoned, or at least made ill, by eating the stuff. In that case they could not find out——

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. There was no name on those packages at all.

Mr. J. D. REID. I did not understand that. But, under this amendment, as I understand it, it would be impossible to put out canned goods without the name of some responsible party on the packages.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Absolutely.

Mr. ALCORN. It appears to me that we are attempting to legislate in the same terms on two very different subjects. It is apparent from what has been said by the hon. member from Vancouver City and by the hon. members from the maritime provinces that the course of business with regard to the sale of fish and fish products differs materially from that followed in Ontario with regard to vegetables and fruit. I do not think it possible to frame a section which will be satisfactorily applicable to both these kinds of business. Therefore, I move, seconded by Mr. Marshall, that the amendment be amended by inserting after the word 'or' the words '(in the case of fish and fish products).'

Mr. FISHER. I think the position is not quite understood. The change made at the instance of the hon. member for Vancouver City (Mr. Macpherson) is not an amendment, but is a part of the Bill. Therefore, this is not an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand that the Bill is referred back for the purpose of considering an amendment.

Mr. FISHER. But the clause moved as an amendment is part of the Bill as printed. It was adopted in committee and is a part of the Bill as it stood for third reading.

Mr. SPROULE. But the fact that we are considering that clause is proof that it was not passed. The order was to go back into committee to consider that clause.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, clause, but not amendment.

Mr. SPROULE. But it is not finally decided until the clause is passed.

Mr. OWEN. The government is doing the packer a great injustice. These men have been building up a trade and a reputation for years, and now they are denied the privilege of placing their own name upon their goods.

Mr. FISHER. Not at all.

Mr. OWEN. If the wholesale man refuses to buy these goods with the packer's name on them, it virtually amounts to the same thing. When people go to buy those goods and ask for a certain man's brand of canned goods, they have got to take the dealer's word for it.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The hon. gentleman has not read the Bill.

Mr. J. D. REID. Canadian canners are willing to put up their goods with the wholesale grocer's name on them, but they also want to put their own name on them. According to this Bill any wholesale manufacturer, or some men that are not particular as to the quality of goods, will put up inferior goods, though they may possibly pass the law; yet they put on the wholesale grocer's name, and the goods can be sold to the injury of the reputation of Canadian goods as a whole. I can't see any reason why the law should not allow the actual packer's name to be placed on the goods so that they can be followed up to their origin. If you went into a retail store and purchased canned goods with simply the wholesale dealer's name on them, you do not know who put up the goods.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The hon. gentleman has not read the Bill, or he would not make a statement like that.

Mr. J. D. REID. In the 'Globe' of April 8, I find an item which bears out my contention. It reads as follows:

Winnipeg, April 7.

The health authorities have seized 330 cases, each containing six one-gallon cans of apples, and they are on the watch for six more cases in the same consignment, of which there is at present no trace. The goods are declared by the health officers to be absolutely unfit for food. All bore the label of an Oshawa Canning Company. Prosecution will follow.

In that case you can trace the name of the manufacturer, and you are able to prosecute him, and you are able to show the public the company that is not putting up a good article.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The hon. gentleman as a business man will understand this proposition. A wholesale firm has been purchasing the output of a canning factory, they have established a reputation and have a label for a certain class of canned salmon. No other names ever appear on these cans except the name of that firm. The wholesale firm may have bought this salmon from a different factory every year, for the reason that one factory or another may have met with a failure. Wholesale traders in British Columbia who went out and bought 4,000 or 5,000 cases of salmon and put their own label on it and sent it to the markets of the world, obliged to buy from two or three different factories, have found themselves in the position of putting up this year canned salmon with John Jones' name on it; next year James Smith's name would be on it, and in a very short time the reputation of their goods would be gone. People will say, this is not the same thing, because this label never carried these goods before. The merchants in British Columbia have found themselves badly handicapped by the operation of the present Act. My good friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) brings in the question of fish. Now we have small canneries who put up both fruit and fish. I do not know whether they are putting labels on their cans or not, but the wholesale houses are buying them. This amendment protects the public, and it does not place the wholesale merchants or canners in any worse position than they have been in for many years.

Mr. J. D. REID. Take the case of fish. They might put up a can of fish that was taken from different parts of the country, and all might not be of the same quality. The effect of the wholesale man putting his name on it would be a guarantee to the public, because the public would know who produced those goods and where they were produced. The particular locality the fish comes from is what the public would like to know. I really think that the wholesale man should not object to the manufacturer's name going on so that he can show the public where these goods are made, and in case they are not good you can go on and prosecute the manufacturer. The very fact of the name of the manufacturer and the words 'made in Canada' being on these labels is evidence to the public that the goods are of the proper quality. I could mention cases where the dealer goes to some other country and gets goods put up simply because they are a little cheaper although they are not of the same quality as our own canned goods. It should be the duty of the government to protect our own manufacturers and wholesale men and no wholesale man in Canada to-day will, if he has the interest of the country at heart, object to the name of any Canadian manufacturer being placed on these labels. I quite understand, as the hon. member for Vancouver has said, that in British Columbia the wholesale men are using these special labels. One wholesale man will get a name for his goods, another will get another name for his goods and yet they are all manufactured in the same factory. In a case such as the hon. member mentions, where it is absolutely necessary the public should be protected, I cannot see why they should object to the name of the manufacturer being on the label as has been the practice in times past.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member for Leeds has classed the wholesale Grocers' Association of Canada as being composed

of people who do not care for the interests of the trade in Canada.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not think so.

Mr. FISHER. That is what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. J. D. REID. I did not know that I did.

Mr. FISHER. No, the hon. gentleman did not know, but he spoke of the people asking for this amendment in that way and the people who are asking for this amendment are the wholesale trade of the country.

Mr. AVERY. I think that both sides of the House want to arrive at some result beneficial to the manufacturers and consumers. If goods are manufactured by so and so for so and so and if you find that these goods are wrong how are you going to trace them up and find out where the trouble is ? We have heard of several cases of goods being sent out which have poisoned people and if the name of the manufacturer is not on the goods how are you going to trace them back ?

Mr. FISHER. Has my hon. friend read the Act ?

Mr. AVERY. Part of it.

Mr. FISHER. Well, let him read the whole of it and perhaps he will not say that.

Mr. J. D. REID. If the minister states the wholesale men are the ones which are making application for this change then I say they are looking after their own interests more than they are looking after the interests of the people as a whole. Suppose some irresponsible person goes to a manufacturer and asks him to put up 500 cases of an inferior quality of goods and this person, after disposing of these goods leaves the country, there is no way of prosecuting because there is no person to hold responsible. If the manufacturer's name is on the goods you can prosecute him but you cannot hold accountable an irresponsible commission man.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Would it not be as possible for a canner who had no more appreciation of his duties then a commission man to do the same thing ? The fact of the matter is that wholesale firms have been operating for years with these special labels ; under the present Act the canners have to have their names on the packages. The wholesale men are to all intents and purposes the manufacturers. They go to the factory and say : I am prepared to buy 5,000 cases of salmon but I want them to be put under my brand. That brand protects the wholesaler in the market.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. J. D. REID. How would the hon. gentleman do in the case that I have mentioned ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. I would put the man in jail, of course.

Mr. J. D. REID. But you could not get him.

Mr. MACPHERSON. You cannot save people from being bad.

Mr. J. D. REID. Could you not if the manufacturer's name was on the label ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. No, you could not any more than you could in the other case. If my hon. friend's imagination shows him how wicked a commission merchant might be he can also imagine how wicked the small canner might be. I know of a small canner who packed Cohoes fish that were too long out of the water and he could not get anybody to take them off his hands.

Mr. BERGERON. I feel very much disposed to vote against all these amendments. I think there is too much law, a great deal too much law and while I am not so dense, and while I have been listening to this discussion the whole afternoon, I think I know less about it now than I did when it commenced. I have no doubt that it will appeal to the public in the same way. There is too much law on the statute-book and there is not enough to carry out the purpose that the framer of the law has had in his mind. We have heard about the rotten fish that was offered for sale last year in Montreal and although the sale of that fish did a lot of harm nothing could be done. There was no law to deal with the case. Although we have the statute-books filled up with laws we have not enough law to provide for a case of that kind. The consumer has been entirely forgotten in this discussion. It is a mere fight between the packers and the jobbers and the whole of the time has been taken for the last four or five hours in an effort to see who can make the most out of it—the packers or the jobbers. That is not the object that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) had in his mind, I am sure, when he undertook, in the first instance, to protect the public against the adulteration of food. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) has nothing else in his mind or in view but fish. The object of his amendment is entirely different from the purpose of my hon. friends behind me who are interested in the packing of tomatoes, peas and other vegetables. I understand the position of my hon. friend from Vancouver, but, of course, we cannot legislate only for him or for those engaged in the fish trade. The position taken by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. A. A. Mc-

Lean) is the same as that of the hon. member for Vancouver. In their case the commercial men take the fish of certain packers. The packers are the secondary persons, they do not conduct the trade, but they are the employees of the men who do carry on the trade in fish. The merchants engage five or ten packers to pack fish for them and they require them to pack fish in different ways to suit different markets. A lobster dealer will go to a packer and say : I want you to pack lobsters in such and such a way for the German market and he will say to another packer : I want you to pack fish in such and such a way for the French trade. In that case the packer disappears completely. The commercial men are the ones who look after this trade. Those are the men that my hon. friend had in his eye when he moved this amendment. But, the position taken by my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Marshall) is entirely different. He and other packers have created something. They can peas or tomatoes and they want to do it in such a perfect way that they will drive from the Canadian market all foreign produce of that kind. It was stated in a very open way that Americans come here and sell an article for 25 cents a package when our friends can put up two packages of the same kind of goods for a quarter. Still the American article takes the lead because of the name or for some other reason. The two interests represented are entirely different and we have lost the whole afternoon in a fight between the packers and jobbers. I appeal again to the Minister of Agriculture. We want to keep the consumer in our eye. He is the one that we are legislating for. We do not want to harm the packers or the jobbers, but they can take care of themselves. It is the consumer we have to take care of. The Minister of Agriculture should insert a clause providing that an inspector could enter a cannery and ascertain whether the goods were in proper condition or not. For my part I would like to see a government stamp on all these canned goods so that the consumer would have ample security that he is protected. After all it is the interests of the consumer that we should look after primarily in this matter.

Mr. OWEN. I cannot understand why the minister compels shippers to put their name on the fruit which is the raw material of these canneries, and deny to the manufacturer the privilege of putting his name on the manufactured article. The Minister of Agriculture compels the shipper of apples to place his name on every barrel that leaves this country so that if there is any fraud in the packing the shipper may be traced, but at the same time the minister takes away from the public the privilege of buying any brand of canned goods they desire to buy from the retailers.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Where does the hon. gentleman get that in the Act ?

Mr. OWEN. There is nothing on the label to show who manufactured the goods.

Mr. ALCORN. The hon. member for Vancouver has been arguing all afternoon with regard to the trade of his province in fish and the amendment prepared by me gives him all he asks for, but yet he is not disposed to accept it. That is evidence to my mind of what I suspected all along, that this is a determined effort on the part of the wholesalers to compel the canners to sell to them and give them control of the trade.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. If the government would accept fish from the provisions of this Act, that is all the fish packers of the maritime provinces and British Columbia have asked, and if the minister gives an undertaking that that will be bone, these useless amendments might be dropped.

Mr. MACPHERSON. There is nothing useless about the amendment because the wholesale grocers have been operating under it for the last eight months, and I think the trade have a pretty fair appreciation of what they want.

Mr. OWEN. If this Act passes in its present shape the public will certainly not be able to tell who packs the goods.

Mr. J. D. REID. It would appear that the wholesale grocers are the only ones interested in this Bill. It seems that this Bill is not in the interests of the canners or the public and that it is passed only to please the wholesale grocers.

Mr. BLAIN. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture, if this Bill passes, can a wholesale merchant in Toronto import from the United States canned goods which have not the name of the packer, and by putting his own name on them sell them to the people of Canada ?

Mr. FISHER. The Bill applies to all goods sold in Canada and the importer would be responsible for the quality of the goods. Under the Act of last session the packer in the United States would be responsible for the quality of the goods and nobody in Canada would be responsible. The amendment proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Macpherson) does not prevent any packer insisting that his name should be on the package ; that is a trade arrangement between him and the wholesaler. This Bill simply provides that the first dealer purchasing from the packer may put his label on instead of that of the original packer, but if an inspector desires

it he must divulge the name of the original packer. If I thought this amendment lessened the protection for the public in any way I would not have accepted it the other night, and believing that the public is amply protected I am not prepared to-day to vote down what the House agreed to the other day. It appears to be largely a quarrel between the packers on the one hand and the wholesalers on the other and I am not prepared to judge between them.

Mr. MARSHALL. It is not a quarrel between the canner and the wholesaler at all.

Mr. FISHER. I cannot see that the guarantee of one is not just as good as the guarantee of the other.

Mr. MARSHALL. It is not as good a guarantee to the consumer. My object is to protect the interests of the consumer. I believe that a packer who does not put his name on the label would not be so careful as he would if he knew the goods were going out under his name. These special labels which state that the goods are put up by so and so for the wholesale buyer have been used for some time and I do not see why you want to change that.

Mr. J. D. REID. If the wholesaler says to the packer: I will only buy your goods on condition that you do not put on your name, then the packer has to comply with that or lose the trade An American citizen can send in here an inferior quality of canned goods, distribute them under the name of some person in Canada which may be fictitious and if anything is found wrong he can move across the other side of the line. The minister has been met by a deputation of wholesale grocers and he seems to have nothing else in his mind but to protect their interests. The very fact that there were 50,000 cases of canned fish in the city of Montreal poisoning the people last fall should be sufficient to convince the Minister of Agriculture that the consumers of Canada need protection. I would suggest that the minister take this matter into further consideration and hear representations from manufacturers. the wholesale men, and some one on behalf of the public. He should prepare a Bill that would protect all and be in the interests of Canada as a whole. The Senate will not meet for two or three weeks; he has plenty of time and there is no object in putting the Bill through to-night. For that reason I ask that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. BLAIN. I cannot understand why the minister is so anxious, in the case of the Fruit Marks Act for instance, the person who packs apples must put his stamp on the package, while he does not insist on that in this case. As has been pointed out, this is only class legislation in the interest of the wholesale dealer.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. BLAIN. I agree that neither the manufacturer nor the consumer has been considered. Surely the consumer, if he finds goods he has purchased are defective, should be able to trace them back to the man who put them up. The minister pointed out last year that the change would place the responsibility on the wholesale man. In order that his memory may be refreshed, I shall read what he then said at page 6773 of 'Hansard:'

> I think all necessary safeguards can be thrown about the Bill with this additional amendment; and, as I have wished all through to interfere as little as possible with the course of trade, I have asked the House to add these words, which would enable the dealer, or the packer who was having goods packed for him outside of his own packing house, to put his name upon them and be responsible for them instead of the actual packer.

There is no doubt that this is class legislation for some particular purpose which I cannot understand. In my opinion this will permit the dealers in western Canada to import canned goods from the United States without a name upon them, place their own names on and sell them. I believe it will interfere with Canadian packers and divert a considerable portion of our trade from Canada to the United States. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) shakes his head. It may be all right from his standpoint, but I wonder that the minister who ought to be responsible for this legislation permits it. We have too much tinkering with our legislation. This Act was passed only last session and almost before the ink is dry the minister allows a member of the west for some special reason to move an amendment that will defeat its very object. The minister will be held responsible for this by the people of Canada.

Motion, Mr. J. D. Reid, negatived, yeas, 26; nays, 44.

Amendment to the amendment, negatived.

Mr. BLAIN. Will any provision be made for those having goods on hand?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think the amendment will affect them at all.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose by that it has no value?

Mr. FISHER. Not at all; it provides that in the future a thing can be done which up to this time cannot be done.

Mr. BERGERON. Under this could there be any prosecution of the men who brought the 50,000 cans of rotten fish into Montreal ?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know anything about the details of that.

Mr. J. D. REID. Does the minister mean to say he does not know anything about it ?

Mr. FISHER. No, I did not say so. The hon. member has no right to put words in my mouth which I did not use. I said I did not know anything about the details of that transaction and consequently I could not say what should be done.

Mr. J. D. REID. Do you not think the minister should know ?

Mr. FISHER. No, I do not.

Mr. J. D. REID. He is in charge of this law, yet he says he does not know anything about the details of that affair in Montreal. 50,000 people were liable to be poisoned.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. J. D. REID. They were by that 50,000 cans, and yet the minister does not think it worth while to get any details. If that is the position of the minister, I think the lives of the poeple will be in danger when this Bill goes through.

Section as amended, agreed to, on division.

Bill as amended, reported, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY—POSTAL SERVICES.

Mr. FISHER moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). On December 10, last, a return was ordered:

Showing what complaints respecting the inadequacy of postal service or delays therein, or respecting lack of or defects in postal facilities or means of communications, have been received by the Post Office Department since the 1st day of January, 1907, and the general nature of such complaints.

I thought that was a reasonable request to make of the Postmaster General, but it is now nearly five months since the order for that return was passed. I was assured some months ago that the Postmaster General was preparing the return, but that it took a good deal of time and care. Consequently, they were not able to bring it down any sooner. However, I cannot but think that, if that is the case, the Post Office Department is not in a very flourishing condition and is not the model department, one would suppose it to be, from the remarks we have heard made concerning it. I can only say that I have received a number of most damaging communications in referrence to the affairs of that department and the irregularities therein. I am anxious to get the information that will come down in the return, that I may see whether these matters have been straightened out to the satisfaction of the public.

Another matter I would like the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) to consider is with regard to the weekly papers. On several occasions I have called his attention to the serious position of the weekly papers in Canada. I understand that the Postmaster General has placed a man in the United States to take charge of papers addressed to people in the United States and distribute them. The publishers are at the expense, inconvenience and delay of that system. The Postmaster General, in reply to questions I asked him in regard to these matters, made the following statement on April 9 :

I received this morning a communication from the Weekly Section of the Canadian Press Association, and they are perfectly satisfied with the answer given.

Well, Sir, I have here communications from a large number of the weekly papers in different parts of Canada, not one in favour of the arrangement that the Postmaster General has now made for handling these papers, but every one condemning in the strongest language this action of the government, not only with regard to weekly papers, but with regard to the daily papers also. Now, the Postmaster General must admit that on the 8th of May last, when he brought in this regulation dealing with the daily and weekly papers, he was placing those papers in a very unfair position. He has been forced to back down from the position he took last May and to restore the daily papers to the position in which they were previous to that time. He has also been compelled to pay tens of thousands of dollars of the people's money out of the public chest to satisfy them in a reasonable way for the loss they have suffered. I would like the Postmaster General to explain the difference in the position of the country to-day as compared with that in which it was in May last in regard to these papers. He will tell us, perhaps, as he has told us on previous occasions, that he has been able to stop at the border all the literature that is of a character that we should not like to have enter our country. If that is the case, what legislation has he placed on the statute-book or why has he gone back on the position with regard to the daily papers which he occupied previous to last year? There is no doubt that the Postmaster General had as good a right then to stop daily or weekly papers of an undesirable character from coming into the country as he has now. There can be no doubt that if he will appoint censors to deal with these

papers, he has power to stop objectionable matter from coming into Canada. At page 3266 of 'Hansard' of this year it will be seen that he said :

So, we are perfectly free to accept or to reject any periodicals, but the House and the country may feel assured that we shall accept only the good periodicals.

He has had to back down from his position in regard to the daily papers, and he is gradually backing down in regard to the weekly papers. What I would like him to do is to come out boldly and manfully and say that he has made a blunder and is willing to take it back; that he is willing to remedy the existing state of affairs and give the newspapers reasonable compensation for the loss they have suffered.

Now, will the Postmaster General please answer me with regard to another matter —and I will ask him to take note of these points and reply to them as best he thinks. I notice that in reply to some questions I asked during the present session in connection with the purchase of a steamer in Great Britain by the Post Office Department, it appeared that the government had seen fit to pay $60,000 for the steamer and $3,500 for bringing her over.

Mr. BENNETT. What is she employed for ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Carrying the mail from the Transatlantic steamers at Rimouski. The steamer carries twenty-two men. So besides the cost of the steamer and of bringing her to this side, it will cost in the neighbourhood of $20,000 or $30,000 a year to run her. And the business that she is to do was being carried out under contract with a private firm for about $4,000 per annum. Will the minister explain in what way this is good business? I understand on very good authority that the new boat is so large and cumbersome that the large liners have expressed a wish that she should not be sent out during rough weather to take the mails, but that the smaller tender be sent out during storms. I might also say that reports are current that when the boat came over in May last——

Mr. BENNETT. What is the name of the boat?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The 'Lady Evelyn.' It is stated that though she came in May last she was not used for carrying the mails until the 20th of August and she made twenty-four round trips. But during this time the contract under which this work was to be done for $4,000 a year was still in force. The minister might explain this. Another thing is this : It is reported that the minister and quite a gathering of friends went for a trip in this boat and spent a good deal of time and a great deal of the people's money in cruising about. I cannot say that I have any definite knowledge of that matter, but these are the reports that come in and I think it but right that the minister should have an opportunity of explaining them away.

There is still another question I would like the minister to deal with. According to his own reports, last year he paid the railways in the neighbourhood of $1,600,000. I have no definite knowledge about the manner in which that money is expended. We know that in the United States the mail is weighed. We know also that a representative in the United States legislature made the statement in his place that over $70,000,000 of the people's money had been wasted owing to the false weighing of the mails by the railways. The minister in reply to a question I asked stated, as I understood him, that the mails in Canada were not weighed, but that they were paid for according to some arrangement with the railways. I think it would be interesting to the country to know just in what manner the mails are carried so far as the railways are concerned.

Another matter with respect to which I would like information is the one-cent drop letter that he promised the people in the cities some months ago, possibly a year ago. People are anxiously waiting for him to reply as to the position he is going to take. I would like him to tell the House in what position he is going to place the smaller towns and rural districts in regard to a cheaper mail service, and what advantage he is going to give them as an offset to the advantages he is giving the cities. The cities are receiving important benefits at the present time in the way of mail delivery, and a great deal of money is being expended upon them, and we who live in rural districts naturally feel that sufficient attention is not being given to us in the way of affording corresponding better mail facilities. The minister says that he is only giving free delivery to towns with a population of 12,000 and a revenue of $20,000. But if he will look across the line into the United States he will see that free delivery is given to cities with 10,000 inhabitants and a revenue of $10,000. The minister seems to be surprised at that, but if he will look into the matter he will find that is the case. He will also find that the Postmaster General of the United States has made several successful experiments in giving free delivery to towns with a population as low as 2,500. I think the minister should be able to give us a better explanation than he did to-day when, in reply to a question of one of the Toronto members, he told us that the matter was under consideration. The minister has, I think, a surplus of a million and a half dollars this year. What is he going to do with it? Is he going to let it pass into other departments to be squandered in the same way as they have been squandering the people's money the last few years ? Is it unreasonable for the rural districts to ask

for a better mail service? If you look around this House you will find that out of 214 members there are possibly 14 representing purely city constituencies, while the other 200 represent, either entirely rural districts or districts partially rural and partially urban. The minister is now considering a proposition to grant to cities a one-cent drop letter system; let him at the same time consider some way of improving the mail service in the rural districts.

I would like him also to give the House some definite statement of his intention with regard to free rural mail delivery. He may think that is a matter of trifling importance, but if he will look around this country he will find that it is a question of vital importance to large numbers of people. Last year he told us that this proposition was a luxury, it could only be looked upon as an ideal, and he said that we might have to wait till this country had a population of 20,000,000. For my part I think the time is already ripe for the Postmaster General to put into effect this important legislation. I will not go into the question fully to-night, because I have already dealt with it at an earlier period of the session. But the more I investigate the matter the more convinced I feel that this is a reform that should be adopted at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. MILLER. The hon. gentleman advocates rural free mail delivery. I would like to know whether he advocates such delivery over the whole of Canada, or only a part, and if only a part, what part.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. gentleman has asked a question that he would not have asked if he had investigated this subject thoroughly. I have never advocated the establishment of rural free mail delivery over the whole of Canada. I have explained clearly that wherever this system has been established, whether in the United States, or England, or Germany, or Switzerland, or France, it has been established under strict regulations that are found to be satisfactory. In the United States the president has established a commission of three men to deal with this question, not more than two of whom must be of the same political party. On that commission there are two Republicans, and one of the most prominent Democrats in the United States, Mr. Black. These men have full power to deal with this question, and when they appoint officials in any branch of the service, party politics are completely ignored by them. One of the regulations in the United States is that the route must be 24 miles long, and there must be 100 families living on that route, out of whom 85 at least must be prepared to place a box at their gate where the mail can be deposited. That rule is strictly enforced. If the route is short and the expense of carriage is less, the number of families to be served may be less.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. The hon. gentleman stated that the selection of routes was left entirely to an independent commission. Is he aware that in a periodical known as the 'Postmaster's Journal,' printed in the United States, the November number of last year states explicitly that the mail routes are made up largely for the benefit of the representatives, and not for the benefit of the people?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not believe that the hon. gentleman can furnish any facts whatever that would bear out his statement.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. I can furnish the hon. gentleman with the statement in this journal.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. gentleman will not find on investigation that politics enter into the administration of this service at all. The most enthusiastic advocate of the reform is the president himself. The editor of the 'Canadian Dairyman' has been over to the United States and made a thorough investigation, and in his paper for the last two weeks he has stated that there is no such thing as politics in the management of the rural free mail delivery system in the United States. I have been over there myself and investigated the question.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE. The hon. gentleman must admit that he can get only a superficial knowledge of the influence of politics in the administration of that system, by merely going over to the United States and visiting the departmental buildings.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have been in the habit of visiting the United States more or less for the last fifteen years or twenty years, and my investigations have convinced me that what the hon. gentleman says is an error. Now, I do not wish to deal any further with this than to say that five-sixths of the territory of the United States is practically covered to-day and that 20,000,000 people in the rural districts enjoy the privilege of rural free mail delivery. While, in 1897, when rural free mail delivery was first established, the deficit in the United States postal department was over $11,000,000, when the expenditure for rural free mail delivery was $14,000, last year, while the expenditure was in the neighbourhood of $30,000,000, the deficit was only a little over $6,000,000 and the Postmaster General himself has distinctly stated that for the first four months of this year there was no deficit at all and that as far as the rural free mail delivery end of it is concerned instead of it being a deficit producer it is a revenue producer. I am satisfied that the Postmaster General will not get up to-night and make the statements in regard to the expenditures and deficits that he made last year and that the Minister of

Agriculture will not repeat the words that he used in Quebec when he told the people how this question staggered him and how he did not even advise the discussion of it in the House. These are the questions that I want to put before the Postmaster General. I did not know of any other way of bringing them to the attention of the House and the country and I am sure the Postmaster General will be good enough to reply to me.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) has called the attention of the House to some matters concerning the Post Office Department. The department is so well administered apparently that I have not heard much criticism about it for a few weeks, although my hon. friend is the official critic of that department. I will be pleased to answer the questions which have been so graciously put by my hon. friend to-night on the different subjects which, he says, have attracted his attention for the last few months. First of all he is anxious to obtain information as regards the return concerning the irregularities reported in the Post Office Department during the last year. This return was moved for by the hon. gentleman during my absence in Japan at the beginning of the session. I have, on two occasions, informed my hon. friend that the officers of the department were anxious to prepare the return as soon as possible ; in fact out of ten or twelve returns which were moved for by hon. members on the other side of the House this year in the Post Office Department all have been laid on the table of the House with the solitary exception of my hon. friend's return. But, my hon. friend will admit that this return entails a good deal of work and, while there are very few irregularities, the officers have to look into every pigeon hole of the department to ascertain what few irregularities were reported during the year and as my hon. friend knows this takes a good deal of time and involves a good deal of work. I am as anxious to lay on the table of the House a list of these irregularities as my hon. friend is to have it. He will see, in looking over the return, when it is laid on the table, that with the millions of letters, packages and parcel packages passing through His Majesty's mails in Canada there are very few irregularities and the department is very soon informed of any such irregularities that occur in any section of the country. My hon. friend is entitled to the return and I can assure him that he will get it as soon as possible. The officers of the department, notwithstanding that they are overtaxed during the session, are only too willing to gratify the demand made by the hon. member.

My hon. friend has called my attention to the weekly papers. I need not repeat what I have already stated to the House on a former occasion. I know that there is some agitation in some parts of the country concerning weekly papers. You are aware, Mr. Speaker, that last year, on account of circumstances which I have fully explained, we had to amend our postal convention with the Washington authorities. That amendment was directed wholly against certain classes of periodicals published in the United States and Canada up to that date obliged both countries to carry according to their respective domestic rates, periodicals and newspapers coming under what, in the postal service, is called second class matter. I have explained on many occasions to the House where the difficulty was as it affected Canada. With the increase in the number of periodicals published in the United States and with the enormons increase in the number of purely advertising sheets published on the other side of the line we had to put our whole mail service at the disposal of United States publishers. Besides, we had received for years, complaints from clergymen of the different denominations, against certain undesirable papers which were circulated through our mails in Canada. We thought that we should revise our postal convention with the United States, so as to protect not only ourselves but even the United States, as we were told by the American postal authorities last year. To clear ourselves of that class of literature, the postal rate on second class matter was raised from one to four cents a pound; that is to say, papers mailed in Canada for the United States have to pay at the rate of 4 cents per pound. It is the same with papers posted in the United States. My hon. friend was asking a minute ago what legislation had been introduced to purge our mails from undesirable literature. Let me tell my hon. friend at once that I claim —and I claim the credit not only for myself but for the officers of the department— that we have nearly purged the Canadian mails of undesirable literature and I am sure that is a fact which will be welcomed by both sides of the House.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the minister be good enough to tell us just what he did that made such a radical change ; what legislation or regulation did he introduce ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Nothing appears on the statute-book because we have a postal convention with the United States. It is in that convention and not in the statute-book that my hon. friend will find the remedy. Under that convention, undesirable periodicals coming from the United States have to pay not one but four cents a pound. There is nothing as effective as a high postal rate to check the importation of undesirable literature.

Mr. BENNETT. What about the great family journal, the Calgary 'Eye-Opener'— ever see that ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not read undesirable literature; my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett), perhaps, does. If he does I am sorry and I hope he will not do it again.

Mr. BENNETT. It is your loss.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. As far as daily papers are concerned they are placed back just where they were, as I understand it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, I will answer my hon. friend.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. And as far as weeklies are concerned——

Mr. LEMIEUX. I was just coming to them, if my hon. friend will allow me. I understand what he wants to know. We have purged the mails of undesirable literature coming from the United States and besides, we have protected our commercial interests by preventing these purely advertising sheets from being dumped in our mail system. The hon. gentleman asks how it is we have rescinded the arrangement made last year with the Washington authorities as regards newspapers. Well, I had to take a radical step to begin with, but I did not intend to maintain that attitude towards the dailies. The hon. gentleman is a reader of the American press as I am, and he will agree with me that as a rule the American daily papers subscribed for by Canadians are respectable journals. Our rule was directed more against American dime novels and other unsavory periodicals. I maintained the rule against such objectionable periodicals and I gave the dailies a rate of one cent a pound. The editors of the weekly press, a very representative body, waited on me on the 9th April with the object of obtaining the same postal rate as the daily newspapers. I must say that the weekly press is favoured in some respects as compared with the daily press. A section of our postal guide reads :

A further exception is made in favour of newspapers or periodicals published not more frequently than once a week which may be sent free to regular subscribers in Canada residing within a circular area of 40 miles in diameter, the centre of which must either be the place of publication or some point not more than 20 miles distant therefrom according to the choice of the publishers. Such papers may also be delivered free to subscribers at the office at which they have been posted, except in cities where the letter carrier system is established. In the latter case ordinary transient newspaper rates are charged.

It will therefore be seen that the weekly press has some privileges? At the request of the weekly newspaper publishers we have given them a substantial reduction. If the hon. gentleman compares the Canadian postal rates with those of Europe or America he will find that we lead these countries in the cheapness of rates. I believe that soon I will be able to grant the weekly press what its representatives asked for when they met me recently; that is to say, the weeklies can be sent to a post office on the border and thence distributed in the mails in the United States without paying any additional postage, thus the rate instead of being four cents a pound will be something like two cents a pound or only one cent more than is now paid by the daily press. The question is now engaging the attention of the post office departments at Washington and Ottawa and I expect to be able to make an early announcement with regard to it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If the minister had appointed a board of censors for papers coming into this country would he not have reached the same end without putting the Canadian press to all this expense and trouble ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. We give respectable American papers the remailing privilege by which they can be mailed to a Canadian post office and thence sent broadcast through the Canadian mails. The undesirable periodicals do not come within our classification. As to the appointment of a board of censors, the burden of the office of Postmaster General is already very great without undertaking the censorship of thousands and thousands of American periodicals. Such American periodicals as Colliers, McClures, and others have applied for and obtained the remailing privilege and are practically obtained by Canadian subscribers at the old rate they paid before the regulations were amended last year.

Mr. CHRISTIE. Do the American agricultural papers come under that privilege ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. As to that, I have been deluged with letters asking to admit a Philadelphia paper which is called, I think the 'Farm.' We have established our rule for second-class matter, and papers coming within that class are described as follows in our postal guide :

Any Canadian newspaper or periodical which claims to be entitled to a statutory privilege must conform to the following statutory conditions namely:

(a) It must be known as a newspaper or periodical in the generally received sense of the word and consist wholly or in great part of political or other news, or of articles relating thereto, or to other current topics, and be published regularly at intervals of not more than one month.

(b) The full title, place and date of publication, and the distinguishing number of the issue must be printed on the top of the first and every subsequent page, and also on any paper, print, lithograph or engraving purporting to be a supplement to it, and sent with it.

(c) It must be addressed to a bona fide subscriber or known newsdealer in Canada.

(d) It must be delivered into the post office under such regulations as the Postmaster

General may from time to time make for the purpose.

In order to illustrate how some very enterprising American publishing firms are acting, let me point out that as I have just stated, I have been deluged, of late, with letters purporting to be from subscribers to a paper published in Philadelphia, called the 'Farm.'

Mr. CHRISTIE. I would mention the case of the 'Breeders' Gazette,' of Chicago, which is valued very highly by the farmers and agriculturists of Canada. It is a paper that is thought a great deal of by the farmers.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If that paper comes within the definition which I just read to the House, it will certainly receive the privilege granted to the other periodicals. However, this 'Farm,' of Philadelphia, is offered to Canadian subscribers at the rate of 85 cents for five years, published weekly. It almost comes within the definition I have just read. True it is a newspaper, it has a title, it is recognized as a newspaper in the United States, it consists wholly or in great part of articles relating to agriculture or other current topics; it has a few political opinions, but about three-quarters of the paper is used for advertising purposes. We are told: Oh, the Post Office Department is refusing the 'Farm' the privilege of the mails. It is not a farmers' advocate at all; it has a few articles bearing on agriculture or agricultural topics, but the balance of the paper, the enormous weight of the paper, is made up of advertisements of American firms, American pills, American patent medicines. Papers of that quality, under these circumstances, cannot come within the definition which is to be found in our postal guide. Every sensible member of the House will understand why we must resist in some degree the invasion of our Canadian territory by bogus newspapers.

My hon. friend wishes to know how our mails are handled on our railway systems. I regret that he did not give me notice of this question this morning, so that I could speak more definitely and precisely on this technical question; when my estimates come up I will be able to give my hon. friend figures, and, I think, gratify his curiosity. The subsidy which we pay to the various railway systems for the carriage of our mails is based on the mileage. In the United States it is based partly on the poundage, the weight of the mails, and partly on the space which the mail occupies in the postal cars. There is the radical difference between the American and the Canadian railway mail service. It is admitted by experts that the Canadian system is far superior, so much so that I may later furnish to my hon. friend a report which was prepared for the Postmaster General of the United States not long ago, showing the enormous amount of money paid to the railways of the United States which was admittedly wasted money. I am assured by my expert officials who are quite an authority on this question, that before long the United States will adopt our system of subsidies based on the mileage. I may say that our great trunk systems, the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway and to some extent the Canadian Northern, are complaining that they are not sufficiently paid. On two or three different occasions, independent commissions, composed of experts, were appointed to readjust the payment of the subsidies, and I wish to inform the hon. gentleman that only a few days ago, at the urgent request of my late lamented friend, Mr. Drinkwater, of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Mr. Wainwright, of the Grand Trunk, and the representatives of the Canadian Northern, I signed an order in council asking for the appointment of a commission of experts in order to readjust the payment of the subsidies to our Canadian system. I do not know if that commission will report in favour of an increased subsidy or a reduced one, but it is the custom every fifteen or twenty years, to readjust the subsidy for our railway mail service. It will be admitted that distances in our country are very great and settlement is sparse, mails have increased, and conditions may call for a readjustment.

My hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) also referred to the 1-cent drop letter system. I have stated on different occasions that this question is under consideration. If I may speak personally, I may say that my sympathies are in favour of the 1-cent drop letter. It may be said at once that I am doing something for the cities to which the rural parts of the country are also entitled. There is some truth in that apparently, but when you come to sift the question to the very bottom and see the enormous amount of money which the Post Office Department is losing every day in all the large cities by the establishment and operation of the messenger services, it is quite easy for the postal authorities to realize on the other hand that if we did establish that 1-cent rate for the drop letter in cities and towns, we would at once cause a large increase in our revenue which would enable the department to give to the rural section of the community greater frequency of service than it now has, and more post offices. I may say to my hon. friend, and I state it before the House and the country, that my policy as Postmaster General is to bear in mind my position as trustee on behalf of the people of Canada for the very buoyant revenue of the Post Office Department. I am trustee for that surplus, just as I am a trustee for the moneys of the public which come into the Post Office Savings Department, and it is my duty to be more careful of that money than I am supposed to be of my own money. Therefore, I

must not waste that money. But with our boyant revenue; I feel that I am in a position to give the country an expansion of the service; where we have a weekly or a bi-weekly service, I think I am quite justified in giving a tri-weekly or a daily service. I believe that I should give the public in the thickly peopled portions of the country the service to which they are entitled. I am giving according to circumstances, a daily service, or a semi-daily service. As regards post offices, a few years ago the general policy of the department was to establish at a distance of five or six miles. I have reduced that distance so that, when an application is made to the department, whether made from this side of the House or from the other side, when circumstances justify it, new post offices are granted at a distance of two miles. I intend to continue that policy, and I hope that in doing so, I shall receive the support of the House.

My hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) mentioned the fact that the department had thought it advisable last year to purchase a mail tender for the transatlantic mails. I do not care to eulogize myself, but I may be allowed to say that, if in anything I am entitled to praise by the maritime and commercial interests of the country, it is because I have authorized the purchase of a new steamer for our mail service at Rimouski and Sydney. Those who travel to Europe, and as good Canadians and good patriots return to Canada via the St. Lawrence route, have been simply shamed by the mail service as it existed at Rimouski. The first thing sighted by the newcomers or passengers returning to this country was something like a tug coming out to meet the steamer, with hardly any accommodation for passengers, with no place for the mails; and sometimes this tug could not come to meet the steamer on time and so mails were missed, passengers were incommoded and the reputation of Canada suffered. The first delegation to meet me after I was appointed Postmaster General was a delegation of the Board of Trade and shipping federation asking me to establish a mail service at Rimouski that would be a credit to the country. I said that I had just been sworn in and did not understand the conditions of the case, but that I would call at Rimouski and see what could be done. I went to Rimouski, and, Mr. Speaker, if you were to return there to-day, you would see what creditable changes have taken place. First, I asked the Public Works Department to give us a wharf worthy of the name, to give us electric light and to give us sheds for the passenger and freight —there were no sheds before. Also, you will see there to-day, one of the finest steamers in the government fleet, the 'Lady Evelyn.' That steamer was purchased not by myself—I am not an expert on steamers or on what pertains to steamers ; but, last year, after asking a vote from parliament for that specific object, and having received it without opposition from either side of the House, I sent to England one of the most trusted officers of the Post Office Department, Mr. Laschinger, the assistant deputy minister. Mr. Laschinger is not an expert either, but he is a very safe and trusted employee. Under my instructions, he went straight to the Canadian High Commissioner, Lord Strathcona, by whom he was referred to the British admiralty, and, under the guidance of the Admiralty officers, he bought the 'Lady Evelyn,' paying $60,000 or thereabouts. As to the value of the steamer, I can say to my hon. friend that not once, not twice, but ten times or more, I have been told by members of the Shipping Federation of Montreal that I could sell the 'Lady Evelyn' at about one-third more than it cost the department to obtain her. My hon. friend is misinformed when he says that this boat has missed the mails. On the contrary, the 'Lady Evelyn' was performing—under another name, I must say—in England, the same service that she is performing at Rimouski, except that the distance she covered on her route in England was longer. She has a fine deck for the mails and splendid accommodation for passengers. I was much pleased last year at the first trip of the 'Lady Evelyn,' when she met the 'Empress of Britain' at Rimouski. The first man that I sighted on the deck of the 'Empress of Britain' was the Principal of McGill, who usually goes to England once a year. He said : 'At last you have done away with our national shame, the 'Rhoda,' and I am proud today to come into Canadian waters and find decent accommodation for passengers.' The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) says that the 'Lady Evelyn' has a crew of from 20 to 25 men. Yes ; the vessel is manned and equipped as an ocean mail tender for Canada ought to be. I keep the men the whole year round, for the service is intended not only for Rimouski but also for Sydney. Could I find and equip a suitable crew for every trip? The vessel may be at Sydney now, but in a few weeks she will be back at Rimouski. Am I to change the crew at every trip ? Could I hope in such a way to secure a well-trained, suitably-dressed crew of men, doing their duty faithfully at very reasonable cost ? I heard some derisive 'Hear, hear,' from my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). Does he suspect that there is something nasty about the 'Lady Evelyn ?' I would like the hon. gentleman to look over the blue-book, to move for any returns or reports he pleases ; I invite him to come with me and pay a visit to the 'Lady Evelyn.' I have been in New York and Liverpool, and I can tell the hon. gentleman that he will see, not merely the best mail tender in Canada, but the best on this continent.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) a question? Could he give us the yearly cost of this tender? The boat she replaced cost only $4,000 a year.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, we had a contract with the Captain of the 'Rhoda,' a contract for five years at $4,000 a year. What does that represent as interest? It represents the interest at 6 per cent on about $70,000. Now, this boat cost about $60,000. This represents an interest charge of about $3,600 a year. So, we have saved money on that account. Besides it is right that this mail tender should be the property of the Post Office Department, so that she may be under our orders. And my hon. friend may rest assured that, as regards this steamer, there will be no scandal. The officers of the department here in Ottawa are looking carefully into the accounts for every purchase made in connection with the vessel. My hon. friend may rest assured that they will make it a point to see that the ship is well manned, well equipped and well run—and without scandal.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I was merely asking for information. I wished to learn, if I could, what was the yearly expenditure of this boat.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think that, the other day, there was a question on the Order Paper on that very subject. In reply to that question, I gave the figures for last year. I have forgotten those figures at present. The expenditure for the present year is just beginning. But if later on when the estimates come up my hon. friend will put the same question, he will have the figures, and he will learn that the amount spent on that steamer is very moderate. Now the hon. gentleman says: Why is it that the 'Lady Evelyn' arrived last year in the month of May and was put on the route only late in August? The answer is very easy. The wharf at Rimouski is a very long one, yet I regret to say that there was not at the extremity of the wharf a sufficient depth of water for that steamer. We had to do some dredging in the channel and as soon as the dredging was completed the boat was put on the route. Now the hon. gentleman says: 'I am told that during the time this steamer was performing her usual service the minister used her for himself and his friends.' My hon. friend is misinformed. I may, however, make a confession. I used the steamer twice. First, when the Prime Minister arrived from Europe. I was asked by the members of the press, and by several of my colleagues in the House, members on this side and I think there were two or three on the other side—to meet the Prime Minister near Berthier in the county of Bellechasse. The run lasted three or four hours, and the dinner offered to the party was at the expense of the Postmaster General. So there was not much expense, the steamer had to be under steam in any case, because she was expected to be called to Rimouski at any day. On one other occasion I used the steamer with the deputy Postmaster General, Mr. Coulter, and my secretary, because I was anxious to establish a winter mail service between the island of Anticosti and the mainland. We left on a Monday afternoon, and on Wednesday morning we were back at Rimouski wharf. But this was an official visit made in the interest of the department and of the service; and when the minister uses the steamer on occasions like this, I do not think the hon. gentleman should begrudge him the honour of travelling on the 'Lady Evelyn.' I do not suppose my hon. friend meant to impute to me any thing unworthy in that regard.

Now about free rural mail delivery, I do not know that I should be called upon this evening to speak at length on this question. I would prefer to speak on it later on when the estimates are taken up. However, as the hon. gentleman has spoken on this question during my absence, he is entitled to a statement from me. On one or two different occasions I think he has spoken on this subject during this session. I read the speech delivered by the hon. gentleman in the debate on the address. His plea on that occasion was, in my opinion, a plea in favour of the United States. I sincerely hope that before long when the country is well settled, when immigrants are not prevented from coming to this country—we will have, as the United States have to-day, the luxury of free rural mail delivery. I agree with the hon. gentleman that the United States today are probably acting wisely in establishing free rural mail delivery. But how have they been able to obtain that luxury ff not by their accumulated wealth, by their large population, and by the large revenue yielded by the post office service? Mr. Speaker, I think the question can be solved in a very few minutes. I need not go to Washington, as my hon. friend says he did. True, my officials went to Washington, but they did not go for the only purpose of obtaining from the United States officials the statement that the system was a success. They went there to investigate. Their minds were unbiased on the subject, they did not come back with the same report as the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman went to Washington for the purpose of convincing himself that it was a good thing for Canada to have free rural mail delivery. My officials went to Washington with an unbiased mind in order to investigate, and see for themselves if the conditions prevailing in the two countries were sufficiently alike to allow of the same system being established in Canada, and if it could be worked out as well here as across the frontier.

Sir, the population of the United States, in round numbers, is 80,000,000 ; the postal revenue of the United States is $183,000,000. In Canada we have not yet a population of 7,000,000. Our limited revenue—I say limited advisedly, although we have a fair surplus—our total gross revenue amounts to $9,000,000. Thus the United States have a population fourteen times ours, with a revenue twenty times as great. Can they not therefore afford themselves the luxury of free rural mail delivery ? Sir, it is with such facts in our minds that this question must be faced. Besides, we have about the same area as the United States. My hon. friend is advocating free rural mail delivery, which I myself would like to see under certain conditions, which conditions I hope will materialize before long. But will my hon. friend say this evening before the province of Ontario and the provinces further west, that he is prepared to discriminate in this matter ? Will he say before the representatives of the western provinces, where the distances are long, the area large and the population sparse—will he say : You shall not have free rural mail delivery, but we will give it to Ontario and to Quebec where the country is more thickly settled ? Why, Sir, my hon. friend could not live twenty-four hours in the Post Office Department if he were to propound such a policy as that regarding the west.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What better position will the people be in ? Will we not have scattered districts a hundred years hence, or fifty years hence, just similar to those we have to-day ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is my hon. friend serious ? Does he propose to check immigration ? Does he think this country will not become settled ? Will he pretend, having read the history of Canada, that a hundred years ago the country was as thickly settled as it is to-day ? Is it not a fact that a hundred years ago in the province of Ontario not far from this city of Ottawa, there were no inhabitants ? Ottawa itself, though now thickly settled, was but a solitude seventy or eighty years ago. My hon. friend surely does not expect that the aggressive provinces of the west will remain unsettled. On the contrary, I think they are God's heritage, and it is predicted that before long the balance of power will pass from the east to the west. Then my hon. friend will, if he lives in that golden age, realize that the west was entitled to the same treatment as the east.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister give me some reason why the thickly settled portions of eastern Canada should not be taken into consideration, and the thickly settled portions of the west as well ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Because a farmer from Scandinavia or Germany happens to settle near Edmonton, or near that ambitious city of Strathcona, should he receive more consideration from the Post Office Department than the brave settler who goes upon the distant prairie and settles boldly alone ? I say that the same treatment must be given to the isolated farmer as to the farmer residing near the city or town.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Why is it, when advantages are given to the cities, that the rural districts are not taken into consideration at the present moment.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No intelligent resident of, say Buckingham, would claim that he is entitled, as regards letter carrier service, to the same service as a resident of Ottawa gets. The parallel should not be established in that sense, but I say that as regards free rural mail delivery—I am not speaking of city delivery—the same treatment should be given to the sparsely populated section of the country as to the thickly settled section of the country. Mark well, I am speaking of the farming community. My hon friend asks : Why do you not imitate the United States in this matter ? My hon. friend should not ignore the fact that the system of free rural mail delivery existed before the United States adopted it. The United States adopted free rural mail delivery, when? When they had 6,000,000 people? Not at all. They did not adopt rural free mail delivery with 15,000,000, nor with 20,000,000 nor with 60,000,000 people. They never dreamed of it in those days; not even when the population reached 70,000,000, but the United States started free rural mail delivery when the population reached the high watermark of 80,000,000 and when their revenue had increased from a few million dollars to $175,000,000. This system is not an American discovery. My hon. friend should not lose sight of the fact that free rural mail delivery has existed for years and years in Europe. In Great Britain, for instance, where from Liverpool to London, it is practically one row of houses on both sides of the railway systems. It exists in France and in Belgium. But what is Belgium compared with Saskatchewan, with Manitoba, or even with Prince Edward Island ? We could put three Belgiums, and even more, in one of the smaller provinces of the Dominion. Therefore we must, before thinking of establishing that costly system in Canada, realize that we have an area as vast as that of the United States of America, that on the other hand we have only 7,000,000 of a population as against 85,000,000 in the United States, and that we have only a gross postal revenue of $9,000,000 as against one in the United States of $183,000,000. Further than that we have not the same climatic conditions. That fact must be taken into consideration also.

Whilst in the United States, generally speaking, they have a fair climate all the year round and good roads, we must admit that in certain sections of the country, during even the month of April and during several months of the year, our roads are practically impassable. All these facts must be taken into consideration before advocating the establishment of such a luxury. Let me draw a parallel. Here is an individual with a revenue of $50,000 a year ; my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), for instance, whom I see in his seat, has, I presume, at least a revenue of $50,000 a year. My hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), less fortunate, has only a revenue of $5,000 a year. Both are well off according to their relative condition of life. Surely my hon. friend from St. Antoine could buy an automobile and every morning he could be conveyed from his private house or country residence to his office, whilst the hon. member from Lambton would be satisfied to take, as I do myself, the tramway, or his bicycle or the ordinary train. He would see my hon. friend from St. Antoine passing in his automobile, whirling about in the streets of Montreal or suburbs, thus attracting his attention. Suppose the hon. member for St. Antoine would remonstrate with him and say: Why do you not get an automobile? You will get a drive through the fresh air ; your health will be better and besides it lends more dignity and charm to life to drive in an automobile? Would not my hon. friend from Lambton at once answer : 'It is a question of revenue ; you have $50,000, you reside in the country, so do I, but I have only $5,000, I have a large family and I must be satisfied with the tramway.' So it is with free rural mail delivery. We have the United States on one side, same area as Canada, but with a revenue of $182,000,000. Here is Canada on the other, same area as the United States, but with only a postal revenue of $9,000,000 a year. Can we indulge a drive in the automobile of free rural mail delivery ? Evidently not, Mr. Speaker, we must be satisfied to live within our means. We must be as wise, as prudent as my hon. friend from Lambton would be if his revenue were what I have just mentioned as a comparison. Now, the United States are spending an enormous amount on this free rural mail delivery system. Last year, according to the figures which we have in the department, the postal authorities spent $26,000,000; that is to say, one-seventh of their income. But this is, Mr. Speaker, and my hon. friend should realize it, three times the total gross revenue of the Canadian Post Office Department. If Canada ceased to spend one red cent on its railway mail service, ceased to pay the postmasters—and what a noise there would be in the country if we did—if we ceased to pay for the conveyance of the mails and if we used the total gross revenue of the Post Office Department for three years it would barely pay what the United States spent last year on free rural mail delivery. My hon. friend says that it is a revenue producer. Most of the revenue in the Post Office Department is derived from the sale of stamps for letters. Newspapers are carried at a loss by the department. We do it to accommodate the public, but they are carried at a loss. If I had more time I would give figures to the House. We get our revenue from the sale of the little postage stamp, but in order to have buoyancy we must have large centres of population as they have in the United States, large cities—Chicago, New York, Philadelphia and San Francisco—where millions of people are living and then we shall get revenue. We get a limited revenue. Therefore, we can spend only a limited amount of money. Now, does this free rural mail delivery increase the revenue? Has it increased the revenue of the United States Post Office Department? We made an investigation. I do not know if my hon. friend challenges the investigation made by the officers of the Canadian Post Office Department.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I certainly do.

Mr. LEMIEUX. We sent to Washington trusted officials of the department, men like Mr. Ross, of Toronto, nearly 35 years in the service, taking more interest in his public duties than he would take in his own private business, being at present broken in health, because he has travelled during 35 years from one end of the country to the other to see that the Post Office Department was run economically and at the same time in the interest of the public. He went to Washington with Mr. Smith, and not relying alone on what they might hear from politicians who benefited politically by the system, they remained in Washington for several weeks and made a thorough investigation and report. They reported that on 81 routes selected by the United States postal authorities for their examination, the revenue has increased during the six months by $50 ; on 51 other routes there had been no increase in revenue, and on 132 routes there had been a diminution of $225. This is not a flight of the imagination, these are cold facts, and before telling the good people of Ontario that there should be rural free delivery it is well that the facts should be presented. Now, the people of Quebec would be quite willing to have rural free delivery too. Even on the distant shores of Gaspé where they have received so many good things from the government since 1896, the hardy fishermen there would be quite willing to have free rural mail delivery. What my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) claims for Ontario I would be disposed to claim for Quebec, but to be fair and just to the other provinces of the Dominion I would

think that British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, are just as much entitled to that luxury as the two large provinces.

Mr. MORIN. And the Yukon.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Well, if we had gathered from the Yukon the crop of gold which the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said were there when he combated that famous railway project, we might have been able to stand the expense of free rural mail delivery, but we did not get the gold and so we must be satisfied with our gross postal revenue of $9,000,000 a year. There is no evidence that in the United States, free rural mail delivery has materially increased the revenue. According to the report of our officials to which I have referred, during a period of six months in 1903, on 132 routes 3,638,000 pieces were delivered, and in 1904, during the same period, 3,662,899, showing an increase of 2,651 pieces or seven-hundredths of one per cent. And this was on 132 routes which were pointed out by the United States postal authorities as being the best routes in the whole Union. My hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) should know that the free rural delivery in the United States which was initiated at an expense of a few thousand dollars, cost the country last year the fabulous sum of $37,000,000. When the hon. gentleman goes before the electors of Lambton with his pleasant smile and condemns this government for refusing them that luxury of rural free delivery which the people across the border enjoy; when he tells them that the Canadian Post Office Department has no care for the welfare of the farmers of Lambton, I wish he would also tell them that the rural free delivery in the United States cost last year $37,000,000. If the hon. gentleman would invite me to his county I would like to discuss that matter with his friends, and I am sure they would give me a cordial reception when I disclosed to them these cold facts.

Until 1904, the United States published figures as to the cost of the routes and the amount of revenue derived therefrom. Since that date no official figures have been published. In 1904, the result of rural free delivery for the whole of the United States, setting forth the total number of letters, post cards, papers, circulars, packages, collected from all the routes and the total amount of stamps cancelled on all the routes and the revenue collected from rural free delivery, shows, there was collected one hundred and thirty-three odd million pieces at a cost of $12,681,876, and yielding a revenue of $2.601,815, thus giving a deficit, so far as rural free delivery is concerned, in that year of $10,080,061. The United States since that date have published no statistics until the present year when they have published a statement in their annual report of the results, not of the whole service but of twenty-seven of the best and most favourable routes in the United States. But the report states that the statement is for the purpose of giving some indication (mark you) of the possibilities of rural free delivery in the more densely populated localities served, both suburban and rural. The hon. gentleman complained in the debate on the address that I had stated the United States deficit on this service to be about $20,000,000. I do not remember having made that statement, but I may point out to the hon. gentleman that at a recent congress of the postmasters of the United States, attended by 1,500 postmasters, matters concerning the postal service in the United States were discussed and amongst others the possibility of developing the rural free delivery system by extending parcel post delivery on the routes, and the statement was then made and it has not been contradicted so far as I know, that the rural free delivery service cost $35,000,000 a year and only yielded a revenue of $5,000,000, thus leaving an annual deficit of $30,000,000, which is $10,000,000 more than the amount I am alleged to have stated. The hour is late and I shall conclude by thanking my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) for his courteous treatment of the department. We may differ, but I must admit that when he discussed questions in connection with the Post Office Department he is always very fair indeed. I am glad he has brought these several matters to my notice this evening and when the estimates are being considered we may discuss the question again. I am sincere in telling my hon. friend that I am as anxious as he can be to give the people of Canada an improved postal service, although I must say that we have on the whole a most creditable system in the urban and suburban districts. Above all, we must not exceed our revenue. I am as anxious as he is to give the farmers of Canada a free rural mail delivery, but my hon. friend will never convince a farmer of the west that he should pay for a luxury to be given only to the farmers of the east. He will never convince a man with a head on his shoulders and with common sense in the head that we are in a position to spend as much money with our limited revenue and our small population as the United States with their enormous revenue and their large population.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say just a word in reply.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has no right to reply. The only motion before the House is to go into Supply.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am sorry I have not the opportunity of making just a few remarks.

ANTI-CIGARETTE LEGISLATION.

Mr. R. BLAIN (Peel). I wish to ask the Minister of Finance a question. I shall

first read the following resolution which was sent to me to-day:

The Women's Christian Temperance Union of Brampton passed the following resolution:

Whereas we understand that a Bill is being prepared for the House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada to prohibit the manufacture and sale of cigarettes;

Resolved, that, for the sake of the youth of our country, we sincerely hope and pray that such a measure may receive the most hearty support both of the Commons and of the Senate of Canada, and soon become law in our Dominion.

I would ask the Finance Minister if a Bill is being prepared by the government to be introduced during this session respecting cigarettes?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I must admit that I am unable to give my hon. friend any definite information. The whole question has been engaging the attention of the ministers as well as of other hon. members of the House, and it may be that before the close of the session some legislation, perhaps not altogether as broad as my hon. friend suggests, but approaching the same lines, will be introduced. I am not in a position to make a more definite statement at present.

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

Chicoutimi post office, $7,500.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). This is a revote to make provision for the completion of a public building now under erection at Chicoutimi.

Mr. FOWLER. How much has been spent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Up to November 15, $28,728.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the contract price?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $22,472, not including electric wiring, heating, interior fittings or clock.

Mr. FOWLER. How about the duty on that clock?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no information as to that. In the case of the clock of which we spoke the other day, I find there were several tenders for the clock and the tenderer to whom the tender was awarded tendered for a certain amount, duty not included. Therefore, of course, the duty had to be added to his contract price.

Mr. FOWLER. And that was expressly stated in the tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. I feel that I should inform the committee that my deputy was mistaken in regard to the security for the Halifax custom house. He told me that the security was still held by the department, but on inquiry he finds that he was mistaken in regard to that. The security was paid over before I became minister and also before he became acting deputy minister. We have held back some $3,000 or $4,000 of the main bill.

Mr. FOWLER. By whose authority was the security paid over?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The certificate the department had at that time was that the building was substantially completed, and it was felt that it was not necessary to retain the security longer. It was paid over in the early part of 1907.

Mr. FOWLER. Referring to the confidential report of Mr. Dodwell on the Halifax building and the subsequent report of Mr. Wright, to what extent do they agree?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In a general way the report of Mr. Wright does not go to the same extent as the report of Mr. Dodwell.

Mr. FOWLER. Under the circumstances do you not think the reports should be produced ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could not produce a confidential report without the consent of the writer.

Mr. FOWLER. Was it expressely understood between you and Mr. Dodwell that the report should be confidential.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Dodwell desired that it should be confidential.

Mr. FOWLER. Had the minister not a right to direct the making of that report? Mr. Dodwell is an officer of the department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought he would write more freely if the report was confidential. He has general supervision over all matters in that section of the country, but he was not in direct charge of this building and, therefore, the report was made confidential.

Mr. FOWLER. He has general supervision over all matters in that section of the country, and I cannot see why Mr. Bush did not report to him and why Dodwell found it necessary to have verbal communication with the minister. I do not understand the supervision exercised by Mr. Dodwell. The minister had a right to command him to make a report. I cannot say that the minister has acted quite properly with regard to this matter. He does not seem to entertain the right idea with regard to the duties of the officers of his department.

Mr. BLAIN. Was the statement correct that was made the other evening, that the government had paid duty of over $400 on the coat of arms supplied for the Halifax building which should have been paid by the contractor under the contract ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The statement made has been verified with regard to the duty upon the coat of arms.

Cookshire public building, $5,000.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister promised to bring some information with regard to the granolithic sidewalk before the Antigonish building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have the information. The sidewalk cost 26 cents per square foot, which included the levelling. Mr. Ewart, the chief architect, says that that was the cheapest price at which he could get it done in that locality.

Mr. FOWLER. Let us have the dimensions. For, I must say, I have not the confidence in the chief architect's figures I would like to have. If the lot was of the dimensions stated by the minister and the sidewalk was of reasonable width, it would be impossible to make up the amount of money paid in this case.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A portion of the sidewalk was 21 feet. The architect says that the price of granolithic pavement in Ottawa is 18 cents. In some places it is more, in some less.

Mr. SPROULE. Not long ago in our section of country this kind of work was done at 9 cents in one case and at 11 cents in another.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect says that he has had this work done at as low as 11 cents, but 26 cents was the lowest price he could get in Antigonish.

Mr. FOWLER. But I would like the dimensions.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect brought the plan over before, but he has not it with him this evening. He will bring it.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, with the plan before us, we can discuss the matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This vote of $5,000 is for a public building in Cookshire. The site has been given free at the cost of the municipal council.

Mr. FOWLER. What did the site at Chicoutimi cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $2,400.

Mr. BLAIN. At whose suggestion was this vote for the Cookshire building put in the estimates ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The people of Cookshire asked for the building and the municipal council passed a resolution to furnish the site free to the Crown.

Mr. SPROULE. Has tne building been commenced ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. SPROULE. What is it to cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is expected to cost in the neighbourhood of $19,000 or $20,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the size of Cookshire ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About 2,000 population, I am informed. It is a growing town, I believe—a nice town.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister did not answer my question. I asked at whose request this item of $5,000 was put in the estimates ? He says that the municipal council gave the site and the people of the town asked for the building. In what way did they ask—by petition ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A resolution passed by the council was sent to the Minister of Public Works in the ordinary way.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the minister a copy ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not it with me.

Mr. BLAIN. And as to the town generally ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A petition was sent in by the residents and ratepayers of the town, which was transmitted by the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Hunt), on December 6, 1907.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the minister a copy of the petition ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. It would make a bulky assortment of papers if I should bring the petitions for all these public buildings.

Mr. BLAIN. I did not ask for all, but only for one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But I did not know which one the hon. gentleman would ask for.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The census of 1901 gives Cookshire a population of about 800.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has grown a good deal since. Then, I understand, this post office will serve a thickly settled community besides that included within the municipal limits of the town.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the revenue ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For the nine months, 1906-7, the revenue was $2,128.44 ; money orders issued $12,902 ; money orders paid, $8,411. Then, to give an idea of the business of the place, the exports were $297,079 in the nine months of the last fiscal period ; imports $65,047. Of course, this building is for a custom house as well.

Mr. FOWLER. It is not a sub-port, is it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It must be, because the customs duties collected at the post office amount to about $2,000.

Mr. FOWLER. I am not finding fault with this public building for Cookshire, which is a nice, thriving little town. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has taken it under his paternal wing and given it a post office, and we are wicked enough to suspect that he has an ulterior motive.

Mr. FISHER. You must not impute motives.

Mr. FOWLER. I say we 'suspect.' If the people of Cookshire get the advantage of this building, so much the better for them. But I wish to press upon the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) the fact that if he contends that Cookshire is entitled to a post office by reason of its importance, the amount of its revenue and the business done, he has double reason for giving a post office to the town of Hillsborough, in the county of Albert.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am glad that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) approves of this.

Mr. FOWLER. My attitude is merely negative—I do not disapprove.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would refer to the census of 1901, page 362. I am not objecting to the post office for Cookshire, but I wish to show that the population must have increased rapidly if it has 2,000 now. According to the census of 1902 there were 322 English, 80 Irish, 49 Scotch, 1 of other nationality, 338 French—total population 801.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is within the municipal limit. But I am told that there is an important community besides to be served.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How far does the minister go in order to find his population of 2,000 ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not understand whether the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) is opposed to this or in favour of it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am not speaking to oppose this vote. I am only saying that if the minister proposes to give a twenty thousand dollar post office to every town of 801 population, we would like to know it, that is all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My opinion is that a good deal depends on the importance of the place and on the business.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the minister tell us what the present post office costs the country for rent and light, and if there is any other government building there ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not sure whether there is an inland revenue office there, but there is a custom house. This building will be also used for customs. The rent paid last year was $190 for the post office and customs office.

Mr. SPROULE. We proposed to put up a building costing $19,000, that will cost us about $1,100 a year, I presume, after it is built.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The intention of the town council is to rent a portion of the building for a registry office; that will give a little income.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not think that is a proper thing to do. It seems to me it is a great mistake for this government, to put up a building for federal purposes and rent a portion of it to a municipality. Let the municipality build its own registry office.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not considered undesirable for municipalities to rent portions of public buildings which are not required for municipal offices. That was a proposition which the municipal council made, and rent might be got from that. I do not see any objection to it at the present time.

Mr. BLAIN. Could the minister give the date of the resolution of the municipal council ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was forwarded on December 6, 1907.

Mr. BLAIN. When was this $5,000 first placed in the estimates?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Last year.

Mr. FISHER. This is a full customs port. Mr. Ross is collector there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The amount received from customs was $3,186.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it the policy of the department to appropriate public money for the construction of registry offices for municipalities ? Surely that is a new departure on the part of the government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought I made myself clear that it had not yet been decided whether to rent a portion of the building as a registry office. But the town council urged that, as it was a very convenient site for that purpose, when the building was erected there might be made in it a room which could be used for the registry office, and for which of course, the council would pay rent.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you got the request there ? I would like to see it.

Mr. TAYLOR. The town council has nothing to do with the registry office, it is the county council.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The information I have is that the resolution was passed by the municipal council of the town of Cookshire. They made a gift of the site, and they have also urged that in the erection of the building, as this is a very convenient site and in a public park, it would be desirable that provision should be made for a

registry office, for which they would pay rental.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister has gone further than that, he has intimated that in his opinion that is all right. The minister might just as well provide at the expense of the federal government, a court house and jail as to provide a registry office. I venture to say there is not another instance like it in Canada. I protest strongly against any such departure from the rule. Does the Minister of Agriculture, for instance, think that is a proper thing ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. All we are asking for now, is a vote for the building ; the question of the registry office is one that we will have to consider.

Mr. FOWLER. Who will consider it ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The minister.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister has already decided.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I said where a town council is willing to give a convenient site in a square, as apparently this is, and if they request that in erecting the building there should be one room made suitable for a registry office for which they are willing to pay an adequate rent, there may be cases that would be entirely justifiable. Whether it will be done in this instance, I am not prepared to say.

Mr. BLAIN. Was that the condition on which the site was granted ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was no condition.

Mr. FOWLER. I think the minister ought to bring down that resolution of the town council to which he pays so much attention.

Mr. BLAIN. I think we should have that resolution. The minister has pointed out that this building was put up at the request of the municipal council, and by a petition of the residents. He says he sees no objection to using a portion of this building for a registry office.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Provided they pay for it.

Mr. BLAIN. Provided they pay for it. In other parts of Canada, particularly in Ontario, no such thing would be tolerated for a moment. Every county council must provide a suitable registry office for the requirements of the country. It would not be suggested for a moment that the government should provide such a building; in fact, a building of this kind would be of no value unless the building were constructed especially for that purpose. It is rather unfair for the minister to come down and ask for an appropriation without having under his hand the request that was made by the municipal council and the petition by the residents of the town.

Mr. SPROULE. We are embarking on a new principle, a principle that, I think, will be admitted by most people, is a bad one. If a place does not require as large a building it is an easy matter to reduce the amount that is proposed to be voted for that purpose. But, when we have supplied a place with a custom house, an inland revenue office and a post office, I think we have gone as far as we can reasonably expect to go.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister supply, at a future date, the petition and resolution passed by the municipal council?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will be very glad to do so.

Mr. BLAIN. And would the minister say whether any part of the building will be constructed for a registry office?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will look at the resolution and I have no objection at all to stating my views later on.

Mr. FOWLER. Then we will have an opportunity of discussing this item again?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not this item, but you can discuss the principle on some other item.

Mr. BERGERON. When will that building be commenced?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We hope just as soon as the plans and specifications can be prepared and tenders called for.

Dominion public buildings—renewals, improvements, repairs, &c., $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This vote of $20,000 is to be applied in carrying out renewals, repairs and work of that kind generally to public buildings in Quebec for which special appropriations have not been made. This is the ordinary maintenance vote which is passed every year.

Mr. FOWLER. At what places is it expected to do this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. At some twenty or thirty different places and the repairs range from $4 up to $2,000.

Dundee custom house—renewals and repairs, $1,800.

Mr. BERGERON. When was that building erected?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was built 58 years ago, and these repairs are absolutely necessary.

Mr. R. N. WALSH. What repairs are being made?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is to be a new stone foundation, the building is to be raised three and a half feet, there will be 175 running feet of concrete and some excavating.

Mr. R. N. WALSH. Does the minister know that this is a very old house that this $1,800 is being spent on, and that he could erect a new building for that sum of money?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I know it is an old house, but with these repairs it may last some time yet.

Mr. R. N. WALSH. But with the $1,800 which is being spent upon it now you can put up a new building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would not like to try to put up a new building with $1,800.

Mr. R. N. WALSH. You could add a little to it and make a good building.

Mr. BERGERON. I see this is a revote.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a revote.

Mr. BERGERON. If the money was voted last year and not spent there is no very great need for it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract has now been let.

Mr. R. N. WALSH. Who has the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. J. Fraser.

Mr. BERGERON. Were tenders called for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is going to cost altogether $3,300.

Mr. BERGERON. How many tenders were there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think Mr. Fraser was asked to tender; there was no public call by advertisement for tenders.

Mr. R. N. WALSH. Do I understand the minister to say that it is going to cost $3,300?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. Why are you asking for only $1,800?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are asking simply for $1,800 because there was $1,800 granted last year. The repairs have not been started. This is a revote, but it is not unlikely that I may ask for $1,500 more in the supply estimates so as to get sufficient to do the work this year.

Farnham post office—alterations, including rearrangement of fittings, $5,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote to make provision for alterations, including a rearrangement of the interior fittings. This has been requested by the Post Office Department.

Mr. CROCKET. When was the Farnham office built?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1893.

Mr. FOWLER. What are the alterations?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is proposed to make a larger lobby for the accommodation of the public and to change the interior fittings.

Mr. TAYLOR. The usual way is for the minister to state how much is to be expended on each item of the repairs, what is to be done with the money, so much for this alteration and so much for that. The minister is not following the usual custom of the Department of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This memorandum has been prepared by the same gentleman who has for twenty or thirty years been preparing these statements.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have been here for twenty years and I have always heard the minister get up and read off in detail an estimate of all the different items, it is placed on 'Hansard' and we can read it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is done in some cases where it is asked for.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is always done. When we ask what he is going to do with this money he tells us in detail. This explanation which consists in stating that a room is to be enlarged is no explanation at all.

Mr. BERGERON. What will be the whole amount of expenditure?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $5,500.

Mr. BERGERON. And it is a revote?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Will these repairs be made by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They will probably be made by contract.

Mr. CROCKET. Are they all interior repairs?

Mr. BERGERON. What kind of repairs are they?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There has been some question as to what should be the extent of the repairs and the details have not yet been determined on by the chief architect.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the estimate appears to be submitted to parliament on guess work, and it is not a businesslike thing to do.

Mr. PUGSLEY. More extensive repairs have been urged than are contemplated by the chief architect, and if we make very extensive repairs it would raise a question whether it would not be better to erect a new building.

Mr. BERGERON. What did the building cost in the first place?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has cost altogether for construction and repairs $11,400.

Mr. J. D. REID. What is the revenue?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Postal revenue (nine months), $2,867 ; money orders issued, $20,000 ; money orders paid, $17,000 ; population, 3,114.

Grosse Isle quarantine station—improvement and repairs to building, $12,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. These repairs and improvements have been requested by the medical attendant at the station.

Mr. BERGERON. Who is responsible for the carrying out of these works?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have an agent there, Mr. Beland.

Mr. J. D. REID. Any relation of the member?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am told not.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you an inspector of works?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Beland.

Mr. BERGERON. Every year since I have been in this House we have been expending money on this quarantine station. I have been on the island and everything appears to be in good order and repair, but still we have to spend money every year as if we were compelled to whether it was wanted or not.

Mr. J. D. REID. Last year there was $12,520 expended. What was that for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was for lumber, plumbing, paint, cement, hardware, wages, sundries, &c.

Mr. BLAIN. Was the cement purchased by public tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot say now, but the quantity purchased was very small.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the policy of the department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The policy is to call for tenders for cement and we are frequently doing so.

Mr. BLAIN. I see six rugs were purchased from T. Beland & Co., at over $20 each. What were they for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume they were for the house of the resident physician.

Mr. BLAIN. Was the cement bought by public tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This was before my advent to the department and I cannot say just now, but the policy of the department will be to purchase as far as possible all the articles that are required for public buildings by tender. Occasionally there may be small quantities which it would not be convenient to purchase in that way, but as a rule competitive prices will be obtained.

Mr. J. D. REID. Will this money be expended by contract or by day's work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. While some of it may be done by contract it is probable that the bulk of it would be more economically and perhaps better done by day's work.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who is the foreman?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Beland, the representative of the Public Works Department at Quebec, is supposed to do that.

Mr. J. D. REID. He lives at Quebec?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When repairs are being made to any extent I understand he remains at Grosse Isle.

Mr. J. D. REID. During the whole progress of the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. So I understand.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is that the real fact?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand so. He is supposed to be there sufficiently to have an oversight of the work.

Mr. J. D. REID. Was he there long last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am told he has been twenty years in that employment.

Grosse Isle quarantine station—disinfecting apparatus, including building, $3,500.

Mr. BENNETT. Will that complete the work ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect says so. There was an expenditure up to November 30 last year of $4,121.

Mr. BENNETT. What is this for ?

Mr. FISHER. Additional sulphur apparatus is needed there.

Mr. DANIEL. How much is for disinfecting apparatus and how much for the building ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The building will cost $4,689, and the balance will be used for the other purpose.

Knowlton public building, $4,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote of $4,500 to make provision towards the erection of a public building in Knowlton.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the population ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 800.

Mr. BENNETT. What would be the total cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract has not yet been let, but I suppose that including heating and everything it will be somewhere in the vicinity of $15,000, possibly more.

Mr. BERGERON. This money was voted last year. If it was very much needed,

you would suppose it would have been commenced. It looks like holding this money out before the community.

Mr. FISHER. There was difficulty in procuring a site. The site owned by the municipal council and their authority for the sale had to be obtained. The site is about 115 feet by 90 feet, and it cost about $350.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you agreed to build a registry office?

Mr. FISHER. No, but there is to be an armoury in conjunction with the post office building.

Mr. BENNETT. To what amount will the minister bind himself as the outside cost of this building? If you start to erect buildings in every town or village of 800 the country will be bankrupt.

Mr. FISHER. Knowlton is the county town, there is no public building in the county, and gentlemen opposite recommended me strongly last year, to get a building put there for that reason.

Mr. BERGERON. When we remember all the noise and trouble that was raised about the La Prairie post office, by the hon. gentlemen, when in opposition, and then have them vote money for a building of this kind, in a place of the size of Knowlton. it is not extraordinary that the public lose confidence in public men.

Mr. FISHER. It is generally conceded that a county town can very fairly lay claim to a public building and such buildings have been erected in most cases. This is the only public building in the county and the post office accommodation is quite inadequate.

Mr. BERGERON. The county town is generally not the largest but the most central town in the county. Is the largest place in Brome only about 800?

Mr. FISHER. We do not spread our villages over half creation. The village itself has a population of 800, but the post office will serve a community of at least 2,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is paid for the present office?

Mr. FISHER. Eighty dollars a year.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the revenue?

Mr. BENNETT. The revenue was $1,557, and the rent paid is $60. That is according to the report.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is for nine months.

Mr. CROCKET. How many are employed on the post office staff at present?

Mr. FISHER. The post office postmaster himself. But I think he employs two people in the office.

Mr. BERGERON.

Mr. J. D. REID. What has the Finance Minister to say about these expenditures? Does he allows every place that asks for it to have a public building? If so, it is no wonder that our expenditure is so high.

Mr. FIELDING. Not every place. But I am afraid I am responsible for the doctrine the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has advanced. I think we can justify the construction of a public building—not necessarily an expensive building—in the county town of every county in which there is no other Dominion public building. I ventured to lay that rule down some years ago, and the more I think of it the more reasonable it seems to me. I think the government owes something to the people of the country in the matter of public buildings. Knowlton is a small town, but, if there is no other public building in the county, I think the government does no wrong in putting up a modest public building in this county town. It is a good example, and while it will cost a little, it does not mean that we are to put a public building in every town—for, I take it, there are other communities in Brome that might put forward a claim. But, if you confine it to the county town of a small county, or, in a larger county extends the rule to two or three communities, I think it is a good rule.

Mr. CROCKET. I am sorry, in view of the statement we have just heard, that the hon. member for Sunbury & Queens (Mr. Wilmot) is not in his place at the moment, for neither Sunbury nor Queens has a Dominion building. In view of the statement of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) a claim might very properly be put in for a public building for Oromocto in Sunbury county and for Gagetown in Queens. It is a new doctrine to me that the government will build public buildings in the county town of every county that has no other government building.

Mr. FIELDING. I have not gone so far as to say that these buildings must all be put up at once. I am not familiar with Oromocto, but I know Gagetown and I think that if there is not a public building in that county a fair claim could be made. And, if hon. gentlemen will be patient, no doubt it will be carried out. But all this will not be done in a day.

Mr. HERRON. What procedure should one take in order to get one of these buildings in his constituency?

Mr. FIELDING. Patience is a good policy.

Mr. HERRON. I have seven or eight towns of from 1,200 to 1,800 people without a public building of any description. I have not made any particular request for one. But if the government is willing to build

on such easy conditions, I think my constituency would have a claim.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Which town would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Herron) suggest ?

Mr. HERRON. Well, for instance, Macleod. The post office there is unfit for a postal service. And it is a very important town.

Mr. TALBOT. What is the population ?

Mr. HERRON. About 1,800 or 2,000.

Mr. TALBOT. The size of one of our villages.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend (Mr. Herron) must have patience. It is twenty-six years since I commenced to represent Brome and the county is only now getting its first public building.

Mr. FIELDING. Is the hon. gentleman right in saying that there is no public building in Macleod. I have understood that there is a very considerable building there.

Mr. HERRON. The constituency is about 40,000 square miles.

Mr. FIELDING. But I am speaking of the principle of making some public expenditure within a county.

Mr. BENNETT. The Minister of Public Works has not said that he will bind himself that this building shall not exceed in cost any particular sum.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think I can say probably it will not be more than $20,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. Was there a petition for this building ?

Mr. FISHER. No, I asked for it. And the hon. member's (Mr. Reid) desk-mate (Mr. Fowler) also asked for it.

Lachute public building, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote.

An hon. MEMBER. In what county is Lachute ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In Argenteuil. The site has been bought and some work has been done. The total expenditure up to November 30, 1907, was $1,645.68.

Mr. BERGERON. From whom was the site bought ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From Mr. H. M. Gall, for $1,200. It has a frontage of 44 feet on Main street.

Mr. TAYLOR. Has the contract been let?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, to Messrs. Lafleur & Son, of Lachute.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the total estimated cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $27,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the population of Lachute ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. By the census of 1901, it was 2,022.

Lake Megantic public building, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision for the purchase of a site. The total cost is $4,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. How large a place is it ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1901, it had a population of 1,883.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is an awful price for the lot in a town of that size.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a very valuable lot with a frontage of 64 feet on Main street, and a depth of 132 feet to a lane. It was considered a most desirable lot and the owners were not anxious to sell.

Mr. FOWLER. Why so big a lot ? In Lachute you have a lot of only 44 feet frontage ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We could not very well have the lot split up, as the owners would not sell in that way. The land was owned by the Presbyterian church, and, of course, they would not want to sell part of the lot.

Lévis public building, $10,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there not already a post office at Lévis ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for a new building. The total probable cost is $49,713.44.

Mr. BERGERON. When was it commenced ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1905.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it not finished yet?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The architect tells me it is finished and occupied.

Mr. BERGERON. Then, what is the money for ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total expenditure to 31st October last was $35,274.44. Amount due on the contract, $6,262 ; wiring, $750 ; amount due on lock boxes, sidewalk, fencing, &c., $500 ; contingencies, superintendence, $3,163. The first contract was for $22,000. The $49,000 includes many things which are not in the contract.

Mr. J. D. REID. How does it come to pass that there are $27,000 for extras ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. After the contract was let the site was changed, and that caused a great deal of extra work.

Mr. J. D. REID. There was a contract let for a certain sized building. Now it was changed from one site to another. Why did the change of site necessitate so great an additional cost ? If a contract was given for $22,000 and then you turn around

and ask for $37,000 for extras, there must be something wrong. I have no doubt that there is some robbery going on in that case. There is public robbery, I do not hesitate to say it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can now give the House some details of the extra cost. What the chief architect tells me is that after the contract was let it was decided to change the site. Where it was decided to erect the building was upon a place where there was an old wharf. That wharf had all to be cut out and a new foundation built of concrete. There was the extra work of excavating on account of the change of site, which amounted to $552. The concrete work, the brick, and so forth, cost $4,261. Then there was further excavation and concrete, and additional stone, $4,275. Then taking something off the foundation and replacing it, 212 yards, $2,106. There is a little over $11,000. I will give the reason why the site was changed. After the contract was let it became necessary, by reason of the Intercolonial improvements at Lévis, to widen the street, and that necessitated putting the post office in a different position by some 50 feet. There was a new station and yard room required. The contract was let in 1905 to Mr. Joseph Couture.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What was the original cost of the site ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The site was given by the Intercolonial authorities ; the town and railway together owned the land. The government did not pay anything for either the first site or the second site.

Mr. MORIN. The minister said he had to build a post office 50 feet from the first site, but that ought not to change the cost of the site. The government bought some ground there to enlarge the street. I do not see how the minister can claim there was any additional cost for the building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Suppose the place where the building was to be first erected was solid ground, and suppose that the new site necessitated building part of the foundation where there was an old wharf. That old wharf had to be cut away and a concrete foundation made. Surely that would change the cost.

Mr. MORIN. I do not ask any one to tell me the location of that post office. He says there was a wharf there. I have my doubts whether there ever was a wharf there. I went into that very place sixty years ago and there was no wharf. Afterwards a wharf was built, but outside the place where the post office is now. But where the post office stands there never was a chance to build a wharf because there was no water. At low tide the water is probably twenty feet from where the post office stands now, and when the tide comes in there is a little water, but not much. There is water at high tide in the month of May. Now will this $2,000 finish that post office?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will complete it.

Mr. MORIN. Are you sure of that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. One cannot be sure of anything in this world.

Mr. MORIN. That post office was built on poor ground. There was a post office building bought at St. Thomas, Montmagny, and it went down two years after it was bought. The government paid $7,794.50 for it. I do not intend to blame the minister for that because he was not in the government at the time. But, when they commenced to erect this building at Lévis they built it on a poor foundation, the foundation gave away, another man took the job of fixing it up, it gave way again and they again fixed it up. Now, if you go there and take a sight you see that the first story on the north side of the building caves in about four inches, and the second story leans out about four inches. The building warps and wobbles. The first story leans south and the second leans north. That is why I ask the minister if he knows what it will cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I wish to thank my hon. friend for assisting me in giving information to the committee as to the very great difficulties that have been met with in the construction of this building. What my hon. friend has stated accounts very largely for the large amount of extras which were necessary in the construction of the building. But, every effort, so the chief architect tells me, was made to secure a solid foundation. The building rests upon a concrete foundation that is deemed to be perfect, and there is every reason to believe that the foundation will stand.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the minister any personal knowledge of the locality?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only in a general way.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not think the minister is doing himself credit. He knows a great deal about Lévis. We remember that a few years ago there was a long discussion about a question as to the acquisition of land in Lévis for the purpose of the Intercolonial Railway. Some parties who owned the land there had met in the department with the statement of an engineer that the land was only worth $1 a foot.

Mr. TALBOT. Was that during the construction of the St. Charles branch?

Mr. BENNETT. It was while Mr. Blair was minister. Was that the time?

Mr. TALBOT. No, prior to that.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Blair happened to be the minister at that time and these par-

ties found an adverse report in the department that the land was only worth $1 a foot. By an inspiration they became possessed of the idea that it would be advisable to secure a magic wand to wave over the head of the minister or some other important gentleman, and these parties hied themselves down to the city of St. John and secured the services of one Wm. Pugsley. May I ask the minister if he is the gentleman who made representations to the minister of that day as to the value of the land?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not remember. I know Lévis just as a traveller would know it, passing through.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman knew it better than that. I think he knew it as a very fair fee getter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not remember. I have no doubt that if I did the work I charged well for it.

Mr. BENNETT. I thought, from the pretty close knowledge the minister had of the locality, as stated in his letter at the time, that he would be able to give us some personal recollections of the locality. I must compliment the minister upon the fact that the land suddenly rose in value from $1 to $2 a foot, and judging from the increase in the price one would naturally conclude that his fee must have been a very fair one. I will refresh the memory of the minister with regard to the matter at some future time. It is on 'Hansard.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. How many years ago was that?

Mr. BENNETT. Probably seven or eight years ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Many things have happened since then. I do not remember these things for so long a time.

Mr. BENNETT. It is a very odd thing that a local solicitor was not called in to make representations to the minister as to the value of this land.

Mr. BERGERON. How much money did Mr. Couture receive ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Up to the first of November the contractor received $26,270. That includes the contract and extras.

Mr. BERGERON. Has he a claim now?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, there is $6,266 still owing.

Mr. BERGERON. I see in the Auditor General's Report of last year that he received $25,365, and also $3,830; that would be over $29,000 that he has already received.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, he had the contract for heating apparatus as well and the contract for fittings. The contract for fittings amounted to $3,500 and for heating apparatus to $2,178.50.

Mr. BERGERON. Did he get all these by tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I see there was an accepted tender dated July 10, 1906.

Mr. BERGERON. Who was the clerk of the works?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Auger.

Mr. BERGERON. What was his salary ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $3 a day.

Mr. FOWLER. Did he get paid for Sundays?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am informed by the chief architect that he was paid for Sundays.

Mr. BERGERON. What reason was there for him travelling? I see that he received $62 for travelling.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect tells me that he summoned him to Ottawa in regard to the foundations.

Mr. BERGERON. Was there not another clerk of the works at this time?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think not.

Mr. BERGERON. Was not Mr. Mullarkey also clerk of works?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, Mr. Mullarkey was attached to the staff at headquarters.

Mr. FOWLER. Why was his pay charged up against that work ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. His pay and expenses are charged against the work he inspects.

Mr. BERGERON. He is down as having received $4 a day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. During what period?

Mr. BERGERON. For 61 days.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We paid his board while he was at Lévis. Mr. Mullarkey, I am informed, is an expert on concrete work.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He is the gentleman who supervised the concrete work for the piers of the interprovincial bridge across the Ottawa river.

Mr. BERGERON. Then why did he go to Lévis as clerk of works ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He goes out to places where important work is going on because of his special knowledge of concrete work and his wages are charged to the particular work under construction.

Mr. BERGERON. I see that the government has paid his board besides $4 a day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When he is away from Ottawa, of course his board is paid. He is an expert in concrete work and he is a man whom the chief architect would be justified in sending to Lévis if the foundations were as the hon. member who has assisted me in giving information as to the building has stated they were.

Mr. FOWLER. Why was it necessary to bring Auger up to Ottawa? What good would he do? If there was anything wrong why not send a man down from the architect's department? He could see with his own eyes what was the matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not being an architect and not being in charge of the work, I would not deem myself competent to criticise the judgment the chief architect exercised.

Mr. FOWLER. Would it not be much better judgment to send an architect at first hand to see what was the matter?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect tells me that it became necessary to make an arangement with the contractor for the extra work and the clerk of works, Mr. Auger, and the contractor came to Ottawa in order to settle what allowances should be made the contractor.

Mr. MORIN. I would say to the minister as a friend that somebody ought to be watched whether it is the architect or the overseers.

Mr. BENNETT. Or the minister.

Mr. MORIN. No, I won't blame him, because he is a new man in the business. All your architect amounts to is just the name; he tells them what to do and how to do it, and as soon as his back is turned the work is neglected. The investigation into the fall of the tower here proved that the man did not attend to his business at all. Some of these days I will show you a place where some of your men were sent to build a wharf——

Mr. BERGERON. Was there any water?

Mr. MORIN. Yes, too much of it. The wharf was built and not a stone was put into the wall, and when the ice moved out in the spring away went the wharf, and it will cost $10,000 to replace it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Where was that?

Mr. MORIN. I will let you know when the time comes.

Mr. BERGERON. As I understand it, while the business portion of Lévis is down near the river side where the post office is situated, the greater part of the town is up the hill. Was it at the suggestion of the municipal authorities that the post office was erected on this site?

Mr. BERGERON.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, and the Board of Trade.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister has accounted for $11,000 in his own peculiar way, but we want to know something about the remaining $16,000 for extras.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Heating $2,178, tower clock $1,500, fittings $3,500, printing, advertising, clerk of the works, travelling expenses $4,213, boilers, etc., $196, electric wire $400.

Mr. FOWLER. Give the details for each of these items for printing and travelling expenses and advertising.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the details.

Mr. J. D. REID. How much has the contractor been paid, and how much is due?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He has been paid altogether $26,270, and $6,226 is still due. The total expenditure to October 31 has been $35,274.44.

Mr. BERGERON. Has that been paid?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. The total is $49,-715.44.

Mr. FOWLER. We are to understand then that this building cost $49,000; the contract for which was $22,000 of which sum $7,000 was paid for the clerk of works or one-seventh of the whole amount.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There were two clerks.

Mr. FOWLER. Even so.

Mr. BERGERON. There must be a mistake somewhere, because it would appear that most of the accounts mentioned by the minister have been already paid according to the Auditor General's report.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What does the hon. gentleman say has been paid?

Mr. BERGERON. Couture has been paid $30,000 already; Auger has been paid, Mullarkey has been paid. The boilers have been paid for, the heaters have been paid for, the King's Printer has been paid.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Have these items been paid, the $6,226 which I say is due?

Mr. BERGERON. No, I do not find that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The wiring.

Mr. BERGERON. There is some wiring.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, $400, but there is still $750 due.

Mr. BERGERON. Here is a payment to L. F. Butcher, on account of wiring, as per tender, that was a contract.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The wiring and fixtures were not in the contract. Is the $500 for the tower clock paid?

Mr. BERGERON. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The $3,500 for fittings ?

Mr. BERGERON. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The lock boxes, sidewalk and fencing and the balance for contingencies and superintendence, $2,163, making up the total of $49,713.34.

Mr. FOWLER. Who was the architect ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The plans were drawn in the department.

Mr. FOWLER. Was there a time limit on the contract ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The date of the contract is January 31, 1905, and the date named for completion October 30, 1906.

Mr. FOWLER. Was it completed then ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, owing to the change in site.

Mr. FOWLER. Was there a new contract ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, but an arrangement was come to with the contractor as to what he should receive for the extras necessitated by the change.

Mr. FOWLER. When was the arrangement made ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect says before the changes were made this arrangement was come to as to what he should charge.

Mr. FOWLER. Before he did anything, under the changed arrangement the price was agreed on ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was by schedule price, so much per cubic yard of concrete and masonry, &c.

Mr. FOWLER. Did the change make any difference in the contract ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, all this very great extra work was by reason of the changed foundation.

Mr. FOWLER. Was that the result of the change in the position.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes; by putting it back by reason of the widening of the street.

Mr. FOWLER. That made a difference of how many thousands ?

Mr. TALBOT. There is about 75 feet of land between high water mark and the cliff 120 feet high ; that is all the land there is there.

Mr. FOWLER. Where is the building with respect to the street that crosses the railway ?

Mr. TALBOT. South east of the railway station.

Mr. MORIN. 60 feet from the railway.

Mr. J. D. REID. Auger was employed at $3 a day. What was his occupation previously ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He was an architect.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is it the custom to pay for Sunday on all this work ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We had a discussion on this on Friday. It has been a pretty general custom. I do not know over how many years the custom has extended, but it has been the general custom to pay inspectors for Sundays.

Mr. FOWLER. Did he reside in Quebec?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I think he resided in Lévis.

Mr. J. D. REID. Did he give his whole time to this building ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I take it for granted he did.

Mr. J. D. REID. We would like to know. If he is a professional architect and will accept $3 a day and has the ability he should have, I think you should bring him to the department instead of paying architects $50 or $100 a day.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the building finished ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Everything is finished.

Mr. BERGERON. From what the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Morin) says it is very serious. It seems the building is shaky.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The member was indulging in figures of speech.

Mr. MORIN. I did not mean that, you say ? I do not blame the present minister but I do blame the government in connection with this matter. They have been 3½ years putting up the building, working for a while and then stopping, and if you paid your architect $3 a day for all the time it is no wonder the building is costing money. Any man can put up a building like that for $10,000 or $12,000. There is no fine work in the building, it is a brick building with stone trimmings around the doors and windows, two storeys high, with a kind of garret and a little tower, probably 50 feet high. I saw them putting in every stone and brick and all the work. The minister said that the wall was resting on concrete but will he state what the concrete rests upon ? He will find out some day that the concrete is not resting on anything solid.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to know if the statement of the hon. gentleman is true that the building——

Mr. MORIN. It is so or I would never say so. If I said it I will stick to it, because I know it to be correct. I will not take back a word of that.

Mr. J. D. REID. If that statement is true it is very serious. Has the department received any word from Quebec that that is the condition of affairs ? Who has taken the building over ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought my genial friend was joking about the building.

Mr. MORIN. No, I do not joke at all, it is not the place to joke.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect says he has inspected the building, that it is a good building, that the foundation rests on rock, so it is a solid foundation and the building will last.

Mr. BLAIN. Only last year the Minister of Agriculture stated to the House that the total cost would be $42,000. An item of $8,000 for Lévis public building was under discussion and he stated that $42,000 would finish the work. Now he states it will cost $49,000.

Mr. FOWLER. An hon. member from the province of Quebec has stated here to-night that this building rests upon a poor foundation, so poor that the building is already out of plumb at least four inches ; that it shifts with the tide or for some other reason ; that, to use the hon. member for Dorchester's (Mr. Morin) own words, it 'wobbles and warps.' Here is a building on which the government has spent $49,000, including some $7,000 for inspection alone. The government have paid two clerks of work, Mr. Mullarkey and Mr. Auger, one of whom is said to be an architect, paid them for week days and Sundays for about three years to inspect this work. And the chief architect says that he has examined this work and taken it over as all right. Well, here is a great variance of statement. An hon. member from the province of Quebec says he was present when a great deal of the work was done——

Mr. TALBOT. Has seen every brick put in.

Mr. MORIN. Even if I did, don't poke your nose in.

Mr. FOWLER. We hardly hold the hon. member for Dorchester to such exactness of statement as to cover every brick. But he has seen a good deal of the work going on. He lives near there and often sees this building, and taking an interest in public affairs, as we know he does, he naturally tries to learn what is being done. He makes this statement that this building is not founded on rock——

Mr. MORIN. No, I cannot say that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOWLER. I am glad to see hon. gentlemen opposite so jubilant. It is so seldom that they get a chance to jubilate nowadays that we naturally like to see them happy. The hon. gentleman stated that it was on a poor foundation. I took it for granted that that meant it was not upon a rock foundation, as the Minister of Public Works alleged it to be, and I think that that was a fair deduction for me to make from the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Morin's) statement. At any rate, he said—and I think he will stand by that—that it is a poor foundation.

Mr. MORIN. I do not know that anybody knows whether the foundation is good or bad, to come right down to the point.

Mr. FOWLER. There is certainly a variation as between the statement of the hon. member for Dorchester and that which the minister reports as the statement of the chief architect.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think not.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. member for Dorchester says the building is out of plumb, while the minister says it is well built. From the fact that so many public buildings put up by this government have fallen, we are naturally suspicious. These buildings collapse mysteriously. As the member for Dorchester has pointed out, even a building on a solid foundation and wedged in between two other parts of a building fell down, though one would naturally have said that such a thing would be impossible. It is no wonder that we incline to take the statements of the chief architect with a grain of salt.

Mr. MORIN. Last summer this building was supposed to be ready to move into. But they were repairing it and they were afraid of it falling down. They only moved in about six weeks ago. I know that perfectly well, because I was in the post office. I wanted to buy a stamp and the postmaster allowed me in, though he said they had not opened yet, but were only moving in that day.

Longueuil public building, $500.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is past one o'clock, and I would ask the leader of the House (Mr. Fielding) if he does not think it time to quit.

Mr. FIELDING. I have counted up the sums voted and the total is under $100,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) and the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) have taken up a great part of the evening——

Mr. FOWLER. Let us sit here as long as they wish.

Mr. FISHER. Sit a reasonable time. We will not stay late. Give us a fair show.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This $500 is to provide for the construction of a retaining wall in

the rear of this building. It is 20 feet long, 8 feet high and 3 feet thick.

Mr. BERGERON. This is a new building, is it not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was built in 1904.

Mr. FOWLER. What do you want with a retaining wall? Is it to keep the building from falling down?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. FOWLER. What do you want with a retaining wall if it is not to retain something ?

Mr. GEOFFRION. It is necessary to build a wall at the rear of the grounds—it is far from the building and is not to sustain the building which is perfectly new, well built and a credit to the city and the government.

Mr. FOWLER. Then, it is a fence ?

Mr. GEOFFRION. Call it a fence, if you like.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister comes down and asks for a vote for a new public building, and now the representative of the county tells us it is a wharf——

Mr. GEOFFRION. No, a wall.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, wharf or wall, it is clearly not a public building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is in connection with a public building. The improvement of the grounds of a public building would come within these votes. As my hon. friend (Mr. Geoffrion) has explained, it is necessary to build a retaining wall to prevent the earth from falling out.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, the item should be amended to provide for building a wall and not a public building.

Mr. FOWLER. What will happen if you do not build the wall ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The earth on the lot will fall away.

Mr. GEOFFRION. There is a little rivulet passes there. My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) and my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Léonard) know the place very well. It is necessary to build a wall to keep the ground even. It is not a wharf, nor a fence, but a wall.

Mr. LEONARD. Who owns the adjoining property ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know.

Mr. BERGERON. How much did the building cost in the first place ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no memo. of that.

Mr. FOWLER. Were tenders called for this work ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, Mr. Baker was the tenderer and the tender was for $950.

Mr. FOWLER. I thought this wall was not to cost more than $500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was an appropriation in 1907-8 for $1,700, which included also a clock and room for the same.

Mr. BERGERON. That is paid for.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and there were other items making a total of $1,475. Prior to March 31, the expenditure was $975, leaving $500, for which a vote is now asked.

Mr. FOWLER. Did you have a clerk of works ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. FOWLER. Who inspected the job ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. One of the resident clerks of works in Montreal.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the work finished ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a little something still to be done.

Magog public building, $13,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote. The appropriation last year was $13,000, of which nothing has been expended. The site has been chosen, we paid for it $4,100, to Messrs. H. N. Rivard and A. Tourigny. The original lot was 100 feet by 8 feet, for which we paid $3,200. Later on there was purchased another strip from the town of Magog to round out the first lot. For the second strip we paid $900.

Mr. BLAIN. What will be the total cost of the building when completed, including furnishings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The estimated cost is $22,000 ; this is to include everything outside the lot.

Marieville public building, $7,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is in the county of Rouville. The population of Marieville, including Ste. Marie de Monnoir, is 2,360. The contract has not yet been let. The building will serve for a post office and custom house. The postal revenue for the last nine months was $1,020, and the customs duties $10,939.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. Supply, at the point where we leave it to-night.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.30 a.m., Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, April 28, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

DOMINION NOTES.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 159) respecting a certain issue of Dominion notes. He said: This is a Bill to legalize and confirm the proceedings which were taken, and were fully explained in the Budget Speech, in connection with advances for moving western grain. The matter was fully stated in the Budget Speech. This Bill only legalizes and confirms the arrangement so made.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. FIELDING moved leave to introduce a Bill (No. 160) to amend the Bank Act. He said: This Bill I may say, is also for the purpose of carrying out an arrangement which was explained in the Budget Speech. It is proposed that the banks, during a certain period of the year, may issue additional circulation limited to fifteen per cent of their combined paid up capital and rest or reserve. The only new feature in the Bill is that special provision is made as respects the Bank of British North America, because there is a special provision for that in the Bank Act, differing somewhat in a matter of detail from the other banks, and corresponding provisions are inserted in this Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask the minister if there is any correspondence on which the introduction of this Bill is based, and if there is, will he be kind enough to bring it down before he goes on?

Mr. FIELDING. There is no correspondence. The Bill is the result of consideration in the department and of discussion with distinguished bankers; but there is no correspondence on the subject.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CRIMINAL CODE—AMENDMENT.

Mr. A. M. BEAUPARLANT (St. Hyacinthe) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 161) to amend the Criminal Code. He said:

(Translation). Mr. Speaker, I beg to submit the following amendment to the Criminal Code, chap. 146, revised statutes, 1906, section 322.

Mr. FIELDING.

Section 322a.—Notwithstanding clauses 165 and 607 of this chapter and all laws, jurisprudence, authorities, courts rulings, order or decree of the court, of a judge, or judges, no one commits an offence by publishing in good faith, outside of the court either by writing, printing or words, an exact or lawful report of the arguments before a court of justice, exercising judicial authority in a preliminary or definite manner, ordinary or summarized, of the decisions of a judge or judges, neither in publishing honest or loval comamnds of these arguments or proceedings.

322b.—No one commits an offence by publishing in writing, printing or words, outside of courts when accused of contempt of court without having an ordinary trial by a jury, if the accused party asks himself or by a counsel for it, and this privilege must be proposed to the accused party by the court or by the judge.

The object of the legislation which I submit to-day to this House is to explain in a clearer and more definite manner than they seem to be presently, the rights of the press in connection with the courts.

The words 'hors de cour' show clearly that there is no intention of intervening in the procedures before the courts of justice, which will continue to have the exclusive control of them and to possess all the necessary powers to exercise their duties that are not only useful and necessary but that cannot be done away with. And in this case, the standing of the courts is clearly established by definite enactments, which are in no way affected by the proposed legislation, for instance:

Section 908, of the Criminal Code, of 1892-1900, which is contained in section 607, chap. 146, revised statutes, 1896, Taschereau, under the heading 'arrest without warrant for contempt of court,' page 623, of his Criminal Code of 1893, and whose able commentaries are generally considered as lost.

Crankshaw in his 'Practical Guide to Magistrates' on page 36, under the heading: 'Powers to maintain and to commit for contempt' goes further in admitting without any hesitation the principal, always doubtful, that party cannot be at the same time judge, when he says: 'there are cases in which circumstances of such a character arise that it becomes the unfortunate duty of the Court to act as both party and judge.' The whole being supported by numerous precedents.

Section 2452 of the revised statutes of Quebec, section 18 of our 'Code de procédure civile, applying generally in reference to general legislation have connection with section 908 of the Criminal Code, and also the corresponding legislation of the other provinces to which section 908 of the Criminal Code also applies.

I point principally in these quotations to the legislations of 2892 and 1900, and to the corresponding precedent legislation; because it is under this legislation that has been framed the jurisprudence which I

wish to summarize and that in this case is not amended.

Therefore, the present proposed legislation will in no way change the existing laws on these points, and will give to every court the necessary power for the accomplishment of their duties without any other control than the control of the legislatures under whose jurisdiction they are.

The question is to regulate what you might call outside relation in a clear and equivocal manner between the press and the courts.

A judge is on the bench or in chamber, the tribunal is complete or has the necessary quorum and has full liberty without any other control than Parliament to decide what they think proper, but I believe that the absoluteness of that power should end at the door of the court, and then the citizen and the journalists would have the right to say in the press and on the public platform what they know and what they think of the decisions of the court, without any other limit than the truth.

Judiciary decisions belong just as much to public opinion as legislated and administrated enactments in a country where not only in theory but in practice, the people have a right to know what is being done.

This is a principle which I think it is desirable to establish in Canada, and would very well suit our society already, under so many aspects, guided by liberal principles.

Then what is the legislation regulating presently these relations between the press and the judges ?

Clause 290, of the Criminal Code, of 1892-1900, given in the Revised Statutes of 1906, in chapter 146, reads thus:

> 390. No one commits an offence by publishing in good faith for the information of the public a fair report of the proceedings of the Senate or House of Commons or any committee thereof, or of any counsel or assembly aforesaid, or any committee thereof, or of the public proceedings preliminary or final heard before any court exercising judicial authority, nor by publishing in good faith, any fair comment upon any such proceeding.

This section would be satisfactory, and if it were not lacking an indispensable thing, that is the way of proceeding and regulating its application, and if, on account of that, the legislator added to it something intolerable, jurisprudence inacceptable to seciety, democratic society like ours.

These remarks which might at first seem strange, will become very clear if I prove in a moment, and I bind myself to do it, that under this legislation apparently liberal, the courts have ordered the imprisonment of journalists, not in a preventive manner, but by final judgment, and when these journalists have never had the advantage of a regular trial.

The object of the two amendments which I propose is to restrain, limit this jurisprudence and prevent the courts from substituting their own will to that of parliament representing the people, and also, if there has been really abuses, such as those which I mentioned, I hope that a legislation whose object is to prevent them, will be favourably considered by parliament composed in majority of Liberal members.

The decisions which I will quote have all been given after the adoption of the laws concerning libel, which legislation undoubtedly applies to courts as to other institutions and individuals, and though this legislation has somewhat varied in its form, to render it more explicit, there has not been any substantial change in its essence, so that these decisions might just as well come under the present law as under the original law under which the truthfulness of the facts published for the information of the public was accepted as a ground for defence. But though admitting this principle of the right of defence based upon the truthfulness of the facts, some judges have rendered the judgments which will be quoted hereafter.

Our law confirm this principle by clauses 5, 6 and 7 of chapter 38 of the statute of 1874, by clause 4 of chapter 163 of the Revised Statutes of 1886. I prefer to give the calendar year rather than the year of the reign, because it is clear—and finally by the clause more explicit of the Criminal Code of 1892, 1900 under number 290 and re-enacted as I have said, at chapter 146 of the Revised Statutes of 1906. And on the 25th of February, 1888, consequently under this legislation of 1874 and 1886, Judge Allen, chief justice of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, from what we read at page 394 of the 28th volume of the reports of the court, admitted this same principle in the case of Hawke, when saying :

> It was contended by Mr. Hawke that he, as a public journalist, had right to comment upon the acts and decisions of this court or of any judge of it. I do not dispute that.

Nevertheless this decision was not in conformity with the accepted principle.

At page 399 of the same report, and in this same case of Hawke, we notice that Judge Palmer, a colleague of Judge Allen, said :

> On the contrary, I think that any man has a perfect right to criticise and discuss the administration of justice as evidenced by the proceedings before him.

But indirect ways are resorted to; an act which is considered to be within the liberty of the press is condemned. But the condition of the condemned party is not benefited by the only fact of changing the label of the sentence. The duty of the court is to apply the laws, not to make them.

Thus, when the courts make these laws delusive, parliaments under whose authority they come have the right to intervene by enacting a clear legislation and this is what I propose now.

Finally Judge Cockburn having very liberal views on this question makes in his comuments upon the Imperial Statute of 1908, which is yet more restrictive than ours, the very appropriate following remarks :

Our law of libel has, in many respects, only gradually developed itself into anything like a satisfactory and settled form. The full liberty of public writers to comment on the conduct and motives of public men has only in very recent times been recognized. Comments on government, on ministers and officers of state, on members of both Houses of Parliament, on judges and other public functionaries are now made every day, which half a century ago would have been the subject of actions or ex-officio informations, and would have brought down fine and imprisonment on publishers and authors.

In conclusion judge Cockburn says :

The nation profits by public opinion being thus freely brought to bear on the discharge of public duties.

Thus, we have, it seems to me, a legislation as clearly admitted as it is surely in existence.

I pointed out, on beginning my remarks, that the law was silent upon the mode of procedure for applying this legislation. In fact, we have only clause 4 of chap. 174, of the Revised Statutes of 1886 forbidding any court, except a Superior Court having a criminal jurisdiction, to enquire into a case of libel. I could add that as far as 1783, in England, the case of Saint Asalph for libel was tried under the jury, and that Fox's Libel Act, which became law nine years later, enacted clearly that all cases for libel would be tried by a jury.

It should be astonishing that after a period of more than 100 years, during which we must have progressed, as says Judge Cockburn, we are yet obliged to let a case of libel being disposed of, even when it relates to judicial authority, without the always prudent safeguard of a jury.

I could even quote the federal law of the United States which is in the lines of my resolution, but as this is only the first reading, I will limit myself in quoting two sections of the American law which support almost verbally my theory, that is to say, clause 143, 7th paragraph of the criminal law of the state of New York, which says:

But no person can be punished as provided in this section for publishing a true, full and fair report of a trial, argument, decision, or other proceedings had in court.

Next, the following, of the state of Pennsylvania, which we find at page 302 of the 12th edition of the Brighty's Purdon Digest, vol. 1, verbo contempt :

No publication, out of court, respecting the conduct of the judges, officers of the court, jurors, witnesses, parties, or any of them, of, in or concerning any cause depending in such court, shall be construed into a contempt of the said court, so as to render the author, printer, publisher, or either of them, liable to attachment and summary punishment for the same.

If any such publication shall improperly tend to bias the minds of the public, or of the court, the officers, jurors, witnesses, or any of them, on a question depending before the court, it shall be lawful for any person who shall feel himself aggrieved thereby, to proceed against the author, printer and publisher thereof, or either of them, by indictment, or he may bring an action at law against them, or either of them, and recover such damages as a jury may think fit to award.

Well, notwithstanding this legislation and the precedents, what has happened in Canada since twenty-five years ?

On the 25th of February, 1888, Mr. J. T. Hawke, editor and proprietor of the 'Daily Transcript' of Moncton, was, not after a trial before a jury, but under a simple ruling of the court, condemned to be imprisoned for having published his opinion upon Judge Fraser of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, as it can be seen at pages 391 and the following of the 28th volume of the reports of that court.

I have been, Mr. Speaker, greatly mistaken upon the meaning of the word 'democracy' if such a decision of the court is in keeping with democratic ideas and with justice.

On the 11th of June, 1889, without any form of trial and under a simple ruling of the court, Mr. John V. Ellis, publisher and editor of the 'St. John Globe,' was also condemned to imprisonment for having published in his paper what he thought of Judge Tuck, of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, on the ground of a contempt of court, by the colleagues of Judge Tuck, as can be seen at page 497 of the same volume. The fact that Mr. John V. Ellis was a most respectable citizen who, some time afterwards was called to the Higher Chamber of Canada, did not entitle him to more respect than another citizen, every citizen being equal before the law. But when the law strikes a respectable citizen every one is naturally inclined to look more precisely into the causes of disgrace or into the justice of the penalty.

A fact worth noticing in the case of Hawke is that Judge Tuck concurred in the judgment of his colleague Judge Fraser, and that in the case of Ellis, Judge Fraser concurred in the judgment avenging his colleague Judge Tuck.

There is no doubt that the judges in these cases have vindicated themselves, but can we say that the ordinary citizen has had justice? And that is a very important fact

to know, because citizens are more numerous than judges.

Where then was the authorization for such imprisonment, without any consultation of the juries or of the fellowmen of the accused party? The best answer I can give lies in the remarks of one of the judges coprating in the judgment, judge King's remarks which we find at page 530 of the same report :

> We are not to look for analogies in other proceedings because in cases of contempt, the court may act of its own mere motion ; and if it acts upon a formal motion made by another it is none the less the action of the court. In such case the court may be considered as adopting the motion so made. Unless proceedings are regulated by statute or unless clear, well settled practice has made a certain procedure essential to the proper entertaining of a matter, the true course is to disregard technicalities and to come at close quarters with the real facts.

Well, I think that proposed legislation is clear enough to prevent the repetition of arbitrary acts such as those which I just mentioned. We may also remark, without taking any concern as to the truthfulness or untruthfulness of the facts, that the following theory has been sanctioned in this case of Hawke :

> It is a contempt of course to publish that the decision of the court in a case pending before it is judicial outrage and a most disgraceful judicial scandal.

Then in the case of Ellis the following principle was professed:

> 1. It is not necessary, to constitute a contempt of court, that the contempt should be made in court, or that it should be a contempt of a judge sitting in court.
> 2. That while the proceedings relating to the prohibition were pending it was a contempt of court to publish anything tending to prejudice the court by which the matter was to be determined against the party who had applied for the prohibition.

Well, I protest specifically and principally against the first of these two principles. I propose then that it be necessary that the contempt should be made in court, to constitute a contempt, and that the judges should be no longer authorized to condemn for any writing or words published out of court, and must content themselves with the ordinary laws as other citizens, political men included.

Well, even since the very liberal clause 290 of the law, 1892-1900, a judge of the King's Bench in Montreal ordered the arrestation of a journalist in his office and in about three-quarters of an hour's time, the journalist was imprisoned. During the same period the judge of a rural district of the province of Quebec threatened of a similar punishment a citizen, lawyer, member of parliament, who has since been appointed judge, and who was at that time a member of a board of trade, who was indisputably interested in the administration of the law, because this citizen had thought proper to discuss before this deliberating body, the manner in which the judge of this rural district was interpreting his commission and performing his duties as a judge

Judges Bossy and Blanchet have also, I understand, during the famous trial of 1892, threatened to imprison the journalists taking sides for the defence.

A similar conflict happened in Halifax last week. A lawyer was fined $50 and obliged to apologize, or if not, to be imprisoned. But as I have not an authentic report of the facts, and have not been able to verify as to whether the incriminated action has been accomplished in the court or outside of the court, I will not make any comments.

Finally, honourable Judge Lemieux, of Quebec, has just issued against le 'Soleil' an order which has created a great deal of sensation in the judiciary and journalistic circles. I have for Honourable Judge Lemieux the greatest esteem. I have always admired him in his career as a lawyer, as a public man, and as a judge. I cannot, however, approve of his attitude towards the 'Soleil,' but I will render him the justice of saying that, to my mind, his decision was authorized by preceding judiciary decisions which ought to be modified in the sense of the proposed amendments. I cannot also fail to praise the energetic stand taken by the 'Soleil' in face of this judiciary threatening. And we would in vain search in this rather expeditive proceeding half a minute given to discussing the truthfulness of the accusation.

It is not now necessary to examine the merits of these conflicts arising between judicial authorities and those who, outside of court, take the liberty to comment upon them. The question for the moment is to know if the way of settling these conflicts will always be arbitrary and if, out of court, the press will be on an equal footing with the courts, and to these two questions I will answer: yes.

We justly praise the democratic and liberal institutions that we enjoy in Canada. The old rigorous and puritan laws of Europe, France or England, have taken more root in certain parts of the United States than in Canada, but we must admit that our neighbours are more opposed than we are to perpetuating the power titles, coat of arms which notwithstanding the storms, always tend to revive. Our sparsely settled population does not tend neither to tighten the meshes of our legislation, so that to-day, with the exception of the fact that we are still a colony, although a self-governing colony, and having the advantage of a most liberal constitution, we may truthfully say that Canada is one of the countries and perhaps the only country in the world where the citizen enjoys the fullest measure of

liberty, and that, in the midst of a society as fully organized as possible to protect what deserves to be protected.

We must not allow this beneficent state of things which is the result of long and ardous work, political and legislative, to be marred by arbitrary acts and abuses of authority creeping by stealth in our legislative and judiciary proceedings.

The tendency of powers is always to grow stronger, even to exceed the necessary limits for their efficacy which should be their sole justification. Experience shows, and it is in the human nature, that if a cast is allowed to take privileges, it will take more than its share. But a people, taking care of its legitimate liberties, must, through its representatives, not allow that this should be lost sight of, that is to say, that the judiciary or other institutions, paid and well paid by the people, do exist only for the needs of the people and not for the satisfaction of what might be called everywhere else individual caprices, a thing which is opposed to all public interest.

The House has undoubtedly noticed that the doctrine sanctioned by the precedents I have quoted, applies as well to the verbal comments of a legislative assembly, on the hustings and even in the ordinary conversation, as to the comments of newspapers, so that in presence of this jurisprudence, which no late legislation has yet changed, I contend that a judge may, proprio motu, order the arrestation of a mayor or alderman or a member of a board of trade, or a warden of a county and principally of a newspaper publisher or any other citizen, by whom he would justly or wrongly claim to have been insulted outside of court, and put him into jail by his authority.

I assert here that, previously to the late incidents which have occurred at Quebec and Halifax, 99 per 100 of the population of Canada did not realize that our laws still contained enactments authorizing such things. If my interpretation of this jurisprudence is right, and I would be glad to hear that I am mistaken, I hope that my proposal of applying a remedy will be favourably considered by a Liberal government.

I am not afraid of the answer which will be made, that is to say, that the courts being the guardians of the individual rights should have all the possible latitude, or other arguments of the same kind. First, besides the extraordinary powers, which I say they do not possess, the courts have all the necessary liberty of attaining their legitimate end, and we must not forget that an absolue and arbitrary power is always claimed to have the greatest solicitude for public liberties in order to more surely substitute itself to the laws, to constitutional and democratic authority, to which the people who loves at the same time order and liberty, will only bow.

It is more by the article itself than by the label that it is possible to judge of its real value. The authority which imprisons cannot at the first sight, be looked upon as protecting liberty, and it is only after we have been able to test the ordinary elements and guarantees of justice that we can come to this conclusion, I therefore ask that the party who comments a judicial decision should not be in a worse position than the one who criticizes any action of the government or parliament. Arbitrary power has no more right to be in the midst than at the head of society. The autocracy of a person who, by his talents or through circumstances, becomes a constituted authority, is not any more tolerable than the hereditary autocracy.

The head of a constitutional government administers practically the country under the most direct and vigilant control of the press, and I do not see why the magistrate would not perform, under the same conditions, the judiciary functions which are assigned to him.

There were judges before any printing establishments ever existed. I know that the press is younger than the bench and older than parliaments, but nevertheless we see parliaments controlling now, if not in reality, at least in theory, the courts of which they have come to be the creators and masters. For these matters as for others, the supremacy must be decided more by the nature of their functions than by their age, and the press which has opened the ways to democratic governments now the creators and masters of the courts, should be at least on equal footing with the courts.

I therefore ask for the journalist, who may have his wrongs and may make errors —and I know something about it, but we have all the necessary laws to repress that —for the journalist, I repeat, who fulfils an undisputable, useful and courageous mission, the same privilege that is given in this very old law, to an accused party, of being tried by a jury of his fellowmen.

When an unknown individual, who has however equal rights with other citizens, an immigrant or a vagrant isaccused of a crime, the law orders, and it is a just and prudent law, to try him only with a jury of twelve citizens unprejudiced and having no interest or relation whatever with him. Then why should we leave the right of rendering judgment to a man who has been, or claims to have been insulted by another, a journalist, for instance, who is obliged by clauses 2924 and the following ones of the Quebec statutes and of corresponding legislation in other provinces to give his address to the courts and in some way keep them acquainted with his busi-

ness and profession ? I say it is an anomaly which, after the incidents that have occurred in Quebec and Halifax, will not fail to call the attention of the democratic governor whom we have at the head of the country, and whose desire is not only to have in his programme the words 'justice and liberty' which sound well to the ears of the people, but something that will represent really the treatment of the people.

The liberty of the press is the exact thermometer of the liberty of the nation. It is by the book, by the pamphlet, by printed matter, and finally by the press that the absolutism of the past has been destroyed, and that constitutional and democratic governments have been established in this modern society, and it is also by the press that they will be maintained there. It is not only a question of gratefulness and justice towards the press, but a question of safeguard for these popular institutions which modern nations do not seem to depart from. A former Minister of Public Works, (Mr. Tarte), who had a great knowledge of our Canadian constitution, and has applied it at times in a happy manner, never feared to say that the press was just as solid an institution as the bench.

By his broad views, by his examples of tolerance and equal justice to all, the government of the day seemed to have inspired the same sentiments to our magistrates, who, up to the last conflicts at Quebec and Halifax, have shown themselves more tolerant than arbitrary, but it seems as though it were not to be always so. Those of our colleagues who have kept the memory of the incidents of 1892, and they are numerous, will do me the justice of saying that I am right.

The prime minister of a province had just been dismissed by an authority—not the authority of the people—but an authority acting in connection with a libellous campaign, the parallel of which has never been met with in this country. Those who have maintained against him their undaunted hostility, have persisted in denying to him the credit that he had deserved; but the public opinion, having returned to a sober sense of the circumstances, has emphatically admitted his great administrative capacity, his intense care for substantial and moral progress of the people, his great patriotic motives, his disinterestedness, his high citizenship, and his unrivalled generosity. Nothing was proved against him. He suffered the punishment of the vanquished, and bore the rancors of the winning party. The leader who seems to have survived this coup d'état, only to remain a living example of frailty of politics, had destroyed a public man; the ministers he had chosen, and who, shortly after, incurred the same fate, undertook to ruin this man in his private life, he was dragged before the courts and accused of malfesance in office. A judge in whose impartiality the public opinion, in its state of temporarily excitement, did not even place full confidence, was called to preside at the trial, and nobody could expect but a complete dishonour for the fallen statesman.

His opponents held the majority in the Senate, where the movement had originated. They also were the majority in the House of Commons, in the legislative council, in the legislative assembly, amongst the magistrates, and also amongst the public officials who, through sympathy or tactics, had joined the accusers, and this man who previously was endowed with an unlimited power, found himself surrounded by a mere handful of individual sympathizers, unable to put himself in touch with the people otherwise than by the medium of the public press.

In spite of the doubtful protection afforded by the existing legislation, the press manfully fulfilled its duty. The aforesaid judge rose from the bench; another one against whose public feeling was not aroused to the same extent, took up his place, and, notwithstanding the existing agitation, a unanimous verdict of acquittal was rendered. It behooves the liberal party to restore in behalf of the accused, whatsoever may be his social standing, or his political condition, the liberty of the press, as a guarantee of justice, in public as well as in private matters.

If good treatment received can repay for some slight injure, I have nothing, so far as the press or the courts are concerned, to thank or to grudge for.

The press has sometimes acted too generously towards me; sometimes also too unjustly. I have good friends among the newspaper men, and also more enemies than on the bench. Outside of the judicial decisions, which are not now under discussion, I have faced kind judges, and also some others not acting with an equal kindness. Those who would not be disposed to agree with me on this point, will readily admit that in this contest my personal interest would rather prompt me to side with the bench, which can reach me as a politician and as a lawyer, than with the press whose influence is purely political.

From my seat here I could easily and safely denounce the miserable individual who in a certain newspaper, acting as the mere tool of another individual well known for long to be my personal enemy. That stand I refuse to take.

I will also give the judges the credit that they have a very difficult task to perform, and also, that as a whole, they are generally men of talent, learning and good will, but I am not speaking at present for my own concern. I am a Liberal, I have been elected as a Liberal. I believe the said legislation to be based on Liberal and public motives. Such were the grounds upon which I introduced this Bill, which. I am afraid, will not reach an issue during

the present session, on account of the advanced stage already attained in our work, but, I confidently believe it to be my duty, to call the attention of Parliament and government, on the state of affairs arising from the recent incidents in Ottawa and in Quebec, for the citizens of the province of Quebec and of Canada as a whole. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the first reading of this Bill.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny.) (Translation). Mr. Speaker, it is not customary to discuss a Bill on its first reading, but, as the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Beauparlant) has just stated it, the session is now so far advanced that it is not probable that such question could be threshed before the end of our work. Such being the case, I consider it my duty to say a few words now.

I was very happy to hear my hon. friend discuss that question of relations between the press and the bench. I imagined for a time that I was listening to the attenuated echo of the voices from the old Liberals of St. Hyacinthe. unheard for so long a time.

The Bill introduced by the hon. member appears to me, to effectively inscribe in our code the old custom granting the unlucky pleader twenty-four hours to curse his judge. This Bill seems to me to be admittedly inspired by recent events. It leads to prevent a judge from calling before the court a journalist having taken upon himself to criticize the court incidents, or the decisions of the judge.

In principle, I agree with him, but, a special clause of the criminal code, and of the revised statutes, allows the newspapers to impartially report the proceedings before the courts, to give what is called a fair comment. Such newspaper articles of comment are privileged, and the writers and publishers of the same are not amenable, and the judge cannot assign them before the court.

But, if the Bill goes further, and permits during the trial to comment on what is passing on, I disagree. The existing law tends to protect not only the judge, but also the accused. For instance, not very long ago, a newspaper man had been dragged before the jury, and on this occasion, we have seen a certain press through fiery writings, try to raise public opinion during the trial, so as to influence the jury before rendering its verdict. At the time of the famous suit Prévost-Asselin, we have seen le "Soleil" inflaming the public opinion against the accused, Asselin.

If the Bill introduced to-day tends to permit the publication in a newspaper of such articles, apt to injure the defence of the accused, and to stir up the public opinion against him, I cannot support it.

As the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe has said, this Bill was suggested by recent events. Have we not seen, among other newspapers, the 'Soleil,' which is to-day complaining of Judge Lemieux—because it is assigned for contempt of court—comment disparagingly on the speech of this same judge, which, judicially acting, had pressed the bar of Quebec to insist on the nomination of a prothonotary to the seat vacant for the last twelve months ? If it is right to have the public respected, it is equally right to defend the bench against such attacks.

Moreover, I believe that it should be allowed to comment the judgments rendered, provided public opinion is interested in the same and the writer is a disinterested person. But my opinion is that in such cases, the writer should shoulder the responsibility of his opinion. For my part, I have commented in the newspaper some judgments, for instance in the case of Judge Cimon, whom I have accused of having condemned a newspaper man, without having heard the evidence of the defence. In so doing, I know the whole import of my act, and I was ready then, as I am to-day, to assume the whole responsibility incurred. According to my mind, the Bill introduced by the member for St. Hyacinthe, should be amended in such a way as to prevent a newspaper man to make any comments during the course of a trial, on the outcome of the case, before the same is adjudged. I consider that we should maintain in our laws, the right granted to the judge, to call before the court, any newspaper man violating this provision. But, after the trial, he should not be called before the court, except according to the ordinary course of law. On general principle, I agree with the present Bill, and I hope that some day it will become law.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—MAJOR HODGINS' CHARGES.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, I renew the motion which I made yesterday and I renew it with the amendment suggested by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). The amendment is quite proper as it introduces and refers to the committee the letters themselves of Major Hodgins and not extracts only of those letters. Therefore I move :

That the memorandum of the chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners to the Prime Minister, of date the 23rd April, and laid on the table of this House on the 24th instant, and the papers accompanying the same together with the letter of Major Hodgins to the public press, therein referred to, be referred to a special committee of five members, with instructions to investigate the matters and charges therein mentioned, and that the said committee be composed of Messrs. Carvel, Macdonald (Pictou), Geoffrion, Barker and Lennox, and that

the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records and to examine persons on oath or affirmation and to report from time to time.

Motion agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MR. JUSTICE CASSELS.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) when it is expected that the proposed inquiry before Mr. Justice Cassels will be commenced, whether it will be proceeded with without delay, or is some adjournment contemplated and is the inquiry to be conducted as a public inquiry, or is it to be an inquiry in camera?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I am informed that it is going to begin on Friday.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it to be continued ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Whether it is going to be in public or not I do not know.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it to be continued?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know. I know it is going to begin on Friday. I heard that it was going to sit on Friday and Saturday. That is all the information I have.

Mr. BERGERON. Who suggested that lawyers should be appointed to carry on the investigation? Did the suggestion come from Judge Cassels or anybody else?

Mr. BRODEUR. In an interview which I had with the judge he thought it would be desirable that some lawyers should be employed for the purpose of assisting him in the investigation.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister inform the House as to the ground upon which the two lawyers who have been selected have been selected?

Mr. BRODEUR. If there are any special grounds?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, not that I know of. They are men of repute and that is the only reason why they have been selected.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). Mr. Speaker, I desire to rise to a question of privilege. I notice that the other day I was credited with a remark concerning a comparison between Doukhobors and some religious order in Ottawa. It is bad enough for me to be responsible for all I really do say, but on that occasion I happened to be some hundreds of miles or more away when the remarks were uttered and I do not desire to be associated with them.

Mr. T. BEATTIE (London). Mr. Speaker, some ten or twelve days ago, at Wolseley barracks in the city of London, a foul murder was committed. Private Moir shot down a colour-sergeant without cause or reason in cold blood.

Mr. SPEAKER. This is not the proper time to enter upon a discussion. The motion to go into Supply will be reached shortly and then the hon. gentleman may bring the matter up.

Mr. BEATTIE. I only want to ask if the government had heard of it. However, I will bring it up later.

SUPPLY—MURDER AT WOLSELEY BARRACKS, LONDON.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BEATTIE. After committing the murder Private Moir obtained two revolvers and a rifle and a large quantity of ammunition and he disappeared from the barracks and has not been heard of since. The police of London have done their best to discover and apprehend the man, but he has got away into the country and the county constables are somewhat indifferent about attempting to arrest a man who is heavily armed in the manner in which this man is, and I do not think that they have given the matter the attention that they should have. I think that if some moderate reward were offered for the capture of this man he would very likely be obtained. The gentleman whom he murdered was not a member of his corps at all. He was a colour-sergeant named Lloyd belonging to the 20th battalion of Stratford and he was only there taking a course of instruction in order to pass an examination which would qualify him to occupy a position in his regiment—a young man of twenty-two years. It is a very serious case and I think that something should be done by the government in the way of offering a moderate reward for his capture.

Mr. BERGERON. What kind of a rifle has he to defend himself with?.

Mr. BEATTIE. That I do not know.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MR. JUSTICE CASSELS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer briefly to a matter which I mentioned a moment ago—the inquiry to be conducted by Mr. Justice Cassels and the manner in which that inquiry is to be carried out. We all realize that the inquiry is a very restricted one inasmuch as it relates to a portion of the administration and to only one of the departments involved in the

report of the Civil Service Commission. It touches only a single paragraph of the report of the commissioners in respect to that department. I have already pointed out to the House that it would have seemed a natural thing to have endeavoured, in the first place, to obtain from the commissioners who had made that report the information which is sought by the inquiry before Mr. Justice Cassels. The commissioners who have made a somewhat exhaustive inquiry, although they say it is incomplete even in the case of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, would seem to be the best men from whom an explanation of the language contained in the paragraph referred to might be sought. As far as the House is aware the government have not sought from these commissioners any explanation of their language, nor have the government invoked the aid of these commissioners for the purpose of obtaining the information which naturally they might be expected to supply. The government have not admitted at all the expediency of sending back the report to the same commissioners for the purpose of reporting at greater length upon a subject to which the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) called attention on the day the report was presented. The government have not even seen fit to propose an inquiry under the first part of the statutes relating to public inquiries. They have proposed a very limited inquiry into the second part of the statute which relates to such subjects. Since the inquiry has been ordered it is proposed that Mr. G. H. Watson, of Toronto, and Mr. Perron, of Montreal, two members of the bar of their respective provinces, shall be assigned for the purpose of assisting Mr. Justice Cassels in the very limited inquiry which he is to carry out. I asked the government whether or not the commissioners, whose report is, to a certain extent at least, under review in these proceedings, were to have any status before that commission, whether they were to be represented by counsel or whether their aid was to be invoked in the matter. Up to the present time no information has been vouchsafed in reply to that question. My hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) inquired of the government whether or not the people of Canada were to be represented by counsel. The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), in reply to that question, stated that the matter would be taken into consideration. Up to the present time we have no reply from the government on that point.

It seems quite clear from this reply of the Prime Minister that he very properly regards the gentlemen who have been appointed as not representing the people of Canada, and the situation seems to be very much like this: The Department of Marine and Fisheries is on trial in respect to its administration of public affairs within the jurisdiction of that department; the government on well known constitutional principles is also on trial because its fate is to a greater or lesser extent involved in the result of the investigation, and two gentlemen both of whom are very prominent Liberals have been appointed to assist Mr. Justice Cassels in that investigation. Now, if I remember rightly, in 1891 when an investigation was carried on in respect of the Department of Public Works the government of Canada employed Mr. B. B. Osler, who was affiliated with the Liberal party and not with the Conservative party, as one of the counsel to investigate that matter and to probe it to the bottom.

Mr. BERGERON. And Mr. Geoffrion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) reminds me of what I was not aware that Mr. Geoffrion, of Montreal, who was also prominently associated with the Liberal party and who afterwards became a member of this government, was also appointed a counsel on that occasion. There is another somewhat remarkable circumstance in connection with this matter and it is this: We have had from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on more than one occasion, the suggestion, or the excuse or the apology put forward that certain matters which had received criticism in connection with the administration of his department were matters for which he was not individually or personally responsible according to his view, because they had been initiated or consummated as the case may be under the administration of his immediate predecessor. And it appears that one of the gentlemen who has been appointed as counsel in this connection to assist Mr. Justice Cassels was for many years a partner in the practice of the law with the immediate predecessor of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. One can hardly appreciate or understand the reasons which have impelled the government to make selections of that character. One would suppose that if the aid of the first commissioners, Messrs. Courtney, Fyshe and Bazin was invoked they at least would have been called upon to make a statement before Mr. Justice Cassels, and that counsel would have been supplied to be nominated by these commissioners to whom they could have given the information and whom they could have instructed as to the matters which they had reported on. One would suppose further, that if that very reasonable course were not adopted the government would at least have endeavoured to appoint men who had not been very actively associated with the Liberal party, who were not very closely in touch with the organization of the Liberal party; in short they would not have selected two men, one of whom Mr. Watson was I understand not very long ago chairman of the Liberal organization for the

province of Ontario, and the other of whom, Mr. Perron was during the lifetime of the predecessor of the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries the partner of that gentleman in the practice of the law. Under these circumstances it is no more than right to bring the matter to the attention of the government and ask whether or not these commissioners are to be represented by counsel, whether or not the people of Canada are to be represented by counsel; and why it is that so extraordinary a choice of gentlemen to assist Mr. Justice Cassels has been made.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I may say at once that so far as the government is concerned nothing will be done to prevent this investigation being as thorough and as extended as possible. As head of that department I have every interest to see that the investigation shall be as complete as it can be. In the very brief interview I had with Judge Cassels the other day I told him that my aim was that officers of the department who had been derelict in their duty should not be spared, and that the cloud on those officers who were not guilty should be removed as speedily as possible. I may say—perhaps my hon. friend will not believe me—but the fact is that I am thoroughly in earnest about this investigation. I want to see the investigation made in such a way that no blame shall be attached to the government or to myself as head of the department as to its precedure. I want to see this investigation conducted in such a way that the people of Canada may be satisfied that the intention of the government and of the department is to make the investigation absolutely right in all respects. I repeat it —I am perhaps more in earnest than he is in wishing that this investigation shall be as thorough as possible. Now, the hon. gentleman finds fault that the investigation is to be held under the second part of chapter 104, but I think there was no discretion for us in the matter. The first part of the statute deals with investigations as to certain public affairs generally, such as the investigation held by the Civil Service Commission, but when we came to a departmental inquiry the statute says it is to be made under the second part of that statute. Whether the investigation is held under the first part or under the second part it can be conducted in absolutely the same way ; it can be as thorough in one case as in the other. It appears to be plain that when the investigation is into a matter of general public interest it comes under the first part of the statute and when it is a departmental investigation it is brought under the second part.

Mr. SPROULE. That would imply there is no public interest in this investigation.

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh, no. The statute determines the class of investigation that shall be held under each part. An inquiry affecting our commerce, or our transportation, or as to combines, would be under the first part of the statute, but a departmental investigation is to be made under the second part of the statute, and after all it really does not make very much difference.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the minister to say that if it related to a matter which concerned the public it should be made under the first part of the statute, and if it were a matter that only concerned the department it was to be made under the second part of the statute. Therefore it occurred to me that if it were made under the second part it implied that the public had no interest in it.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no doubt the public is interested, but I am not the author of the law, and the statute makes this distinction, and under the advice of the Minister of Justice this is the part of the statute under which the investigation should be held. The investigation will however be held just in the same way no matter which it comes under ; witnesses will be examined under oath and the procedure will be the same. My hon. friend says no effort has been made to try to ascertain the opinion of the commission. Well, I suppose that would be a matter for the commissioners themselves to dispose of. It is not for us to suggest to the judge the way in which he should proceed. I want to leave him absolutely free to act as he lkes in this investigation. I would not wish to make any suggestion to him which might be interpreted as restricting him in the exercise of his powers. I repeat that we want this investigation to be thorough ; and if I were to make any suggestion to the judge as to the way in which he should conduct the investigation, I might be reproached by the House with interfering with something that I should not interfere with. The commission gives to the judge the right to investigate this matter, and he is absolutely free, so far as the government or the department are concerned, to act in the way he likes ; and that is the position I will take all through this investigation. My hon. friend says that in several instances I have tried to shield myself behind my predecessor. I can assure my hon. friend that there is no intention of that kind on my part. I have never so far done anything, and never will do anything, to shield myself from any responsibility which attaches to me as Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I am manly enough to act as a man should act in such circumstances, and the responsibility I incur for the acts of my predecessor, I will never try to shield myself from that responsibility by going behind a corpse or a coffin. There are perhaps men in this House or outside of it who cannot understand a man taking that position. It has been stated that one of the

persons selected as a counsel in this investigation has been for some time a partner of my predecessor in office. It is true, before Mr. Préfontaine was a minister, when he was first elected mayor of Montreal, he dissolved partnership with Mr. Perron, and that fact was publicly announced. Do I understand that my hon. friend wants now to attack the character of Mr. Préfontaine? I think it was the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) who said a short time ago that Mr. Préfontaine was an honest man and that there was nothing against him. Do I understand that the hon. member for Grenville is now standing by his words ?

Mr. J. D. REID. I said that if you or any other man on that side of the House was afraid to stand up and defend him, I was prepared to do it. But every one on that side was afraid to do it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand that my hon. friend from Grenville said that there was nothing against Mr. Préfontaine ? If that is the case. why does the hon. leader of the opposition say that we want to prevent the truth coming out so far as Mr. Préfontaine is concerned ? No ; there is nothing that the government want to conceal in this matter. We want the truth and the whole truth to come out, and perhaps we shall find some truth that will surprise somebody.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Mr. Speaker, if we were looking for a party success I believe we should refrain from criticising the position taken by the government, because to my mind they have put themselves in the worst possible position. What are the facts? The government appointed a commission composed of three men in whom they must have had confidence—honest, honourable men. The chairman of that commission was in the Finance Department for over thirty years, enjoying the respect and esteem of both sides of this House ; Mr. Fyshe, of Montreal, well known in commercial circles, and Mr. Bazin, of Quebec. That commission went to work and made a report. That report was entirely against the present administration. With regard to two departments which they investigated, the Marine and Fisheries and the Militia, their report could not have been more severe. They declared that they had not time to investigate the other departments, but from what they heard, if they had had time to investigate them, they would probably have had the same report to make with regard to them all. That is the report. What does the government do ? The government, to place themselves in a good position before the public, should have acted on that report. The man on the street. who is not prejudiced, would have expected the government to act on that report immediately. The man on the street would have expected the government to say to the commission : We want you to continue and go through all the departments ; we want to show the public that we are in earnest, and that if there is anything wrong in any of the departments, we want to put an end to it. But the government of Canada did not do that. They seemed to be disappointed with the report of the commission ; they seemed to think the commission should not have made a report of that kind, and they appointed another commission to investigate the first commission ; that is what it means. It means that the government are under the impression that a new commission will attenuate the report of the first commission. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has said so. He says, we want the employees who are guilty punished and the employees who are not guilty vindicated. That could all be done by the report of the present commission. We do not want another commission for that purpose.

Mr. BRODEUR. There are no names given in the report of the present commission.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend knows very well what it means, however. I am sure he knows.

Mr. COMMEE. What does it mean ?

Mr. BERGERON. I am not appointed as a new commission to make a report. Personally I think the government could not be in a worse position than they are. I think this new commission is entirely useless. We are told that Judge Cassels is an honourable man. I believe that, but what I am surprised at, and I do not see any reason for it, is the idea of appointing lawyers. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says that it was at the suggestion of the judge that these lawyers were appointed. Of course, I take for granted that what he says is true ; but I am astonished that Judge Cassels should have asked for anything of the kind. And who are the lawyers appointed ? My hon. leader has said that when an investigation took place into the Department of Public Works under a Conservative administration, lawyers were appointed at the demand of the Liberal party, then in opposition, to go through the books and other documents in the Public Works offices at that time. The Conservative administration, though having a very large majority, granted that demand. And who were the lawyers appointed ? The government might have appointed some Conservative lawyers ; but instead of that, they appointed two Liberal lawyers at the suggestion of the then opposition. How different that is from the present case. I am told that one of the gentlemen appointed to-day. Mr. Watson, is or has been at the head of the Liberal or-

ganization in the province of Ontario. He may again be president, a strong party man, a strong friend of the present administration. The other one, Mr. Perron, is as strong a partisan as could be found in the whole Dominion of Canada; he has been engaged in nearly every contested election trial that has taken place in Montreal, he is looked upon as the staunchest friend of hon. gentlemen opposite. All his life since he became a lawyer he has been a partner of Mr. Préfontaine. My hon. friend said that Mr. Préfontaine had resigned from that firm. We all know what that means; Mr. Préfontaine was a member of the firm until he died. His name did not appear, but he was a member of the firm of Archer, Perron & Taschereau. And Mr. Perron is called in as a lawyer in this investigation. I would not say a word against his personality, but we all know how far a man can go for party purposes, and I would say, if it was not so serious, what a farce it would be to have a report from Mr. Cassels assisted by Mr. Perron and Mr. Watson against the report of a commission appointed by this government less than a year ago. The government could not be in a worse position. The appointment of Mr. Perron may satisfy the Liberals of Montreal, staunch Liberals who expect something from the government —because those are the only ones to-day who stand by them—but the independent elector, the man who is looking for an honest report, will certainly blame the administration and will have no confidence in the report that Judge Cassels will make. This is another way of spending money, this is another part of the combine. Judge Cassels, I understand, will not be paid any extra fee, he is paid as judge of the Exchequer Court about $8,000 a year. But how will the two lawyers be paid? I believe they will be paid $100 a day each. I do not believe that Mr. Perron would work for less than $100 a day, and he would be very foolish to do so, because if he asks that amount he will get it. How long will the inquiry last? I repeat that the man on the street, the public, will be disgusted with the lavish way in which this government is spending the public money. I am sorry for the good of Canada that the commission which made the first report has not been called upon to go through every department in Ottawa. The government should be interested in having such an investigation. When I look at the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance I have no doubt they are interested in seeing whether proper investigation is made into every department at Ottawa. We will not have such an investigation, as that branch of the inquiry is finished; this will be an investigation of the investigation. It will be something done to try and whitewash what has been said in condemnation of the two departments in which the investigation has been going on.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman sees that the commissioners in their report say there is a lack of conscience on the part of some officers of the department. At the same time no names are mentioned, no persons are singled out. Does he think I should continue to administer the department with the same staff without taking the proper steps to investigate and find out who are the guilty parties?

Mr. BERGERON. I want to say that my hon. friend could have done all that if he wanted to, without having a new commission.

Mr. BRODEUR. How would you do it?

Mr. BERGERON. I am not going to tell my hon. friend and the House. I will tell my hon. friend privately, it could be done in two hours. When the commission makes a report that in his department money is lavished, that it is the most extravagant department at Ottawa, that it is squandering money, that it has no conscience, that there is only one aim, to spend money, that no discount is obtained as in ordinary trade, it is clear as day to me. The money is not used for religious purposes, it has gone somewhere. Why the hon. member does not need to appoint another commission; in two hours he could find a remedy and could save the money of the country.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I think the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and the leader of the opposition also, have an entirely erroneous impression of the nature of the inquiry on which Judge Cassels is about to enter. They have assumed that the inquiry of Mr. Justice Cassels is a review of the work of the commission whose report has already been presented to the House. Nothing could be more erroneous than that conception of Judge Cassels' duty.

Mr. BERGERON. What is it then?

Mr. FIELDING. Judge Cassels' duty is to inquire into certain matters as to which the commission seemed to have failed to prosecute their investigation to the end. The commissioners' report may be deemed to be divided into two parts. One part of it relates to the ordinary questions of the civil service, such as the conditions of admission, examinations, promotions, salaries, &c., questions of a broad and important class. In addition to that there is another branch and that probably is the branch which has received the most attention and consideration by the public, that is the accusation made in somewhat general terms, of not mismanagement, but much worse. It is practically stated in the report of two of the commissioners, Messrs. Fyshe and Bazin, that there has been corruption in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The word is not used but my hon. friend says he knows what the report means.

Mr. BERGERON. So do you.

Mr. FIELDING. No, I will be frank and say I do not know what it means. I know in a general way, but I certainly think, with all deference to the gentlemen composing the commission, for whom I have the greatest respect, that on that particular point it is a fair criticism to say that the commission has said either too much or too little. If they wished to go into that branch of the question—and I do not say they should not have done so—as to whether or not the officials in the service were corrupt, then they were bound in justice to themselves, to the House, and the individuals concerned, to go further, and say in some detail who was corrupt and wherein the corruption lay. That is the only criticism I offer on the report of the commission. As to its general recommendations, I do not call them in question. We will have to deal with them later. My hon. friend says: Why not deal with them? Whether or not we will deal with them has to be considered. If we fail to deal with them at all, we shall be no worse than hon. gentlemen opposite who had a similar report in 1892, kept it for four years and did nothing.

Mr. BERGERON. It was not complete.

Mr. FIELDING. The report was most complete, and if my hon. friend does not want to take the trouble to read it, he may have seen in the Ottawa Conservative paper in the last week, three or four letters from a civil service official, calling attention to the fact that years ago, in 1892, four years before the Conservative government left office, a report was made by a civil service commission dealing with practically the same classes of questions as are referred to in this report, the question of the political influence exercised in relation to patronage, the inequality of salaries, the purchase of supplies—all these questions were reported on by that commission, which included one of the gentlemen who sat on the recent commission. The hon. gentlemen opposite remained in power for four years from the date of that report without attempting any remedy whatever. So, if it should be the policy of this government, and I hope it will not, to pay no attention whatever to the report of the commission, if we should be simply content to receive it, pigeon-hole it and forget it, we would be on even terms with my hon. friends opposite, because that was precisely their course with regard to the report of the commission of 1892 as will be explained later on if necessary.

Mr. BERGERON. The report of the commission of 1892 and the report of the last commission are not at all alike.

Mr. FIELDING. Let me mention some respects in which they are alike. They are alike in the allegation that political patronage enters largely into appointments.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes. That is not a crime.

Mr. FIELDING. That is not a crime, but the commissioners said that was a great evil. They said that in 1892 and it is said by the present commissioners. But while in 1892, that evil, so far as it is an evil, was pictured by that commission in their report just as it is pictured to-day, the Conservative government of that day pigeon-holed the report and took no notice of it.

Mr. BERGERON. And the same thing may happen in this case, so far as that point is concerned.

Mr. FIELDING. If it should happen, then my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) will be in a position to assail us; but the time has not come yet.

Mr. BERGERON. I say it is not a crime. It is something that takes time and is very hard to do. But when the commission said that stealing goes on, that robbery goes on, that corruption exists, it is a very different thing.

Mr. FIELDING. But I want to come to some other things in the commission of 1892. That commission reported on the question of supplies. We had a debate here, not many days ago, on that question. Whatever evils there may be in regard to the patronage element in the purchase of supplies existed in 1892; it was reported on in 1892; it was fully exposed to the Conservative government of that day,—and they took no notice of it. In that respect, the report of 1892 and the report of the present day are substantially alike. My hon. friend says there is corruption, there is dishonesty——

Mr. BERGERON. 'Lack of conscience.'

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, 'lack of conscience'. Now, my hon. friend says he knows what that means. I wish to be candid and to say that, as respects any officer of the Marine and Fisheries Department, I do not know what it means. I know what it means generally; I know what thieving, robbery means. But surely my hon. friend would not have this government, on the strength of that report—which, on that branch of the subject, I say is incomplete,—he would not have the Minister of Marine and Fisheries dismiss men now in the service on the ground of dishonesty. Would he have these men, some of them employed for many years in the public service, branded with the charge of dishonesty and dismissed? Surely he would not. He may suggest that now, but if he had that sense of responsibility which men in public office ought to have, he would say that such a course would be utterly unfair and unjust.

Mr. BERGERON. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) allow me? That is

what is going to happen if what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says is carried out. He says that he wants a commission to find out and punish the men——

Mr. FIELDING. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) says he knows who these men are.

Mr. BERGERON. It is clear, for instance, that they are not the officers of the Department of Finance. They are employees of this department which has been reported upon.

Mr. FIELDING. But the hon. gentleman will see that 'employees of the Marine and Fisheries Department' is a broad and general expression. The misfortune is that the commission,—unintentionally ; they are not lawyers, but good business men—have generalized in such a way as to leave the whole department under a cloud as respects dishonesty.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Will the minister (Mr. Fielding) allow me a question ? Why did not the government refer this back to the commissioners to find out who these men are ?

Mr. FIELDING. The commission, in the first place, had unlimited power. They had the right to report as they have done, of course. They were free to take their own course. They took all the time they wanted. And they reported to the best of their judgment. Unfortunately, they left this particular branch of the business in an unfinished state ; and it is the unfinished business as respects the reflections upon the integrity of the Department of Marine and Fisheries that Mr. Justice Cassels has been asked to inquire into. Not the integrity of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ; that is not called into question. Let there be no misunderstanding on that point. We know the doctrine of constitutional responsibility and we accept it. If an official of my department in Victoria, B.C., should betray his trust and steal the public money, there is a constitutional sense in which I should be responsible, and so should my right hon. friend the Prime Minister and all my colleagues. We know, I say, what constitutional responsibility is, and we are prepared to accept that without the slightest hesitation. But there is more than the mere question of constitutional responsibility in this matter. So far as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is concerned, let it be stated clearly and beyond all question that there is not a a line in the report of the Civil Service Commission which, even in the most shadowy way, reflects upon the integrity, the honour or the independence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur). It is not pretended that there is any responsibility upon the minister other than that constitutional responsibility which we are ready to accept. But there is not only the constitutional responsibility which I have described, there is the individual responsibility for acts of dishonesty. Now the commission have given it to be understood that there have been acts of dishonesty on the part of officials of the Marine and Fisheries Department. It is not fair to leave these officials, many of them old employees in the public service, under that imputation. And so, with a view to prosecuting the inquiry further, this reference is made to Mr. Justice Cassels. There can be no question as to the propriety of that course. While, in the case of questions of classification of officials, salaries of officials and matters of that character, the opinion of any good business man may be valuable, yet, when you come to make an inquiry that will affect a man's honour, his character, his repputation his standing in life, who so well qualified to conduct that investigation, as a judge of one of the higher courts? Surely, if we were to have a further inquiry into that branch of the question, it was eminently fitting that the inquiry should be conducted by a gentleman holding the high position of Judge Cassels.

With regard to the selection of the legal gentleman, I think there is an important difference between the situation in 1891 and the situation of to-day. In the proceedings in 1891, accusations were made against members of this House—accusations, I might almost say, against ministers, because they involved ministers in the end. But that is not the situation to-day. There is no accusation here against any minister ; there is nothing alleged in the report of the Civil Service Commission which, even if proved to the last point, would call for the retirement of any hon. member of this House. There is no allegation of wrong as affecting any minister or member of this House. The allegation is of lack of conscience, in fact, of dishonesty, on the part of some of these officials. Now, it so happens that most of the officials of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, especially the older officials and those holding more responsible positions, were appointed in years gone by by the Conservative government. What would have been said if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to-day, acting upon that vague and indefinite report—for, upon that branch of the subject, it is vague and indefinite—had proceeded to dismiss officials appointed years ago by the Conservative party, with no better grounds than the indefinite statements of that report ? What would have been said by gentlemen opposite ? They would have been the first to attack the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. They would have said : You had not any evidence ; you had only vague and general charges ; but you seized upon these and made them the excuse for dismissing old officials appointed by the

Conservative government. We were not prepared to give occasion for an accusation of that character. I trust that, no matter who might be the officials concerned, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would not be willing to take that course. But, when we remembered that a charge of that kind would affect the chief officials, when we remembered that these were gentlemen who have occupied positions in the civil service for many years and who had received their appointments from the preceding government, I think that every consideration of right and fairness and justice would lead us to say that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries took the right course when he declared that he would not dismiss men on the strength of this report, but inasmuch as their honour, their conscience has been called in question, has declared that he will carry on a further inquiry on that particular branch of the subject—not reviewing the report of the commission, but taking up the case where the commission left it off —and, in the light of such a full and fair investigation as shall take place, then let justice be done.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). The defence which has been put up by the two hon. gentlemen who have spoken has shot wide entirely of the mark, so far as it attempted to answer the very temperate observations which were made by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries thought that all he had to do to answer that was, in the first place, to make repeated and strong asseverations of his own honour and integrity and his complete desire to see the public service purged, and then he wound up with an ill-concealed threat that before he got through with the investigation we on this side of the House would find out something that we did not know before. The threat was a very plain one; he has used it so often that the moment the hon. gentleman frames his lips we know exactly what is coming. The threat concealed in part, but still open enough, is : We will have our vengeance out of you anyway, because we will punish some of the old officials belonging to the Marine Department. Now, that was not very dignified, not very satisfactory, nor was it politically a very astute defence for the hon. gentleman to make in reference to matters in his department. He has been very anxious indeed to separate himself absolutely from the department. His colleagues are equally anxious, because they know as well as he does that it is impossible constitutionally or practically to separate the head of the department from misdoings of the department itself. They are all very anxious to make it clear if they can to the public, if they cannot make it so to this House, that it does not matter at all to the heads of departments into what depths of inefficiency, or confusion, or blundering, or waste, or extravagance, or worse, the department under their charge may fall. They have no responsibility in the matter, the Finance Minister, in fact, stated it in so many words. He said : There is nothing that reflects upon the head of the department, there is no responsibility attached to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for this matter. Those are about the plain assertions that are made. You can carry on no government in modern times under an assumption of that kind. We know that it is the very essence of the strength and efficiency of a government under our forms to hold the minister to his responsibilities as the executive head of the department over which he presides, and no asseverations of my hon. friend can divorce him from that position and from that constitutional responsibility.

Now, the Minister of Finance, thinking perhaps that his colleague had not been very brilliant in his defence, takes another tack, and he makes a defence something on this line : Attack the other fellow. There was in 1892 a Civil Service Commission, and it reported to you, and you gentlemen on the other side pigeon-holed that report for four years. Let me ask my hon. friend a question. Is he not able to get beyond the idea that these are simply party matters? Does he not know that they are matters that belong to the state? If a Royal Commission in 1892 made a report on the civil service, it was a report to the state, to Canada, and not simply to the party who happened to appoint the Royal Commission. He concludes that we were derelict, and that he has done sufficient to make his own case good when he says: You pigeonholed that report four years. Did he not see that in making that very statement he was also stating that he and his government pigeon-holed that report for twelve years succeeding the four years? It was a Royal Commission report on the state of the service that these gentlemen in 1896 had before them; they were responsible for the service; they had facts reported by the commission, and if the facts were as stated by my hon. friend, grave facts that ought to have resulted in action, he and his party are absolutely responsible for the inaction from 1896 up to the present time, as we were, in his estimation, for the inaction from 1892 to 1896. But after all, what stock does the country take in that simple statement that you did not do as you should have done in the four years you had that report before you, and therefore our skirts are clear ?

Now, there are some things that are peculiar with reference to this matter. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries came into the department succeeding his immediate predecessor, the Hon. Mr. Prefontaine. He has been in that department for two years. Presumably he has done as a minister should have done, and proceeded to

make himself acquainted with that department, with its methods of work, with the duties it had to perform, with all the general direction of the affairs which came under that department, and for the direction of which he as a minister was absolutely responsible. They were all before him, he had the files of the department and the reports of his own officers. If he had used reasonable diligence, if he had walked through one of those outside agencies, if he had asked half a dozen questions of the men therein employed, if he had looked into the reports which lay in his department and came in from month to month, he would have understood in what a loose manner, in what an inefficient, confused and blundering manner, to say no worse, that department was being carried on. Has he done so ? If he has not, he is responsible for not doing so. It is impossibe for him to say: All I have to do is to draw my salary as minister and look after the appointment of the party officials and the like of that. He is appointed at his salary to take charge of the department, and it is his duty as a minister to master that department, and every minister who is doing his duty to himself and his country does so. Take the Minister of Agriculture. The Minister of Agriculture did not sit down and justify himself and satisfy himself by simply handing out a slip of paper or giving instructions to the deputy minister of his department. When he came into his department he knew nothing about it ; so with every other minister. The man who knows what his duty is goes into his department and masters its details so far as he possibly can, in so far at least as is necessary to give him an adequate idea of how the business is going on. My hon. friend did not do that. What is the glaring instance that shows he did not? Take the Falconer case. One day he met a man by the name of Falconer on the wharf, or somewhere else in Montreal.

He did not know anything about him, did not know what staff he had, did not know where his offices were, did not know what work he was doing and did not know how he was doing his work. He had a conference—may be another. What then does he do? Without questioning him, without getting a schedule of prices, without informing himself as to the time it would take to do this work, without limiting this man as to the number of men he was to employ, or as to the amount that he was to pay them, he gave him carte blanche to go on, go through the department and run up a bill of $50,000. And, the work is not half done. That bill of $50,000 was run up before the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was in possession of the scale of prices that Falconer was going to charge him. Until the day when we brought him on the witness stand in the Public Accounts Committee he did not know that there was such a firm as Gunn, Richards & Co. of New York, which had really been doing the work and that this man Falconer was merely a touter for work, being paid a liberal salary and commission on all the work he got for the New York firm. He handed over a simple letter to his deputy head. There is no instance in which a minister has ever made so difficult a problem for his officers as this hon. gentleman did when he handed over that memorandum or letter, signed by himself, without one single instruction, without one single line as to the schedule of prices, without any intimation at all to his responsible officers and then holds them responsible for what he himself failed to do. No minister who initiates business in that way can clear himself of the responsibility. And what an example to set to his department! Does the minister think that he has no responsibility in the matter? I doubt if to this day he has seen that schedule of prices upon which he made that hard and fast agreement by word of mouth, or simply by a letter bearing his own initials. Does he think that he can escape from all blame for initiating business in that way? What word of reproof can he give to his subordinates when he initiates business in that way? Talk about confusion, no head, no direction, no conscience! What direction, what head, what system, what conscience was shown by an arrangement such as that which was made by the minister in the Falconer case?

Well this investigation went on by the Civil Service Commission. Let it be noted by this House and the country that the hon. gentlemen who appointed that commission never expected a report on these lines. They did not ask for it, they did not want it. They got more than they wanted when they got it, and they showed their testiness the very moment that the report came down. The very first thing that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries did was to get up and attack his own commission for going beyond their bounds. What next developed in the country? The hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) got up in his own constituency and attacked the commissioners for going beyond their powers and making a report upon what had not been entrusted to them. Here are two ministers; these two ministers' utterances show that these hon. gentlemen got more than they bargained for. They cannot very well get up and express their dissatisfaction with reference to what their commissioners report and criticise them for it without laying themselves open to the charge that they did not expect a report upon these matters by these gentlemen. They appointed them as to the question of salaries, the cost of living and the classification of the service without expecting any more than a report upon these matters.

Now, Sir, what happens next? That report came in on the 17th of last month.

More than a month has passed and the report, as incisive, full and particular as it is, lies there to this day without another move. They have spoken of the commission that they themselves appointed and in reference to its constituents they have given it the highest praise; yet the report declares that there is a department without a head and without a conscience. A month has passed and what has been done? Hon. gentlemen say, and this order in council says, to put it in plain English, that inasmuch as certain general accusations or inferences have been made in the report, that there has not been strict business honesty in carrying on the affairs of the department, we will have a commission which will examine really into what?—to find out whether anybody has taken bribes or has been guilty of personal dishonesty as regards the carrying out of the transactions of the department as employees of the same. That is all. Judge Cassels is not to touch upon the weightiest of all matters, the utter disorganization, inefficiency and lack of business method in the department. These gentlemen say: We want to find out the truth; we do not want these general accusations to lie against any members of our staff and consequently we will appoint Judge Cassels to look into it. But, before Judge Cassels is appointed and before he does a stroke of work the minister himself undertakes to do what they say they want a commission to do, and he has suspended, one, two, or three of his officers and is conducting a departmental inquiry of his own. Why, what he wanted Judge Cassels appointed for was to do that very thing, and it seems to me that the hon. gentleman who presides over that department ought not for a single instance to have undertaken any inquiry into these matters himself when they were relegated to the commissioner who was appointed for that purpose and who was appointed because of these very reasons and these only.

The hon. Minister of Justice was good enough to say, in his speech in his own constituency, that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was carrying on an investigation in his own department, that he was weeding out the Tory goats from the Liberal sheep, I suppose, and further it was asserted by the Minister of Justice, who had appointed a commission to find out something which he did not know, and which the government wanted to know, that the Tory goats should be well punished by dismissal for their wrong-doings in the matter of their departmental work. What a spectacle it is to have a government, which wants to know something and cannot make a decision until it finds it out and has Judge Cassels appointed to investigate; pronouncing judgment themselves as individual members of the cabinet! The Minister of Marine and Fisheries did so and the Minister of Justice, of all men in the world, did so in his speech in his own constituency the other night. That is British justice. That is one way of doing things, but it does not seem to me to be the best way. Ah, but the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was wonderfully anxious to find out just who had been doing these things. There had been different accusations, if you call them such, but which I would rather call inferences, by Messrs. Courtney, Fyshe and Bazin. What would be simpler than to say to these gentlemen: We want you to give us the facts from which you drew these inferences. These gentlemen are responsible men; they have the Prime Minister's and the government's own endorsement of their character and ability.

They went into it themselves, they investigated it, they made their report and the inferences or accusations are a part of that report. If the government wanted to know exactly who they were, what more simple than to ask these gentlemen to further amend the report by giving the special instances. That would have been an easy thing to do. Why, if the government wanted the information did they not take that short business cut and get the information that the commissioners have on their note books or within their minds, because it is they who made the report in which these accusations or inferences are brought out which are referred to Judge Cassels. What happens now ? The Minister of Marine and Fisheries says he is intensely desirous that the whole truth shall be brought out and what does he do ? He appoints a commission to investigate himself under the idea that he is not investigating himself but certain officials in his department. It is a commission appointed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself as the order in council goes, differently worded from a general commission. And then the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who is the person responsible, who is the person implicated and the person whom the public will hold responsible ; he appoints his own counsel to carry on the prosecution in the case, absolutely appoints his own counsel. He is being tried, his efficiency or inefficiency is to be shown in this investigation. Talk as you like, if this gentleman who is at the head of the department has guided for two years a department with that sort of thing going on and has not found it out and has not reformed it and has not put it in good directive condition, the minister himself must have the responsibility. He is the man who is really on trial and yet he appoints a commissioner who is for all we know to carry on the investigation in camera, and then he appoints two red hot partisans in order to shield himself and his department. There cannot be any other inference. Hon. gentlemen may say what they please. They may try to make themselves believe what they please but the country at large will not be satisfied with that kind of dealing. The country will say:

These gentlemen want to mitigate the force of a report which has struck them hard and they try to mitigate it by appointing an in camera investigation and then by putting their own hard and fast partisans on to carry out the investigation. But, you say, Judge Cassels will carry on the investigation. Yes, but these are the counsel through whom he is to carry it on. They are the men that are to advise what witnesses should be brought and what cases should be taken up. They are the men who are to steer the whole investigation. Judge Cassels, cannot do it, it is not his position, he is in the way of a judge, an inquiring judge of course. But the cases have to be brought and the witnesses have to be brought, and who shall be shielded and who shall not be shielded, that is the part of Mr. Perron and of Mr. Watson and they are being paid their fees in order to do that part. Now, will the country stand for that sort of thing ? I ask my right hon. friend if he thinks the country will. If he is imagining such a vain thing as that he will wake up some day and find he is mistaken in his imaginings. The least the government can do is to make the investigation openly. If they want some of their own partisans to defend themselves let them get them and pay the country's money for that if necessary; but let them put some one there who has at heart the State's interest and no other interest than the State's interest, as a prosecutor to bring evidence and to bring up the cases. For instance, what is one of the glaring cases. It is with reference to your Commissioner of Lights. Now, Sir, we have been told by the Minister of Justice that these were Tory goats who had got the Minister of Marine and Fisheries into all this trouble. Was the Commissioner of Lights a Tory goat ? Will you take his appointment and his salary when these gentlemen came into power in 1896 ; will you take his specific appointments since and his increases of salary from time to time, and the responsibilities that have been put upon him ; will you put all this together and say that it was simply a Tory goat that was working all this time, and that it was the purpose of the minister to weed him out from the Liberal sheep in that department. This is a gentleman who was appointed by the minister, who was chosen by the minister, who was given almost absolute power by the minister, who went into the business of the buoys and fog signals as though, to look at the commissioner's report, he were the paid employee of these two great concerns interested chiefly in finding out how much he could buy from them and where he could find a place to store the goods before they were wanted for actual use. The minister cannot escape from the responsibility in that case. Was it a Tory goat who made the arrangement with Falconer, an arrangement which on the face of it is so child-like and so unbusinesslike that you would think no sane man, mature and grown up man would be guilty of. None of these things were committed by these Tory goats. Now I ask the minister if he proposes to go into that transaction of his Commissioner of Lights, who, to the extent of $1,600,000 worth of new apparatus within two years patronized one single concern and caused the commission to say, as they went through the astounding history, that it looked as if that body had their own servant at work in the department. Will the minister have Judge Cassels root that out from the bottom ? Is that a portion of Judge Cassel's work ? Will Mr. Watson, King's Councel, take it up and push it ? Will Mr. Perron go into that business ? Is that what is to be done, or, are these gentlemen simply in chamber to find out how little they can bring out, how much they can shield the government and how far they can go to keep the grand old party from getting what is rightly its due ? They have been 12 years in power, they have had their chosen men in that department and at the end of that time it is pictured to the public as a department without a head, without direction, and without conscience. The people of this country want a full investigation, they want it in the light of open day, they want it fair and not loaded, they want to see somebody who is not a paid and partisan friend of the minister, interested in bringing the evidence and in making there searches before Judge Cassels.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). The Minister of Finance seemed to take comfort to himself that there was no imputation against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the report of the Royal Commission. I take distinct issue with the hon. gentleman upon this point. What I complain of particularly in regard to the reference to Judge Cassels is that it is an isolated charge taken out of the body of the charges made by the commissioners, in which is included a charge and imputation against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as distinct a charge as could possibly be made. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that in the report, both before and after the statement which is referred to Judge Cassels, there are statements equally as damaging as the statement which is referred to the judge. And when the minister says in the order in council :

> The minister observes that some statements are made in that report which affect the honour and integrity of the officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

He fails to grasp the significance and meaning of the Royal Commission because that report, as I read it, is not directed to the officers of the department alone but to the head of the department as well. Let us see whether this is correct or not. They say on page 33 :

Your commissioners have spent a large amount of time trying to get an insight into the general administration of the government business, as shown in the management of this department. They found that to make any efficient inspection was a matter of enormous difficulty.

And they point out the reasons for that. They indicate that they have not made an exhaustive inquiry; but they leave it as a clear inference that, if the government desires to know the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, they are quite prepared to go on and investigate further. I want to call your attention to the fact that they are speaking, not of goats or of sheep, but of a department; and when they are speaking of a department, they are speaking of an hon. gentleman who is at the head of the department, and who said this afternoon that more than all he desired a complete and thorough and extensive investigation. On page 34 they say :

There are officers enough in the department, both inside and outside, to do all the work efficiently, if they were properly trained and organized; but there is no efficient organization.

Are they pointing at the subordinates or at the head? I understand that the head is responsible for the organization, and if the head is not able to perform the duties of the organization for which he is responsible, he should resign. They go on to say :

It is practially impossible to fix responsibility on anybody.

Does that responsibility rest upon these unfortunate subordinates whom the minister has suspended, whom he tries himself and makes guilty by his own act before a proper investigation is had? The report continues :

The deputy is supposed to shoulder responsibility for everything, as his signature shows; but that means that he speaks for 'the department' and 'the department,' like the King, can do no wrong.

That we hardly believe.

Mr. FOSTER. Theoretically.

Mr. LENNOX. Theoretically only, of course. The commissioners go on to say:

There seems to be a huge redundancy of work, which proceeds in a lumbering haphazard way, giving rise to constant blundering and confusion.

Whose act is that? Is that the act of the deputy head? Is that the act of a chief clerk or of a second-class clerk, or is it the act of the responsible minister of the Crown, who is at the head of the Marine and Fisheries Department? I take it, that applies to the head of the department—that 'there seems to be a huge redundancy of work, which proceeds in a lumbering, haphazard way, giving rise to constant blundering and confusion.' Does the minister want to leave that on record? Is he satisfied that his department should be so characterized? Then they say :

There is no sign visible of a single directing head or an intelligent purpose, unless it be that of spending as much money as possible.

Who is the head of that department? Who should be the single directing head? Who should be the man of intelligent purpose to control the expenditure of the department, and to see that extravagance and dishonesty and graft do not prevail? Who but the minister, who says: Wait till we have an investigation, and we will show what will surprise some hon. gentlemen—meaning, with that cowardly threat, that Conservative members of his department will suffer. We have it so far pretty clear that these gentlemen are speaking, not of subordinates, but of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. What are they talking of? They are talking of paying two prices where we should only pay one; they are talking of paying dishonest prices when we should only pay honest prices; and does the minister want to escape on the plea that for two long years all this has been going on in his department and he has been absolutely ignorant of the fact that we have been paying for goods at these dishonest and extravagant prices? These gentlemen go on to say :

Zeal for economy and good management, or pride in the work, is not visible.

What are they speaking of? They are speaking, as the heading indicates, of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. No attack, says my hon. friend, upon the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; no imputation against him; and my hon. friend waxes eloquent on that point, and thinks he has settled the question. I want to say here and now that we have not all the people before the court in this inquiry before Judge Cassels; that when it is referred to Judge Cassels to try the officals of this department, the record is not complete; that if you are to have a fair trial, an honest trial, a thorough and efficient trial, which the minister says he desires, it would not be alone to find out whether certain officials of the department are guilty or not, but to find out where the minister stands in regard to this matter as well. They go on to say:

Perfunctory and mechanical discharge of duties is the rule, with apparently no perception of any need for improvement.

And I suppose that if there were any improvement inaugurated, it would naturally be by the head of the department. Then the report says :

The lack of organization and of organizing power in the department has recently been very conspicuously and painfully illustrated

by the fact that the accountant's or bookkeeping branch had apparently fallen into such confusion that expert accountants had to be called in to put things to rights and create some intelligible system. After months of work by these highly paid experts, the result has been at least greatly improved books as far as mechanical form is concerned, but probably little else; and this achievement has been accomplished at an almost fabulous expense.

Then we come to the paragraph which my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has seen fit to refer to Judge Cassels; but, mark you, he did not see fit to refer the whole of it. He thought it desirable to leave out the first sentence, which shows the meaning of a great deal of what follows :

There is not only a lack of efficient organization and method in the department.

Then follows what my hon. friend refers to Judge Cassels :

There would also seem to be a lack of conscience.

A lack of conscience where, when you take the whole clause? A lack of conscience in the department, and so in the hon. minister himself. I need not follow with what is set out in the order in council, as my hon. friend has had it printed; but I may point out that this does not. even as printed here, mean that the commissioners thought the officials were responsible, but means that they were of opinion that the minister was responsible; and to show that I will read what is set out here. I will read just what is said following the words in reference to the department :

There would also seem to be a lack of conscience. In connection with the enormous expenditures which are deemed necessary, the word 'discount' never appears. It is tacitly assumed there is no such thing; but the whole commercial world knows otherwise. If no one gets any benefit from trade with the government except the trader, then it must be clear that in these great purchases made for the government, without discount, its officers must be assisting the trader to get better prices from the government than he can get anywhere else; for everywhere else he has to give a discount.

Down to that point there is nothing to indicate that it is the officials who are charged with dishonesty ; it is a general charge of dishonesty in the administration of the department at the expense of the country. What follows shows clearly that the commissioners had it in their minds that the officials are doing this either in ignorance or upon an intimation that the government wants it done in this way.

In other words, some of the government officials are serving two masters and apparently succeeding with both—scripture notwithstanding——

Whom do the commissioners mean by two masters ? They mean serving the seller and the buyer. The buyer is the minister ; they are serving two masters, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and at the same time the men who are selling to the department. Does anybody believe, with our experience of what has taken place in the last eleven or twelve years, that this thing is done for love or for any other purpose than to enable these men who sell to the government to have the means, if they see fit, to assist the government when a crisis comes and an election is coming on ? No other reasonable construction can be put upon this paragraph than that these officers have either acted ignorantly or are acting by connivance with the government in paying prices much too high. That is borne out more strongly still by the expression.

—and apparently succeeding with both.

If the commissioners had not in their minds that they were acting in concert with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, why should they use that phrase that they were apparently succeeding with both, scripture notwithstanding ? The minister is endeavouring to narrow this inquiry and secure an unfair advantage because if he had wanted to have the thorough, broad and complete investigation he says, why should he select this paragraph out of what I have read and what follows and refer that merely to the judge. He is not giving Judge Cassels a proper chance to try this case at all. If we are to believe what the minister says as to his desire for a full investigation, would he not have made the investigation as broad as I have suggested ? The minister seemed to have a doubt as to whether we could believe him. He said : I do not know whether hon. gentlemen will believe me or not but my object is to have a full and thorough investigation. Let me say to him now that if he had been desirous of convincing the members of the opposition or, what is far more important, the people of Canada, of his bona fides and honesty in this matter, he would have secured that end by referring to Judge Cassels, not an isolated sentence but the whole matter of his department, or else referring it back to the commissioners who had cast the aspersions upon him and his department.

The Minister of Finance also says that this is not a review. It is not a review, it is a good deal more than that, it is an attack upon the Royal Commission and as it stands to-day it is an appeal. The very day that this report was placed upon the table of the House the minister made an attack. He did not conceal his motive, he was clear and distinct. His statements are on 'Hansard'. He stated what he thought of this report and amongst other things claimed that the commissioners had gone beyond their duties and beyond the scope of what was referred to them. I

care not whether they went beyond the scope of what was referred to them or not, they have found a certain amount of truth, they have laid it before the House and if the minister wanted to ascertain the names of the men referred to in the report it would have been an easy matter to consult the commissioners. But the minister made his attack and then he followed it up. And what is he doing now? He is putting these commissioners upon trial. The language he uses in his own order of reference, in the order in council, makes that perfectly plain.

The minister observes that some statements are made in the report which affect the honour and integrity of officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. On page 61 of the report the following paragraph appears.

Then he quotes the paragraph.

The minister further observes that it is assumed by that statement that commissions are received improperly, or enhanced prices paid through dishonesty on the part of officials of the Department of Militia and Defence.

I have already pointed out that it is not confined to the officials of the Marine and Fisheries Department. He says then, as the result of the whole matter:

The minister therefore recommends that he be authorized to appoint the Hon. Walter Cassels a commissioner under part 2 of chapter 104 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, to investigate and report upon the foregoing statements contained in the said report.

His department is on trial but he selects his own judge. No one will argue for one moment that in view of the language used by the hon. gentleman himself, this is not a clear and distinct appeal and an endeavour to reverse the statement of the commissioners in regard to the matter just quoted. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) asked the other day whether the government intended to appoint anybody to represent these commissioners. Their action has been called into question, their finding has been challenged, the matter is referred to Judge Cassels, with the hope evidently that the findings of this commission will be reversed. Under such circumstances would it not seem honest and fair, Mr. Speaker, that instead of the gentleman whose department is attacked first selecting his own judge, them proceeding to try some of the offenders himself before the investigation could come on and then selecting two eminent counsel who are clearly identified with his party and with this department, somebody should have been appointed to represent Canada and to represent these gentlemen who have had the bravery to make this report to the government. The minister has seen fit to take another course. I have not a word to say against Judge Cassels.

But I have this to say—and I think I shall be upheld in the country if not in this House—that this whole affair is inconclusive. I venture the prediction that this trial will result in the same kind of farce as did the West Elgin election trial some years ago, in which also Mr. Watson figured. I say that, not because I have no faith in Judge Cassels—I have every faith in him; I believe that if he were given a chance he would get at the bottom of this matter; but I have pointed out that he is not given a chance; he is bound by the terms of the order of reference in such a way that he cannot possibly investigate this matter as it ought to be investigated in the public interest. And this I say because the government has shown a desire to follow the methods of their friends in Ontario in the West Elgin case and their own methods in the insurance investigation of a more recent day. The minister says there must be a full and thorough investigation. But how is it to be accomplished? Behind closed doors. A full and thorough investigation was promised when the insurance commission was appointed. But what happened? The moment counsel appeared on behalf of parties interested, Judge MacTavish refused, at the instance of Mr. Shepley, to allow that counsel to ask a question. And the same method will be pursued in this investigation. Why should not counsel appear and have a status in this investigation? Why should the doors be closed? The officials of the department over which my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) presides, officials of whom he is the guardian in a sense, are attacked; they are on trial. Yet, I venture to say that, with all his boasted sense of justice and his boasted desire for a full and fair investigation, he would not allow the counsel of these gentlemen to appear in order that a fair investigation may be held. A cloud may rest upon the officials, or it may rest upon those who are higher than the officials. And, in that condition of things, is it fair—or is it not an outrage?—to commit the matter to two counsel, one being Mr. Watson, who has been all his life identified with the workings of the Ross administration, and the other, this gentleman from Quebec, who is identified clearly and completely with the department under investigation, and both selected by my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur)? So, I have no hesitation in saying that this investigation will be a farce in its progress and a farce in its results.

Let us see how these things are worked out. Mr. Watson will be the senior counsel in this matter. I have nothing to say against him personally. So far as a man can be said to be a good man who is of his political persuasion and has always been mixed up with the managing of the machine,

he is a fairly good man. But I do not think that this kind of thing adds to a professional man's morality in the end. Mr. Watson is the gentleman who engineered the West Elgin election case, and he is the gentleman who will guide this proceeding. I do not think he will go as far as Mr. Shepley went in the insurance inquiry. Mr. Shepley was the counsel throughout the entire insurance investigation ; he guided and shaped the evidence, and every question by anybody else had to percolate through Mr. Shepley and he had to give his own interpretation to it in propounding it to the witness. And at the end, when all the evidence was in, you will say, Mr. Shepley, after addressing the commission, went about his business leaving them to decide. Nothing of the kind ; Mr. Shepley remained, as we have been told in this House to assist and direct the judges, before whom he had pleaded, in arriving at their conclusions. We shall have a better state of things, I believe, in this case, for the reason that I have faith in Judge Cassels and feel sure that he will not consent to anything of that kind. But, still, we shall have an investigation guided by Mr. Watson. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), in one breath told us that he had told Judge Cassels the other day that he was to have a full and thorough investgation——

Mr. FOSTER. That was gratuitous.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes. That he was to find out the guilty parties and spare them not. (But in the next breath, the minister tells us that it would be improper for him to instruct the judge as to what he should do. That is only in passing, however.) What I particularly want to point out is that the minister told us that Judge Cassels said he wished to have counsel to assist in this investigation. But he did not tell us—and so I assume it did not happen—that he asked Judge Cassels to name counsel that would suit him Oh, no ! that would not do. Counsel must be named by the very party that names the judge, the party that more than any other is interested in the final result of the investigation. In the West Elgin case, we have a confession signed by Donald McNish, and witnessed by A. B. Aylesworth, his counsel, of the state of things in that election. Subsequent to that, we had three judges appointed by the Ross administration to inquire into the manner of conducting that election, Judge Barron, Judge Morgan and Judge MacTavish—and the last named qualified, more or less, I imagine, in that case for his subsequent employment at the instance of the Crown. And when I tell you that these judges say that practically nothing was done wrong in the West Elgin election, and when I read you the confession of their own side you will be able to form an opinion as to that inquiry. That investigation was conducted and engineered by Mr. Watson. And the report, in concluding, compliments Mr. Watson upon the able and thorough manner in which he conducted the case on behalf of the Crown. I have here a speech made by Hon. Geo. W. Ross in which he refers to that trial and appears to think that Mr. Watson acted on behalf of the culprits, Pritchett and others, who were on trial. He said :

Mr. Watson had acted for the defence; he did so on his own responsibility.

But, to be perfectly fair, let me say that the hon. gentleman may have referred to the subsequent trial in which it happened that Mr. Watson, who had acted for the Crown in the first investigation, appeared for the defence. Either way is not satisfactory in some regards. However, Mr. Watson is complimented on the result of that investigation. Mr. Ross points out in a speech he made in Napanee on the eve of the last general elections, what a satisfactory result it was, and it was satisfactory in the face of what I am going to read to you, signed by Donald Macnish, the gentleman who produced and furnished unfair recommendations of the gentlemen to be deputy returniing officers, and that declaration was witnessed and concurred in by A. B. Aylesworth, as able counsel as could be found in Ontario. Here is the declaration :

1. That a large number of persons were especially sent into the constituency by men working on behalf of the Liberal party for the express purpose of taking part on Mr. Macnish's behalf in the election held January 12, 1899, and we believe that fraudulent and corrupt means were used by some of such persons to secure his election.

2. That some of the said persons illegally and without authority acted as deputy returning officers at the said election and in at least three cases so acted in the names of reputable local men, having, under assumed names, been introduced to the returning officer by local agents of Macnish.

3. That in many of the polling subdivisions of the riding there were grave irregularities connected with the return of the ballot boxes and their contents, the voting, and the counting of the ballots thereat.

4. That there were large numbers of persons brought into the riding for the express purpose of personating legitimate voters, and assisted by some of Macnish's local supporters such persons did personate qualified voters in voting for Mr. Macnish.

5. That the declared number of votes for Mr. Macnish largely exceeded the number of bona fide votes cast for him.

6. That a large number of ballots cast for Mr. McDiarmid were in some nefarious and corrupt manner manipulated, whereby the result of the election was rendered doubtful, and in this connection the voting at Shedden and Middlemarch and in several divisions of St. Thomas, where said strangers so acted as deputy returning officers, merits special mention.

7. That there are good reasons to believe that there are many specific and well authenticated cases where agents for Mr. Macnish concealed at their homes some of those strangers, who there paid large sums of money to electors to induce them to vote for him.

8. That Mr. Macnish will forthwith deliver to the Speaker of the legislative assembly his resignation as a member thereof for the said electoral district.

(Sgd.) DONALD MACNISH.

Witness:

(Sgd.) A. B. Aylesworth.

I have only one word to say in addition. When that matter was subsequently referred to Judge Barron, Judge Morgan and Judge McTavish and they sat and examined 211 witnesses, as Mr. Ross here states in his speech at Napanee, and as the fact was, these gentlemen, under the able guidance of Mr. Watson, whom they complimented, were able so far to whitewash the illegality, rascality and criminality indulged in on that occasion, that they found practically that nothing wrong had been done in West Elgin.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I would not have risen to speak on this occasion were it not for some words that fell from the lips of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). It seems to me that the burden of what he said in regard to His Honour Judge Cassels, and the investigation before that commissioner, implies one of two things, either that he thinks the commissioner is dishonest or a fool. Whatever his opinion may be, I do not think that the members of this House imagine for a moment that His Honour Judge Cassels is either the one or the other. In fact, he was chosen by the government to carry on that investigation because we had absolute confidence in his integrity and his ability, and, therefore, we thought it better to leave the conduct of the investigation entirely in his hands. The commissioner asked for legal assistance and he has received it. He has not yet declared to us or to the country whether the investigation is to be an open one or in camera. I may say that the government assumed, and does still assume, that that investigation will be a public one, and the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has absolutely no foundation whatever for his assumption that it is to be in camera; he has absolutely no foundation for the fabric of accusations he has raised against the action of the government on that supposition. I will not say any more in regard to that, because I believe that the matter is in the hands of an absolutely competent and honest judge, and having put it into his hands we think it best to let him deal with it in the way he sees fit.

Mr. FOSTER. Before my hon. friend spoke, had the government decided in their own minds that it would be a good thing to have the investigation public?

Mr. FISHER. The government has not given any dictation to the commissioner.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the Minister of Marine and Fisheries know as much about it as the Minister of Agriculture, and if he did, why didn't he answer the question that was put to him?

Mr. FISHER. All I say is that the matter has been left in the hands of the commission. We have assumed that the investigation will be public, but at the same time we have not undertaken to dictate whether it shall be or not. I do not think that in any way contradicts what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has said.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot come to that conclusion.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend may come to his own conclusions, but his own conclusions very often lead him stray, as they would lead the country astray if they were accepted. My hon. friend from North Toronto has talked about ministerial responsibility and about the responsibility of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has assumed his full ministerial responsibility so far as regards the efficiency of the department, the organization and work of the department. But the minister has not assumed the duties of a judge to investigate the integrity and honesty of his officials. I do not think that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is at all called upon to exercise that function, and if he had, on the report of the Civil Service Commission, undertaken to declare that so and so and so and so were dishonest and must be dealt with, hon. gentlemen opposite would have been the very first to raise a howl of partisanship and political persecution. It was because the Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not wish to assume the responsibility of prosecuting any of the gentlemen who were smirched by this report of the Civil Service Commission that the government appointed an independent judge who could do that in a judicial manner and without the slightest suspicion of partisanship.

The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been very busy, ever since the acceptance of the position of minister, investigating his department. He has been trying to use his ministerial responsibility to put that department on a firmer and more satisfactory footing. What has been the history of my hon. colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries since he has become minister? He took that office, I think, in February, 1906. He was in the midst of an arduous session, he carried through the work of that session, and the parliamentary duties of a minister absolutely precluded his making a thorough investigation into the details of the working of his department. Immediately after the session he sat-

isfied himself that the book-keeping of the department was not all it ought to be, and he then employed Mr. Falconer to undertake a thorough investigation of the book-keeping of the department, not only to try to find out whether there was any absolute wrong-doing, but to find whether a better system of accounting could not be adopted and put into operation. The evidence of Mr. Falconer and the other accountants who came before the Committee on Public Accounts showed that it required time not only to investigate but to work out a system which they might substitue for the system which was in existence before they began their work. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine spent the summer going about the country examining and investigating the different offices of the department. He came back here in the fall to enter upon a long and arduous session during which it was impossible for him, with his parliamentary duties, to undertake a thorough investigation. At the close of the session of 1907 he was called upon by the Prime Minister, at the request of the imperial government, to go to England and take part in the colonial conference. While he was there he was asked by the Prime Minister to help my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in the negotiation of the French treaty and he was away for six months. During that time he could not carry on any investigation or reorganization of the department. When he came back he asked for the report of Mr. Falconer and in a little while afterwards he had the report of the Civil Service Commission. But, before the report of the Civil Service Commission had come to him or to the government my hon. friend had commenced again, on his ministerial responsibility, an investigation into the organization of his department with the object of bringing about efficiency in the service and which it is his duty to carry on and which is not a matter at all for the investigation which Judge Cassels has been asked to undertake. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) spoke a few minutes ago as if the investigation which has now been entrusted to Judge Cassels ought to have been carried on by the Civil Service Commissioners. The Civil Service Commissioners, as a matter of fact, did not make any accusations against any individuals, although they did make general statements in regard to conditions in the department. I have not spoken to the commissioners about it, but from their report I should say that they did not consider that they were the proper persons to conduct a judicial investigation and take evidence in regard to the particular responsibility or honesty of any one member of the department. We have put it into the hands of a judge who is the right man to make a judicial investigation and give a judicial decision. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) spoke of the accusations in the Civil Service Commissioners report. If they had made any accusations surely they would not be the right people to investigate and give a decision on the question in regard to which they had made accusations. If Judge Cassels thinks it wise he can summon the Civil Service Commissioners before him to give any further information than that published in the report and we can get the advantage of that. I had not intended to dilate upon these matters. I am not going into details with regard to them at all. There will be occasions upon which they can be taken up and dealt with at greater length. I only want to show that the accusations which have been made against my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries are not well founded. Those against my hon. friend in regard to his shirking his ministerial responsibility are not justified or based upon facts, but, as a matter of fact, the action and the career of my hon. friend, since he has assumed that office, show that in every possible way he has been prepared to take the responsibility of his ministerial position although he is not prepared to take the judicial action of deciding whether an individual officer in his department is guilty of dishonesty or not. He leaves that to a gentleman whose reputation is such that hon. members on the other side of the House cannot, in so many words, attack it, although they may try to insinuate that he may be influenced unworthily.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. EDMUND BRISTOL (Centre Toronto). Mr. Speaker, with all deference to those who have spoken on the other side of the House, it seems to me that in this discussion they have strayed far from the questions which the leader of the opposition so courteously asked the First Minister this afternoon. There were two simple questions put to the right hon. gentleman. One was, why the inquiry in this case had been restricted and placed under the second part of the Act respecting public and departmental inquiries instead of under the first part of that Act; and the other inquiry was, whether, in addition to the two Liberal partisan counsel who would defend the government, it was the intention of the government to appoint other counsel who would act independently in the interests of the people of Canada at large. If I can understand the reasons given by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in relation to the first question put by the leader of the opposition, he takes the ground that he himself and the government had in no way been attacked by the report of this commission, that he and the government are held absolutely

blameless and that therefore there is no necessity for any inquiry of a general character in the public interest. The Minister of Finance also seems to state that while there may be and no doubt is a constitutional responsibility there is no further or other responsibility falling upon the government which would involve inquiry into anything except the conduct of some officials whose names have not been mentioned in the report of the Civil Service Commission. That must indeed be a very comforting position for the government to take. They congratulate themselves that they are absolutely absolved and held guiltless, and they therefore decide they will have no tribunal to investigate themselves. but they will have an investigation of some of the departmental officials. Let me present to the government and its followers some few considerations which they may reasonably think on before they become steadfast in their conclusion as to their non-responsibility in this matter, and as to the interest of the public in a broad investigation instead of the restricted and narrow investigation which they offer. It is interesting to note that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries declares that he wants the fullest possible investigation and that while he holds up one hand for the fullest possible investigation he holds up the other hand for a narrow and restricted inquiry into the officials of his department only. That is a contrast which the people of this country are quite able to appreciate. The Minister of Finance told us that in 1892 Civil Service Commission made a report which to a large extent involved some of the various iniquities which the present civil service report has pointed out. If that be correct, then I do charge that the government of this country from 1896 to the present time have been going on in the full knowledge that these double prices were being paid and in the knowledge of the iniquities which have been proven by this new Civil Service Commission. Even if that were not so, I charge that the question of this department and all the mismanagement and all the extravagance of this department was brought up in this House two years ago by the leader of the opposition who on May 18, 1906, moved :

That all the words after the word 'that' in the proposed motion be omitted and the following substituted therefor:

A committee of seven members be appointed to inquire into and investigate the expenditure of public moneys in or by the Department of Marine and Fisheries from and after the 30th day of June, 1902, and to inquire whether any abuses, irregularities, improvidences or maladministrations have arisen or occurred in respect of such expenditures and whether any persons employed in or connected with the said department have profited thereby, and whether any additional safeguards should be provided in respect of the expenditure of public money in or by the said department and to report upon the matters aforesaid.

That the said committee have power to send for persons, papers and records and to examine witnesses under oath.

By means of this resolution and the speeches in support of it, the government had their attention brought in the most forceful manner to the absolute rottenness of the administration of this department, and it is idle for them now to say they have no responsibility. Two years ago when this resolution was moved, everybody who takes an intelligent interest in the public affairs of Canada was well aware of the rottenness of this department, and yet the government wilfully shut their eyes to it or were incompetent to apply a remedy. There was brought to the attention of the government at this time the scandal of the 'Arctic,' the scandal of the purchase of cutlery for the 'Montcalm' where the most extraordinary prices were paid for tableware for an ice-breaker, and above all there were the Merwin scandals. I emphasize this latter because in the Public Accounts Committee in 1906 it was proven that this man Merwin had sold to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, articles which that department and any business man in this country could have purchased direct from the wholesale merchants and manufacturers at from 100 to 187 per cent less than they paid Merwin. There was a Sturtevant engine which cost $262.50 and which was sold to the department by Merwin for $550; there was another engine of a similar character which cost $25 and was sold to the department for $550, and another similar engine which cost $335 and which was sold to the department for $960 or at a profit on the transaction of 187 per cent. The battle was fought in the Public Accounts Committee in respect to this man Merwin and it was only after the greatest possible effort and in face of obstruction on the part of members on the other side of the House that the facts in relation to this thing were brought out. Let me ask? Is there any sane business man on the opposite side or any sane business man in Canada, who, if he found a man charging him an exorbitant profit or from 100 per cent to 187 per cent for articles of ordinary commerce, would go on buying from that man without tender and without having his prices checked. But that state of affairs went on until October last, and goods were purchased from Merwin to the extent of considerably over a million dollars without tender. And yet the government say : We are a business administration and we have no responsibility in this matter. Why, Sir, if the board of directors of any company were to tell the shareholders that for three years they had gone on dealing with a man who had so grossly overcharged them for ordinary articles, the management of that com-

pany would not be permitted to continue for a moment. Surely, the administration of the public affairs of a country should certainly be on the same business basis as the administration of the affairs of a private commercial corporation. Nay more, I would put it on a higher plane, and I would say that a man of honour anxious to endeavour to live up to the fullest extent to the trust imposed in him, would be even more careful in the conduct of a great public department than in the ordinary affairs of business.

Here we have the spectacle of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, for over two years in this department, with statements brought constantly to his attention as to the rottenness of that department, saying and the government saying : We knew nothing of this matter ; we are not responsible ; the commissioners have found no fault with us, let us go after a few understrappers in the department. I think the people of this country will not be satisfied with such sophistry ; business men, who conduct their affairs honestly, will not be satisfied with such an absurd and unintelligible argument put forward by the apologists of this government. Mr. Speaker, I want to place on record the plain distinction between the two classes of investigation which are open to the administration. In the first place, they appointed a commission in May, 1907, not to investigate charges or abuses, irregularities, improvidence or mal-administration, but to look into the operation of the Civil Service Act and the services and compensation of the officials of the government ; and such inquiry was to include the following subjects :

1. General operation of the Civil Service Act.
2. Classification of the service.
3. Salaries.
4. Temporary employment.
5. Technical employees.
6. Promotions.
7. Discipline, hours of service, &c.
8. Efficiency and sufficiency of the departmental staffs.
9. Retiring allowances.
10. Any other matter relative to the service which in the opinion of the commissioners requires consideration.

It has been pointed out that two hon. ministers have attacked these commissioners for going outside of the terms of their commission ; and if it had not been for clause 10, it would no doubt have been possible legally to take that position ; but under clause 10 they had the right, and they exercised that right, of making a more general investigation. Now, the order in council authorizing that commission was passed under part 1 section 2 of an Act respecting public and departmental inquiries, being chapter 104 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. Subsection 2 is as follows:

The Governor in Council may, whenever he deems it expedient, cause inquiry to be made into and concerning any matter connected with the good government of Canada or the conduct of any part of the public business thereof.

The order in council appointing the Hon. Mr. Justice Cassels as commissioner is based on part 2, section 6, of the same Act, relating to departmental investigations, which read as follows:

The minister presiding over any department of the Civil Service of Canada may appoint at any time, under the authority of the Governor in Council, a commissioner or commissioners to investigate and report upon the state and management of the business or any part of the business of such department, either in the inside or outside service thereof, and the conduct of any person in such service, so far as the same relates to his official duties.

The part which the Hon. Mr. Justice Cassels has been asked to investigate is merely one statement in the report, which is as follows :

That immediate steps should be taken in order to determine what officials, if any, deserve condemnation, and to give to all an opportunity to meet the charges implied.

By the very terms of this last commission the minister and the government leave themselves out of the investigation. Suppose the investigation goes on. Certain officials of the department are charged with getting graft or commissions, and the question is naturally asked, what did the minister know of these transactions ? Did you tell him or give him information of the people from whom you were buying, or of the high prices you were paying ? Under this commission questions of this kind are completely shut out, because the conduct of the minister is in no way to be inquired into ; the inquiry is absolutely confined, under the order in council, to the acts of certain officials of the department. So that we have the administration calmly saying, in the light of the facts which are common knowledge to the people of this country ; although for years we have known of these charges of graft, and although within the last two years they have been brought repeatedly to our attention, we are absolutely without responsibility, we are innocent, there is no charge against us.

Now, I do not wish again to go over the very able argument which was made by my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) in regard to the responsibility of the minister ; but I do affirm that any unprejudiced person, reading that report, will say, quite apart from any observations that I have addressed to the House, that there is ample evidence on which any man wishing to protect his honour against aspersions, any government holding themselves high as the guardians and trustees of the people, would have demanded the fullest possible investi-

gation and the fullest opportunity to free themselves of any suspicion of connection with or knowledge of the graft that is charged. And so I submit that when it is sought to narrow this investigation, it is an absolute and direct effort on the part of the administration to contract themselves out of the investigation and to say : We are innocent, we do not propose to have any inquiry made into our acts, but we propose to narrow the inquiry down to what a few officials in the department may or may not have done.

That leads up to the second point which is of great importance to the people of this country, and that is the method of conduct of this investigation. And here one is somewhat amused at the answers which have been made to-day ; because, instead of the ministers making a fair and proper answer to the questions of the hon. leader of the opposition and the arguments advanced, they put up straw men and at once knock them down. A very good example of that was the argument presented this afternoon by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), who tried to insinuate that some attack had been made by this side of the House upon the hon. Mr. Justice Cassels as the commissioner in this inquiry. I want to say, so far as I have the right to do so, that I have not heard any such attack, I do not believe that any such attack was directly or indirectly made, and I want to be allowed to say that I have known the Hon. Mr. Justice Cassels for many years, and I gladly say that he is universally regarded by the bar of Ontario as one of our ablest lawyers and one of our most high-minded and impartial men. I cannot pay too high a tribute to the great abilities of that hon. gentleman, and I do not think the government could have made a better choice for their commissioner than the hon. judge whom they have appointed, and that is the feeling, so far as I know it, on the Conservative side of this House. But that has nothing to do with the question. That was simply to draw a red herring across the trail. The hon. Minister of Finance attempted to make an excuse for the appointment of two partisan Liberal counsel to assist in this investigation ; and when it was pointed out to him that when a charge was made against a Conservative department, two of the ablest Liberal lawyers in Canada, one of English origin and one of French origin, were appointed to assist in the investigation, the Minister of Finance said, in that case it was a Tory minister who was involved, whereas in this case it was merely the officials of the department. It certainly is a new distinction to make that we should employ the most distinguished counsel to bring to earth a Conservative minister, while we should employ a partisan counsel to bring to justice, if justice it be, the members of a department who have been accused of wrong-doing.

That, of course, is an absolutely and utterly illogical position for the Minister of Finance or any one else to take. The whole point is : Do hon. gentlemen opposite really think they will have satisfied their own honour, will have satisfied their Liberal friends throughout the country, will have satisfied public opinion in Canada by appointing to assist in this matter two strongly biased Liberal lawyers It does not matter how able they are, the point that was made is simply that it would be common decency, at all events, if the government proposed to appoint two gentlemen of the same stripe of politics as the administration whose life, so to speak, is at stake in this matter, to have appointed independent counsel who were not strongly swayed by considerations of party politics.

I wish to emphasize, with all the force I can, what I believe to be the indecency, and impropriety of this administration in appointing these two gentlemen to act as counsel. It goes to show that the ingenuous and somewhat amusing, but I fancy hardly intentional statement of the Minister of Marine to-day that he did not want any blame to attach to himself or to the government in connection with this matter, was really to be worked out by the fact first that the new commission was so restricted that it was absolutely impossible under its terms to attack either the minister or the government, and secondly that counsel were being employed whose political proclivities were such that it might reasonably be anticipated that their bias would induce them to do every thing they could to protect the government by whom they were paid and whose life long supporters they were. So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I wish to protest as strongly and as vigorously as I can against both the restricted nature of this commission and the appointment of partisan council in connection with the investigation of a matter of such great public importance.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). Mr. Speaker, the subject under discussion may be, I suppose, compendiously stated as whether or not this government has done right in the course it has taken in this matter in authorizing the issue of a commission to Mr. Justice Cassels. To appreciate whether or not that action on the part of the government was the correct method of dealing with this subject, it seems to me we should remember exactly the position created by the circumstance of the report of the Civil Service Commission being made and laid on the table of this House. I do not, for the moment, speak of the circumstance that no sooner was that report presented, no sooner had it become the subject of any discussion in this House, than the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who to-day inveighs so emphatically against the course

the government has taken in this matter, was himself the very first to suggest that it was incumbent on the government to deal with this question either by the appointment of a committee of this House or by the issue of some commission of inquiry. We have taken the better of these two alternatives. I do not suppose any hon. gentleman in this House would contend that any more impartial tribunal for the investigation of this question could by possibility have been selected than the one which has been named or that there would have been any greater propriety, even although there had been party advantage, in the appointment of a committee of this House to investigate this question. We have then accepted and acted on one of the two alternative suggestions made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), yet in doing that it seems we have, according to the views he has expressed to-day, most grievously erred. It is of course but another example of the facility with which hon. gentlemen who desire to criticise on all occasions the government of the day and who are determined, no matter what course that government may take, to condemn it off-hand, and to cry out against the course which it has adopted, will trim their sails according to the breeze and be prepared at any time and in any event and at all seasons to condemn whatever may be done by those who are opposed to them politically. The situation when this report from the commission of inquiry into the operation of the civil service was made was, it seems to me, a very simple and plain one. I have been accused to-day of having attacked this commission when speaking before my constituents on the subject some three or four weeks ago. I deny that statement ; I made no attack. If I had wanted to criticise, the material for criticism was ready to my hand. I did not even criticise, although the report of the commission itself certainly well invited criticism. I said on that occasion what I have no hesitation in saying again and what any hon. gentleman who reads the mandate to these commissioners can at once see for himself, namely, that they stepped altogether outside of that which was defined to them as their jurisdiction when they made a report at length as they have made with regard to the different departments of the governmental service. They were appointed to inquire into the operation of the Civil Service Act ; they were not appointed to inquire into the administration of the general departments of the government service. They were appointed with specific reference to many matters arising under the Civil Service Act. These particular matters were specified in the order in council appointing them, in the commission issued to them. They were to inquire generally into the operation of the statute, with special reference to the classification of the service, to the salaries of the service, to the matter of temporary employment, of technical employment, of promotions, of discipline, of the hours of service, of retiring allowances and then (in the only phrase that could possibly, by any stretch, be taken to cover the course which they followed in making the remarks they have seen fit to make on general administration) they were finally appointed to inquire into the efficiency and sufficiency of the departmental staffs. I am not here to criticise, much less to attack the course which the commissioners took. I am simply pointing out, not in any way of attack or even of criticism upon their work, that they did undoubtedly go beyond the commission of inquiry issued to them in what they have reported. But that I make no point of, that is in no degree an answer to what they have said, or in any way a circumstance which relieved the government from considering the report which they have seen fit to make. When that report comes to be presented not only does it deal with matters committed to them for inquiry, but it goes into the general question of the administration of the different departments of the government service, and they have reported to this House that in the Department of Marine and Fisheries there is this to be criticised, the system in vogue of distributing the daily correspondence of the department. They have taken the time to discuss at some length that method of distributing the correspondence and to suggest what they consider would be improvements in it. They next take up and discuss what they say is a lack of efficient organization in the staff of that department, and at considerable length again they discuss that feature of the administration of the department. Other similar matters are dealt with, with which the minister who is in charge of that department, himself can deal, and in regard to which he is himself engaged. But they have gone further and have not only stated these general things with regard to the administration, the organization and the system or method of doing the work of that department by the staff there employed, but have said that there seems also to be in that department a lack of conscience, and having made that statement they follow it up by saying that some government officials are serving two masters. That is a tolerably specific statement, if we can make that observation with regard to something that is absolutely and entirely general. I do not know, I have very considerable doubt in my own mind, whether the gentleman who penned that phrase had at the time or has now any certain, particular person in mind toward whom he aimed when he used the expression : There are some of the government officials who are serving two masters.

I incline to think, after giving it the best

consideration I am able, that the gentleman who used these words himself would say—I did not mean any specific person; I meant merely, in arguing what I thought must be the condition of things, to say that, from what I had seen of the lack of organization—of the lack of efficient work, if you please, of the wrong system upon which things are done in that department—there must be somebody or other who was serving two masters. Now, whichever thing he meant—whether the man who wrote those words meant that there was some particular individual or set of individuals in the department who were lacking in conscience and who were trying to serve not merely their employers but some one else from whom they were receiving benefits for favours given, whichever meaning was attached, in the mind of the person who wrote these words, to the words he has used, it is a subject of inquiry. And I do not for a moment shirk the situation that, although this was something quite beyond what these commissioners were appointed to do, the fact that they have said it is, none the less, a reason why the thing which they have said must of necessity have, at the hands of the government, further investigation.

Now, it seems to me that the circumstance presented by the delivery of that report from any person entrusted by the Crown in any kind of inquiry into a matter affecting the public service was not unlike, in principle, what would be the case supposing some party of government surveyors or some set of men who might be in government employment and sent out on some prospecting investigation, came, if you like, by accident—or, if you like, by search—upon a dead body in the course of their work, and, looking at the circumstances, thought that this dead body might have been the result of foul play and, in the course of their report upon their work made the observation that they had, upon a certain day, come upon this corpse, and that there might have been foul play in connection with it. What then would be done? What would be the duty of those charged with the administration of justice, without regard to whether this body of men had been sent out for the purpose of searching for what they had found, or had come upon it, and had reported that they had come upon it, by accident? The course naturally taken would be the empanelling of a coroner's jury, and the investigation of this corpus delicti by the form of a coroner's inquest. That is exactly the course the government has taken in this matter. Hon. members in this House talk about somebody being on trial. The very men who use that expression over and over and over again must perfectly understand that this is no proceeding in the nature of a charge and trial, that it is nothing else than that to which I have likened it, an examination into circumstances—of, if you like, a suspicious character—in regard to which an investigation is directed precisely of the nature which is carried on by a coroner and coroner's jury in the case of inquest upon a body found. In these circumstances this is in no sense a prosecution or trial; it is an investigation to ascertain facts. This report gives no one any facts upon which he can act. Merely by way of illustration, I presume, two instances are given of what the commissioners say they found in the nature of impropriety or wrong-doing in the department; and, as I said before, if one wanted to go looking for opportunity of criticism, it would not be hard to find material ready to hand upon the face of this report itself. Because, it turns out, the moment they mention in detail two specific instances of what they thought was wrong-doing in the department, in each of the two cases it was they who were mistaken and the department was absolutely correct. They charge, in terms, that there had been an authorization by the department, that there had been an accepting by the minister, of a recommendation of one of his subordinates, to depart from a contract and to pay a higher price for a certain commodity than that which the seller had undertaken to receive. In that, they were entirely wrong. They fell into an error, not unnaturally, but an error which they would not have fallen into if any one had known that they were travelling outside the purpose for which they were appointed or were engaged in an investigation which they intended to make the foundation of a report of this character—which simply illustrates the danger of acting upon or accepting the conclusions of gentlemen who have gone about a work which they were not appointed to undertake, and a work which nobody was aware they were engaged in at all. If they had mentioned to anybody in the department, I suppose, that they thought there was in these circumstances of the coal purchase at Prescott something that called for explanation, any official of the department acquainted with the facts, or in possession of the files of the department, could at once have shown them that, in that particular instance at all events, there was nothing calling for comment, for the minister at the head of the department, immediately on the recommendation of his subordinate coming to his attention, refused to act upon it, directed that the contract should be acted upon and that that thing exactly should be done which the commissioners find fault with the department because they thought it was not done. In the other instance, they are equally at sea, and equally under a mistake, simply by reason of the circumstance that they were going on unguided, unassisted, and without reference to any person who was in a position to know the facts and drawing conclusions which the

circumstances not only did not warrant, but, immediately on being known, demonstrated were entirely at variance with the truth.

Now, notwithstanding that these features of the report must necessarily lessen the weight which otherwise would be attached to it, we have the fact that two out of the three gentlemen for this purpose make these observations with regard to the personnel of the staff in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. What was the government to do ? I make no point of the fact that the third or chief commissioner did not concur in the remarks of his colleagues. It would have been exactly the same situation if but one of the three commissioners had said what the two have said here. If, instead of saying it in the report, they had said it by letter, or in any formal way had brought it to the attention of the government or of the minister, the situation would have been identically the same ; and therefore, I say, I make no point whatever of the fact that they have travelled afield and outside and beyond their jurisdiction ; I make no point whatever in derogation of the weight that should be attached to this report of the other circumstances I have adverted to. I come simply down to this situation, that gentlemen who were entrusted by the government with a certain investigation have seen things, in the course of that investigation which, they say, call for further inquiry, and that they considered themselves justified in summing up by the statement that somebody or other in the Department of Marine and Fisheries was without conscience and apparently serving two masters. That is the one thing in the report that calls for further action in the nature of inquiry. The other things in the report are matters of departmental administration with which the minister is in a position to deal. But that particular statement is a statement which cannot be ignored and a statement in regard to which no investigation the minister himself could make would satisfy hon. gentlemen who are so ready to criticise that nothing whatever which can be done will satisfy them. That statement appearing on the face of the report was something which, according to the gentleman who, for the time being, was leading the opposition, called for the issue of a further commission of inquiry, or the appointment of a committee of this House to investigate; and the government taking the view which he presented, has appointed a further commission of inquiry to do exactly the work which I have described as the work of a coroner and a coroner's jury in this matter.

Well, the next question I suppose is whether any exception can be taken to the gentleman who is chosen for the duty. Now I am not aware that any person in this House or out of it has taken the slightest exception to the gentleman who has been named to do this work. We have in the past not only, in this House but in other legislative assemblies in this country, seen the necessity arise for the appointment of commissions of inquiry of one character or another. We in the province of Ontario, within the last three years, have seen a good many instances of it, and we have seen commissions of inquiry appointed by a government supported by hon. gentlemen who sit opposite, a government that they laud to the skies and we have seen commission after commission issued by that government to political heelers of the very lowest description, selected for no other purpose than to do the duty of an executioner, and in whose hands the result of the commission was foreseen and expected. If this government had selected for the purpose of this inquiry a man as commissioner against whom one word of exception could be taken, then there might have been some foundation for the attacks that have been made today, and that have been made consistently since this commission was appointed ; as if there was in the appointment some intention to whitewash, some intention to prevent thoroughness, some intention to get over what is said to be the damaging effects of the commissioners' report. I say Sir, that the very fact that this gentleman has been chosen as commissioner is in itself a sufficient answer to charges of that character.

But criticism upon the course of the government does not stop there. Criticism follows the least action which is taken by the government, objection is sure to follow every step which the government may take, no matter what it may be. If the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, instead of making the appointment he has made, had chosen to investigate for himself and had made no appointment of a commissioner at all, it would at once have been said that he was standing behind his officials, that he was identifying himself with them, that if they were without conscience, as was charged by the commissioners, then he was equally to be condemned because he was making common cause with them. On the other hand, the moment that he appointed this commission of inquiry, at once the word went out from headquarters, at once the 'Mail' newspaper, which I suppose is the gospel of the hon. gentlemen from the province of Ontario who sit opposite, takes the position that the minister has determined to sacrifice his subordinates, that he is not manly enough to stand behind them, but that the fiat has gone forth that they must be beheaded. Well, everyone is prepared for either alternative, that is a beautiful example at all events of the fact that whatever course may be taken in this matter by the government, that course will necessarily be condemned, and that course is the one which will afford the best opportunity for criticism and attack.

Now, Sir, the commissioner having been selected, and being a gentleman not only above reproach, but actually above even attack by those who would attack every earthly thing that was done by this government, the next question was as to the manner in which that inquiry should be carried on. Now it has been said that the commissioner himself desired in this matter to have the assistance of council. I take no advantage of that position. I assume, as legal adviser if you please of the government in this matter, the fullest responsibility upon my own shoulders for the advice that this was an inquiry which ought not to be conducted without the assistance of counsel; and whether the commissioner desired council or not, I would certainly be unwilling that he should enter upon an inquiry of this character, one the result of which is so certain to be attacked, without the help of counsel to assist in the investigation, and relieve him from some portion of the laborious work which otherwise he would have to undertake personally. Somebody of necessity must investigate, case after case of individual character; somebody must pore through file after file, thousands upon thousands of pages in the Department of Marine and Fisheries; somebody must of necessity go up many a blind alley before he can possibly hit upon anything that would be productive of results, anything that could lead to a determination of any of the circumstances which the commissioner is appointed to investigate. It might be said: Let the commissioner himself do it. His time is no more valuable than that of anybody else; he is a public servant, and let him take the weeks or months that may be necessary to do that work of preliminary investigation. I submit that it would not be wise or prudent that the commissioner should do that work, and for the simple reason that the man, whoever he is, who does that work of investigation, whoever he is, whether counsel or commissioner, who does the work of questioning witnesses, must and will be undoubtedly represented as prosecuting counsel. This inquiry although it is in every sense as far removed from the trial of any accusation as any inquiry possibly could be, is already represented by nearly every speaker opposite who has addressed you to-day, as a trial of somebody or other, and just as it is so improperly represented, just as it is sought to be in the eyes of the people so distorted from its real character, so truly would the man who was conducting that inquiry, whether he were commissioner or counsel, be represented as nothing else but a prosecutor, or indeed a persecutor. The moment you put the commissioner into a position where it is possible to say that of him, you detract immeasurably from the weight which his report would have, and you at once bring him into the arena of a prosecuting counsel instead of leaving him where he ought to be, a judicial officer to determine. In these circumstances I certainly felt no hesitation whatever in advising that counsel should be engaged for the assistance of the commissioner. I take upon myself the fullest responsibility for the course the government has taken, and am willing to relieve the commissioner absolutely from the suspicion even of having suggested that anything of the kind should be done.

Then it having been decided that there should be counsel in this matter, the next question was who that counsel should be. It is perhaps not unnatural that, having the duty of recommending the person of the counsel, I should turn in my mind at once to the men of my own immediate acquaintance. I happen to be, from the circumstance that for nearly a generation I have practised law in the city of Toronto, better acquainted with the lawyers of Toronto than I am with the lawyers of any other part of this country, and it was, in these circumstances, not an unnatural thing that I should canvass in my own mind the men with whom I am best acquainted and of whose ability and standing I have the best knowledge when it was a question of who should be selected for this work. I take the full responsibility of having recommended the name of Mr. Watson for this position. I did that upon my knowledge of the man, and I have not heard as yet any criticism offered except the question which I see was propounded by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) as to Mr. Watson's identity a few days ago, and the observation made this afternoon by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) that he had been, or, I think, the statement was that he at the present time was in charge of the Liberal organization for the city of Toronto. Mr. Speaker, I am in a position to give an unqualified denial to the latter of these two statements. Mr. Watson is not, so far as I am aware, identified with any Liberal organization in Toronto or elsewhere in this country. He was at one time, I think, chairman or president—I really do not know what the title was—of some organization of that character in Toronto—I have no idea whether for a riding or for a ward or for the whole city. I am absolutely indifferent on that head. I know Mr. Watson to be a Liberal politically. He is a man who I know has confidence in me and perhaps it is not strange on that account that I should have confidence in him, and I do not hesitate in this House or anywhere in this country to justify before hon. members or before any body of men the selection of Mr. Watson for this work. He is a man of standing in his profession. I have known him personally for about 35 years, from the time when he was a struggling young barrister to the day when he stands amongst the foremost leaders of the bar in the province of Ontario, and hon. gentleman must

recognize him not merely as a man of integrity and character, but as a man possessing legal attainments such as fit him for any brief or any work which may be entrusted to him by any client. In these circumstances I had no hesitation, on Mr. Watson occurring to my mind, to recommend him as a man who would conduct this inquiry properly, who would conduct it as it should be conducted, who would pursue the end towards which this investigation was directed and who would make the investigation of that thorough and complete character which was from the beginning intended. I cannot too highly emphasize the observation that was made this afternoon by my hon. colleague in charge of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, that the one intention and desire in the appointment of this commission was that this work should be thorough and the one piece of instruction which I have given in this matter to Mr. Watson in a personal interview and in writing was that this work was to be of a thorough character, that the thing that was expected of him was that he would spare no effort to make this investigation perfect and complete and that he would go into the department to the very bottom of things and satisfy this government and the country whether or no there was any foundation for the remarks which have been made by the commission as to the lack of personal honesty and integrity on the part of officials of the department, and if there is foundation for them to determine who the men are that they may be weeded out from among their fellows and that the truth in regard to them may become known. These are the instructions that Mr. Watson has, and I am well enough acquainted with him to know that these instructions will be carried out and that the work which he undertakes will be work that is thoroughly done. In these circumstances it is not a subject of criticism, it is not a matter in regard to which those who may wish to criticise have the slightest ground for the attacks they make; that counsel has been selected and that counsel has been the man of whom I have spoken.

Now, Sir, it has been asked here whether or not this gentleman is counsel for the minister or whether or not any counsel is to be engaged for the gentlemen who have prepared the report of the commission of inquiry into the civil service. Well, Sir, I scarcely know whether or not such a question is being propounded seriously. I suppose that the hon. gentleman who put such a question knows perfectly well the character of this investigation. If any hon. gentleman of the legal profession or acquainted with the ordinary course of legal proceedings puts such a question he must see at once that it carries with it its own answer. He knows—he must know that this investigation is in no sense, as I have already said, a question of trying anybody, but that it is simply an investigation of inquiry, and he might quite as well ask, to return again to the illustration which I have used before, whether or not counsel for somebody or other for some individual or witness, was going to appear before a coroner appointed to take evidence in an inquiry of this nature. It is no attack upon the commissioners, it is no trial of the commissioners, the commissioners are in no sense upon the defensive; it is supplementing and carrying forward the work which they, in the way in which I have described, have done. It is in no sense a review or a trial or any kind of imputation or charge against these commissioners. This, Sir, is simply a public inquiry and counsel who appear in this matter under the instructions of this government appear for the public, as occupying precisely the position that a county Crown attorney occupies at a coroner's inquest, inquiring for the whole country and engaged to probe the matter to its depths to ascertain what foundation there may be for a statement which appears in the report which is the basis of this inquiry. Mr. Watson is counsel for the people. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House amuse themselves by using that phrase of which they are so fond, and I wonder if it never occurs to them that they are, perhaps, unconsciously, or perhaps purposely, seeking to identify the sixty or seventy men who compose His Majesty's opposition with the people of this country. They seem to forget that the people are represented by their chosen representatives in this House of parliament, that the country is represented by this government and that it is the government and not the gentleman who sit on your left, Sir, who have the right to speak for the people in whom the people have time and time again already demonstrated, as time and time again they will in the future, demonstrate their confidence by their votes at the polls. Mr. Watson is the representative counsel in this inquiry for the people of this country. He is selected for that work by the government who have the confidence of this House and the confidence of the country, and it is of little moment for hon. gentlemen in whom so often the people of Canada have refused to repose confidence to speak here as though they were voicing the sentiments of the people of this country. I submit to you, Sir, under these circumstances that the appointment of Mr. Watson is one with which the people of Canada will be satisfied, and until some charge is brought against him other than that he belongs politically to the majority, his appointment is not open to criticism.

Now, I simply took the floor to speak as to the appointment of counsel. I regret that I am quite unable to answer observations that have been made in the course of this debate because I have had to depend en-

tirely on what good friends who are able to hear have told me as to what has been said. Unfortunately for myself I am not physically in a position to engage in political controversy. I have risen simply to lay before the House the considerations which have moved the government to take the course it has taken in appointing for this important work the gentleman who has been selected as commissioner. I take great comfort to myself, as I am sure every one in this House ought to take comfort to himself, that the appointment of Mr. Justice Cassels has been so well received on all hands and that there has been no criticism applied to his appointment. Under these circumstances, whatever else may be said of this commission or of any person who may be engaged in it, I have the confident hope that the course which that commissioner may take will commend itself to every one in this House and in the country. He can certainly be relied upon to do his duty in the premises, without fear, favour, partiality, or affection. He is acting literally in judicial capacity; he is charged to report who the men are (if there be any) who are described in this portion of the report in question. No other duty is put upon him nor was there any intention to put any other duty upon him. He was appointed simply and solely for the purpose of pursuing to the end the question started by these commissioners: That there did seem to be somebody, or more than one, in the department in question who was not honest, who was not faithful to his trust, but who was worthy of punishment and dismissal. His duty is to try these men, whoever they may be, so far as there is trial, and to investigate and report what foundation there is for the existence of this suspicion which has led to the statement that forms the whole basis of the inquiry. I submit that the government has taken the only proper course in this matter, that it has adopted and acted upon the very suggestion that came from the leader of the opposition or the hon. member for North Toronto, and that acting on that suggestion it has appointed a man who is above question and above reproach, and that upon the result of the inquiry which may be conducted before him this House and the country may well depend for a certain knowledge of what, if any, foundation, exists for the charges and insinuations which have been so freely made.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). There is an old adage: that whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad, and I venture to say that when the history of this country comes to be written no more perfect illustration of this adage will be found than in the order in council that is being considered to-day. And, if by any possibility the perfection of that illustration could be improved upon I venture to say it would be in the counsel who have been named to assist the commissioner. And, if by any stretch of imagination we could imagine any further addition to the perfection of that illustration it would be the speech of the Minister of Justice to which we have now listened. To avoid any possible misunderstanding, let me say in the first place that no one in this House has spoken with greater respect or could with more sincerity speak with respect of the Hon. Mr. Justice Cassels, than I. It is a pleasure to me to speak of him in these terms. I believe that from one end of the country to the other no commissioner could possibly have been selected whose ability and integrity stand higher than the ability and integrity of the Hon. Mr. Justice Cassels. And, it is because I do so highly respect him and that I know he will do his duty in whatever sphere he is placed, that speaking for myself I regret that this additional stain has been cast on the dignity of the bench by his appointment to such a contemptible little commission as this. Sir, no one can really understand the question without considering the historical retrospect so as to know what has led to the unhappy position in which the government finds itself to-day placed. Although I need not go beyond the Civil Service Commission report itself to find that there are other departments equally open to criticism, I shall confine my remarks to the Department of Marine and Fisheries because it is that department we are specially dealing with now. I would remind the House that this department was so deplorably mismanaged and had run to such a scandalous state of chaos that not long ago the Prime Minister himself on the floor of parliament in the presence of dozens of hon. gentlemen admitted that the department had reached this sad state under the guardianship of the Hon. Mr. Préfontaine, predecessor of the present minister. And the right hon. gentleman said that he had put in office the present minister to bring order out of the chaos which then existed and because he thought he would be able to bring that department up to the standard which at one time it had attained. That was the description of this unhappy department, according, not to Conservative imagination, but according to the statement of the right hon. the Prime Minister made on the floor of parliament. And why did the right hon. gentleman say so? I suppose he was impelled by necessity to make that admission, humiliating though it must have been to the gentlemen behind him who sat there night after night deliberately voting that the voyage of the 'Arctic' was a most excellent undertaking on the grounds of economy; that Merwin was a philanthropic patriot and so self sacrificing as to give his goods and chattles for the benefit of the country, and that Strubbe

was a man whose character and conduct were beyond description. It must have been galling for these hon. gentlemen who again and again voted that everything was right and proper and most delightful, to hear their right hon. leader admit that the department was in a state of disreputable chaos. It would be only fair to admit that while the present minister is constitutionally responsible for the acts of his predecessors and that having accepted the office he must bear the responsibility, yet, morally and politically and every way except constitutionally had he (to use a common expression) made good and had the department improved under his regime, it is only fair to admit that he might well come before parliament even in the face of this unhappy report and plead that he at all events was not one of the parties referred to in the strong denunciation of the commissioners. But has the present Minister of Marine in a single respect remedied the debauchery of the department that existed under his predecessor? I challenge any gentleman on the other side to point me to a single respect in which the improvement has come. We remember how scandalized the country was when we found that Merwin, partly under his own name and partly under the name of Brooks & Co. was selling half a million dollars worth of goods to the department year after year and raking off over fifty per cent profit.

I look into the Auditor General's Report which we are now investigating before the Public Accounts Committee, and I find that our old friend Merwin is carrying on business at the old stand, in the same old way, and it is reasonable to suppose with about the same profits; and yet the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who would wish to appear before this House and this country as an honest and capable administrator, knew two years ago exactly what Merwin was doing. Many hon. gentlemen will remember the case of Strubbe, of Montreal, who in the presence of a couple of friends, cashed a cheque here in Ottawa for about $4,700, sent $2,500 to his own bank, and put $2,200 into his pocket; and although he left Ottawa within an hour afterwards, he could not tell what he had done with the money. It was such a common circumstance to place $2,200 in his pocket in the presence of a couple of friends who came from the Department of Marine and Fisheries with him, that he could not recollect what he had done with it. And yet this same gentleman is carrying on business with the Department of Marine and Fisheries in the same way as before. Evidently these two gentlemen, in the estimation of the present minister, possess the necessary qualifications for doing business with the department, and are therefore still doing business with it.

The hon. Minister of Justice has referred to this commission as a coroner's inquest. I am not prepared to contradict him on that point. A coroner's inquest is generally a post-mortem ceremony, and I quite understand that after the death-blow given by the report of the Civil Service Commission, the hon. gentleman thinks it is very appropriate to have a post-mortem, to be followed by the funeral obsequies at a date to be named by the government either in next November or at some later date. I have referred to the state of the Department of Marine and Fisheries under the previous minister and under the present minister. We have found the Public Accounts Committee year after year dragging out scandal after scandal in that department; and yet to this day no one ever heard of any one being punished until the report of the Civil Service Commission came down; and then, Sir, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who stands before this House as so noble that he would scorn to judge one of his subordinates, has to call in a judge to pronounce the sentence. This minister, after beginning to suspend and decapitate his subordinates quite royally, when he thinks he can do it with safety, calls in a judge to pronounce the sentence of death on those whom it pleases His Royal Highness to have executed.

Now let us consider the exact condition of affairs. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Finance Minister speak of the report of the Commission as if there was really nothing in that report that in any way reflected upon the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I did not mind the Minister of Marine and Fisheries saying that as much as I did the Finance Minister, who has stood before this House and this country for integrity and honesty, and I was pained to hear him speak as he did this afternoon. Was a greater absurdity ever heard? On the one hand, they say, we have given you a commission because the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for North Toronto said: In view of such a report you must have either a parliamentary committee or a royal commission to investigate. Why, Sir, it reminds one of the evening when the right hon. gentleman who leads this House, having been taunted by the hon. member for Grenville, the hon. member for Leeds and myself, with one instance of corruption and extravagance after another in this very department, promised to give us an investigation by a parliamentary committee; and when he brought down the motion for the committee, there was such a puny reference to a few trifling charges, that we could not have had any investigation at all under the terms of the reference had not the whole department been so hopelessly extravagant and corrupt that we could touch nowhere without finding something. Yet the Minister of Finance dares

to stand before this House and speak of the hon. leader of the opposition and the hon. member for North Toronto having asked for an investigation and therefore this commission was given, when all that anybody who knows his A B C's has to do is to read the report at page 44, where he will find charge after charge, made, not against officials——

Mr. FIELDING. It is not of much consequence, but I did not make any allusion to that at all, if that will make any difference.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I apologize to the hon. Minister of Finance. The statement was made by a minister, and I thought it was made by the Minister of Finance. When such extraordinary statements are made by ministers, it is not to be wondered at if one attributes to one minister a statement made by another. However, the statement was made from the ministerial benches, I believe by the Minister of Justice just before he resumed his seat, that the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for North Toronto had asked for an investigation by either a parliamentary committee or a commission, and therefore this commission to Mr. Justice Cassels was appointed. Consider the audacity of the man who would make such a statement before this House in view of the fact that the report of the Civil Service Commissioners says this :

> The lack of organization and of organizing power in the department has recently been very conspicuously and painfully illustrated by the fact that the accountant's or bookkeeping branch had apparently fallen into such confusion that expert accountants had to be called in to put things to rights and create some intelligible system.

Who called in these accountants ? Why, the minister. The Commission found that somebody was so much to blame that he had to call in outsiders to do the work which should have been done by his department ; and yet we are told that there is no reflection on the minister. Then the report says :

> There is not only a lack of efficient organization and method in the department. There would also seem to be a lack of conscience.

Not one word to say that that lack of conscience was only in subordinates ; the report applies this remark to the department. It is not for me, standing in this House, to say that the minister is devoid of conscience, but the report hits equally the minister and his officials, and the courageous way would have been to have a committee of this House to investigate the matter, and to say whether the head of the department was to blame or only some subordinate. I remember in the olden days that the Reform party laid down the principle in this House that investigations of this kind should be by this House, that it was the duty of the members of this House to investigate, and they deprecated the royal commissions. But notwithstanding the fact that half a dozen charges have been made against the department, we find the minister taking before the council a modest little order which he wants to have passed, limiting the inquiry, not merely to one single charge, but to one head of that charge. Let me remind the House again of the extent of this last commission, to show how contemptibly insignificant the reference is. On page 34 of the report the following paragraph occurs :

> There is not only a lack of efficient organization and method in the department. There would also seem to be a lack of conscience. In connection with the enormous expenditures which are deemed necessary, the word 'discount' never appears. It is tacitly assumed that there is no such thing; but the whole commercial world knows otherwise. If no one gets any benefit from trade with the government except the trader, then it must be clear that in these great purchases made for the government, without discount, its officers must be assisting the trader to get better prices from the government than he can get anywhere else; for everywhere else he has to give discount. In other words, some of the government's officers are serving two masters, and apparently succeeding with both—scripture notwithstanding.

So that is the whole reference to Mr. Justice Cassels. We have a judge brought down from the bench, we have two counsel appointed, and all under the sun they can investigate, of all the details given in this report, is whether or not there is a rake-off in the department by which certain officials in the department profit in the purchase of goods. An official who will order a million and a half dollars worth of goods in a year might be a secret partner in the firm from which he orders, but that could not be investigated ; he might order a million dollars worth of goods from a firm on condition that the firm would subscribe one hundred thousand or two hundred thousands dollars to an election fund, but you could not investigate that. He might be paid by the firm in any way you see fit, but as long as there is not a rake-off coming to him from the purchase of the goods, Mr. Justice Cassels has no more authority to investigate than has the Speaker of the House. Thus you see how contemptibly insignificant the investigation is. Every one knows, it has been common rumour on the streets of Ottawa for years, that in connection with some of these large firms, ministers and ex-ministers are partners. I am not in a position to know this, to assert it positively, but I know that it has been the common talk for years and that any proper investigation would allow that fact to be discovered. Why any minister in the cabinet to-day might be a partner in the

Wilson Company, the Merwin Company, the Brooks Company or any other company and that fact might be known to the witness in the box and to counsel, yet under this order of reference it would be impossible to investigate that matter because that is not the subject referred. Can we imagine anything more absurd than that after all this cry in the country as the result of these charges, we have a paltry, puny, whittled down reference, only the single point whether the men who buy goods get a rake-off back from the purchaser.

If there could be anything more absurd than that it would be the appointment as first counsel of Mr. Watson. The minister of Justice grew very eloquent over his friend Mr. Watson. I have nothing to say against Mr. Watson, I think it would be cowardly, on the floor of this House, where he cannot defend himself, to say a word against him. I shall only state a couple of facts that cannot be gainsaid. An investigation was held in the county of Elgin some years ago on behalf of the Ontario government into charges of corruption in an election. A commission was appointed by the Ontario government and Mr. Geo. Watson was appointed counsel to elicit the evidence necessary and proper to be brought before the commission to enable them to make an intelligent report. Mr. Watson no doubt thought he was doing his duty because he drew his pay and I am sure he would not do that if he did not think he had done his duty. The commission solemnly sat, the evidence was produced and I have the report here. If we believe the report founded on the evidence brought forward by counsel on that occasion, there was never a purer election on earth than that election. The minister said he appointed Mr. Watson because he knows him. Of course he does, no one knows him better. He was the eminent counsel who secured the verdict of acquittal here. A short time afterwards a protest came up for trial. Mr. Wallace Nesbitt appeared for the Conservative and Mr. A. B. Aylesworth, who is now the Minister of Justice, appeared for the respondent. I shall not occupy the time of the House by reading the confession of Mr. Donald McNish, because every one in Canada knows that there is no offence forbidden by the election law which is not included in the solemn confession signed by Mr. McNish as having been committed in that election, and in order to prevent any possibility of his afterwards saying that he did not understand what he was signing, that although it was true that his signature was attached to the confession, he did not know that all these crimes were set forth in it, Mr. A. B. Aylesworth was compelled to sign as witness because Mr. Nesbitt knew that with the name of that eminent lawyer, who was at the head of his profession, attached as witness to the signature of his client, the client would not be able to say that he did not know what he had signed, because his professional honour and reputation would compel Mr. Aylesworth to drive the lie down his client's throat. So we find that the minister can well say that he knew Mr. Watson because they had met during an inquiry in West Elgin and, knowing Mr. Watson, he appointed him first counsel in this important investigation. Counsel might have been selected from any province in the Dominion. There is no particular reason why counsel should come from Ontario and Quebec; they might equally well have been selected from New Brunswick, Nova Scotia or British Columbia, and yet out of all the lawyers in Canada, he selected Mr. Watson. Without saying a word against Mr. Watson, if the minister were here he would bear me out when I say that I could name Reform lawyers in Toronto, just as able, in just as good standing in the profession as Mr. Watson whom he could have selected if he had chosen to do so. There is no gentleman in this House from any province in Canada on either side of the House, who would not be able to name a Reform counsel from his own province, eminently capable and able to conduct such a trifling investigation as this inquiry. But no, of all the lawyers in this country the first one to be selected was the gentleman who had made a record along the very line on which it would be in the interest of this government to have another record made in this case.

One would have supposed that one counsel would have been sufficient in a little investigation like this, but no, a second had to be appointed. Again the bar of the whole Dominion was at the service of the government and of all the men in Canada the only one they could choose as a fitting colleague for Mr. Watson was the partner of the late Mr. Prefontaine. The Minister of Marine made a certain statement in the House this afternoon which I cannot characterize as I would like on the floor of this House owing to the rules of parliament. But I will say as a fact, and my statement of fact can be contrasted with his, that when I asked in the House the other evening if Mr. Perron was a member of the firm of Prefontaine, Archer, Perron & Taschereau, of which the late Mr. Prefontaine was head, I was reading the name from the Montreal City Directory of the years 1903-1904, so that up to that date Mr. Perron was in the city directory of Montreal as a partner of Mr. Prefontaine. Does it not strike the ordinary man, I shall not speak of the politician, as rather extraordinary that when this judge was appointed to investigate the doings of the department of which the late Mr. Prefontaine was head for some time, being succeeded by the present minister who has been its head since, the only man to be selected as a colleague of the counsel who

was not able to find anything wrong in the other case, was the gentleman who, above all others in this country, was interested in protecting the name and fame of his late partnr, Mr. Préfontaine ? Why was this ? I do not pretend to say. There are two possible explanations. One may have been an honest desire to see that justice was done to a colleague now unhappily removed, another may have been that in view of all the reflections that have been thrown on Mr. Prefontaine from the other side of the House, in view of the innumerable times that the present Minister of Marine has held up the shadow and the shade of Mr. Prefontaine between himself and attack, it may be that he felt some pressure from the province of Quebec which compelled him in his dying political moments to defend the memory of the late Mr. Prefontaine. Whatever the reason, the fact remains that the people of Canada are to be represented, if they are represented at all before this coroner's inquest, to use the words of the Minister of Justice, by one counsel who could not find anything wrong in West Elgin, where other counsel found so much, and by another who was the partner of the late Minister of Marine. Surely the people of this country must begin to have their own opinion of the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite and perhaps most suspect them when they promise most fairly. The Minister of Justice was good enough to sneer at hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, because he said we claimed to represent the people of this country. Do not let us bandy words about claiming to represent the people. Let members on both sides for a moment lay aside all political bias and prejudices and consider what has happened on the floor of this House. Let us consider the fact that we come here at the beginning of a session and find that thousands of miles of timber limits belonging to the people the session before have now been granted to private individuals ; who inquires what has become of these lands, who inquires when the people are dispossessed of portions of the public domain? Never a gentleman on the government side of the House. Never will you find inquiry raised in that respect, except from the ranks of His Majesty's loyal opposition. Whether it be coal leases, or timber leases, or fishing leases—no matter what it is that the people have lost, so far as my experience goes in this House, I never heard an inquiry or a regret from the other side of the House, but I have heard many an inquiry and deep regret from hon. gentlemen on this side. So, I think, if we lay aside bias and prejudice and frankly consider the duties discharged by gentlemen in this House, it will be found that in any inquiry of interest to the people, of help to the people, it is the opposition that represents the people.

Mr. NORTHRUP.

But let us take the report of the commission which is before the House. It says that all sorts of extravagance, corruption, rascality—if I may use the term—exist in several departments. Has any single step been taken by any minister to see whether these charges are true or not? It is true a little inquiry is proposed into one corner of this great domain. But when such serious charges are made, is it not a shocking state of affairs that ministers who control this House and who are supposed to have the honour of the people in their charge, make no move to see whether the report brought down by the commissioners is true or not? Would it not strike any man of ordinary business capacity, any man accustomed to affairs, that when three commissioners bring down such a report as this, no doubt at serious expense to the country, it would be easy to ask them: 'To whom do you refer? Who are the people who are guilty of this wrong-doing?' When these men have done so much of the work why send new men to begin de novo. The first men have been working for weeks and months in the mine and have brought up good solid ore as the result of their workings. Only those who desire not to discover the truth would take such a course.

Now, I do not intend to discuss this question further, more than to say that when the matter comes to be laid calmly and dispassionately before the people of this country, when, laying aside political bias, if it be possible, we come to consider the case on its merits, what are the people to think of a commission appointed to investigate about one-twentieth of the charges that are made, and that one-twentieth so selected that by no possibility can a minister be hurt? What are the people to think when they see a minister sheltering himself behind a commission so that he should by any possibility be hurt and telling them: 'Go on, investigate among my subordinates?' And then, when he has so entrenched himself that not even a stray shot can possibly hit him, even then he is afraid to appoint counsel in the ordinary way to investigate the case, but selects, I venture to say—without casting any disparagement upon the integrity or ability of the gentlemen—the two counsel who of the whole bar of Canada are the least suitable for the particular duties which they are called upon to perform in connection with this commission. Then, Sir, when after such an attempt as that, first to shelter the minister and then to select counsel so as to secure him from any possibility of trouble, we find the government gravely telling the House and the people that they have given this commission because that is what the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for North Toronto have asked, can any one fail to be reminded of the well-known lines :

In short, I firmly do believe
in humbug generally,
For it's a thing that I perceive
To have a solid vally;
This hath my faithful shepherd ben,
In pastures sweet heth led me,
An' this 'll keep the people green
To feed ez they have fed me.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): The debate started by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) this afternoon has given some hon. gentlemen who sit behind him an opportunity to go over all the old stories that they have been revamping for the last two or three years. It is quite evident that most of the hon. gentlemen on that side who have spoken this afternoon have never read the Civil Service report at all.

Mr. OWEN. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) has read it, he can give us something new.

Mr. MACDONALD. It would not take much reading on my part to fit me to instruct the hon. gentleman who interrupts me. I say that the remarks of these hon. gentlemen and the reiteration of all these fables and old wives' stories that they have been retailing until they have begun actually to believe some of them themselves, indicate that these gentlemen have not read the report. It is true that my ingenious friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox)—whom I will not call an artful dodger, but would rather call an artful dissector—has treated the report in a way for which he can find no authority in his effort to find some references to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I submit that any gentleman who reads the report through will find that there is not the slightest intention on the part of these commissioners to refer to the minister in any manner, and the hon. gentleman who tries to argue to the contrary is simply torturing the language and attempting to put a construction upon it which it will not bear. And when the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), who has spoken with more than ordinary eloquence and fluency this evening, undertakes to say that there are charges of rascality against three or four departments contained in this report, he will not find any such charges in regard to any departments in this report; he simply cannot put his finger upon any such language. He will not find in this report in referring to officials of the department of this government anything that would demand an investigation more than these words that are contained in the report on which the order in council is based appointing Judge Cassels as commissioner in this matter. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen, taking inspiration from their party organs, to run away with the idea that this report has said something about somebody in particular. But let us calmly and deliberately look at this report and see what these commissioners have said. They have first dealt with the Department of Marine and Fisheries and have said a good deal in regard to the files and correspondence, the methods of dealing with these files and the difficulty of finding matters referred to in the files. Then they deal with the methods in regard to correspondence between those in the department itself and with parties outside. They go on and deal with the number of officials and state that there are enough officials in the department to do the work if they were trained and organized. They go on to discuss the question of putting responsibility upon particular officers for departmental acts. And when hon. gentlemen opposite attempt to argue that a phrase used in this report is intended to refer to the minister they refer to a portion of the report which clearly indicates the deputy and those responsible to him, the heads of the several branches and to them alone. Then they go on and deal with the lack of organization in the department. Then they come to the one and only specific statement contained in the whole report which makes an allegation of wrong-doing or 'lack of conscience,' to use their own term, the only charge which this House or the government could take cognizance of for further investigation. And as I intend to refer to that when I come to the order in council I shall not read it now. Then they go on and discuss the system of purchasing supplies in the Marine Department, and I want my hon. friends opposite who are endeavouring to make themselves believe that this system of purchasing grew up under this government to listen to this statement of the commissioners.

> Your commissioners are informed on the best authority that this state of things has been going on ever since pre-confederation days.

The hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Owen), if he will examine the report will find that the good old Conservative party he loves so much purchased supplies just in the same way in the Marine and Fisheries Department, and he will find the statement reiterated that so far as there is anything to be condemned in that respect in the Marine Department, the only trouble was that the officials went on purchasing supplies just as they did under the previous government. Then the commissioners go on and discuss the wisdom of the appointment of the lighthouse board, and they name the officials who compose that board, Colonel Gourdeau, Colonel Anderson, Commander Spain, J. F. Fraser, H. A. Allan and Captain J. W. Troupe. They condemn the proposition that the power of determining where lights should be placed in this country should remain under the control of that board. Having dealt with all these subjects, they come to the following conclusion:

Your commissioners regret that they have been unable to investigate the condition of things in some of the other departments. But to do the work with any pretensions to thoroughness would take much more time than would probably be agreeable to the government. They have been able to go over only a very small section of even the Marine and Fisheries Department. If they had had time it would have been most desirable to have inspected the work of the department at the agencies—Quebec, Sorel, Halifax, St. John and Prescott—particularly Quebec and Halifax.

Now we are told that there have been great abuses in the purchase of supplies, and we are reminded of the stores purchased for the 'Arctic' and the 'Montcalm'. Some of those hon. gentlemen who have never seen the ocean, know nothing of the way in which steamers are run in the St. Lawrence and on the Atlantic; if they did they would have saved themselves a great deal of the rhetoric with which they have flooded this House. The men who go down to the sea in ships require to be pretty well fed; and sailors who go on long voyages exposed to the perils of the Arctic navigation require to be well provided for. Hon. gentlemen seem to forget that their own friend, Mr. Gregory, a gentleman whom they appointed and who has been continued under this administration, was the man who certified to the accuracy of the quantities and the correctness of the prices of the supplies purchased, not only for the 'Arctic' and the 'Montcalm,' but in regard to every dollar's worth of supplies purchased in the city of Quebec, and he has been doing that inspection the last twenty years. The hon. gentleman who spoke last (Mr. Northrup) insinuated that the minister should be held responsible for any excessive price paid for supplies. Well, will he tell me how in the name of all that is reasonable could a minister in Ottawa be supposed to know whether this official away down in Quebec certified correctly to the purchase of a barrel of flour? Is the minister of a department continually to assume that the officer who has that duty in charge is deceiving the government, and wasting the public money by paying more for supplies than he ought to? If the ministers in all the departments were to assume dishonesty on the part of their officials, we would have a very peculiar state of affairs in this country. Then these gentlemen go on further to say:

Your commissioners have to confess that the general conclusions which they have formed regarding the administration of the department are most unfavourable. It seems to have few redeeming features. Although there are some, one of which is the presence in the department of some good men, chiefly, but not wholly, in the lower ranks. With a better organization and better methods, these might form the nucleus of a good staff. The trouble is not of recent origin, but has been long continued, and is the result of evil methods and practices persisted in for many years.

It has been the same under all administrations. This difficulty of administration, this trouble of which they complain, this lack of conscience which they say they have discovered in certain officials, all these things, they declare, are not of recent origin, but have been long continued, and are the result of evil methods and practices persisted in for many years under all administrations. Now I say that my hon. friends who have discussed this question, if they go to work and dissect this report, will be unable to find one single reference of a nature which calls for an investigation, either by the government or by this House, except, the subjects mentioned in this order in council. We are told that there have been difficulties in regard to methods of administration, abuses which have always existed, and the commissioners go on to discuss the question of salaries, and to discuss civil service reform, which they take to mean the absence of all political influences in the appointment of civil servants. The hon. member from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) talked glibly about this report, but he will not find anything in it calling for investigation with the exception of the subjects contained in the order in council appointing Justice Cassels as commissioner. That brings me to the question raised by the leader of the opposition as to whether this inquiry has been restricted. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) suggested that it was not necessary to have this commission at all. He seems to disagree with his leader. The hon. member for Hastings insinuated that because this government had appointed Mr. Justice Cassels and because they did not re-appoint the three commissioners, therefore they did not want to find out anything wrong. Now it won't do to laud Justice Cassels in one breath, and in the next breath to insinuate that it would be just as well to have no commissioner at all. Yet that is what the member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) said this afternoon. Now, is there any restriction of the inquiry? I have shown that a careful perusal of the report will lead any fair-minded man to the conclusion that the only words contained in the report respecting the Marine and Fisheries Department that the government could deal with, are these:

There would also seem to be a lack of confidence. In connection with the enormous expenditures which are deemed necessary, the word 'discount' never appears. It is tacitly assumed that there is no such thing; but the whole commercial world knows otherwise. If no one gets any benefit from trade with the government except the trader, then it must be clear that in these great purchases made for the government without discount, its offi-

cers must be assisting the trader to get better prices from the government than he can get anywhere else; for everywhere else he has to get discount. In other words, some of the government's officers are serving two masters, and apparently succeeding with both—scripture notwithstanding.

And the minister draws, in his report to council the inference that commissions are received improperly or that enhanced prices are paid through dishonesty on the part of officials in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The report continues:

But unfortunately the report does not mention any names which would enable him to take definite action concerning these officials. It is, however, in the interest of the Department of Marine and Fisheries and of the country that immediate steps should be taken in order to determine what officials, if any, deserve condemnation and to give to all an opportunity to meet the charges implied.

I submit that the statement is broad and generous. It draws the only inference that can be drawn. It is by way of reflection upon the officials of the department. I do not know whether my hon. friends, ingenious as they are in being able to manufacture imputations and suggest all kinds of wrong-doing without the slightest pretext can possibly infer more, from the language used, than what is indicated by the minister in his report. It seems to me that it gives full effect and to the utmost limit to which my hon. friends might go in that direction. What then does the minister do?

The minister therefore recommends that he be authorized to appoint the Hon. Walter Cassels a commissioner under part 2 of chapter 104 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, to investigate and report upon the foregoing statements contained in the said report of the Civil Service Commission reflecting upon the integrity of the officials of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or any of them.

That is the reference. Now, what can the gentleman who was appointed commissioner do? He is appointed under a section of the statute which gives the minister authority to appoint.

A commissioner or commissioners to investigate and report upon the state and management of the business, or any part of the business, of such department, either in the inside or outside service thereof, and the conduct of any person in such service, so far as relates to his official duties.

That is what the minister has done. The broadest and most complete powers are conferred by this order in council and this statute upon Mr. Justice Cassels. If these gentlemen have anything to say about Merwin, if these hon. gentlemen have anything to say about the 'Arctic,' if these hon. gentlemen have anything to say about any of these stories that they have been circulating up and down this country, this gives to Mr. Justice Cassels full and complete authority to investigate and to put on record before this House and the country his findings and report so that this House and the people may deal, not with the insinuations and innuendoes that have been hurled up and down through the country by hon. gentlemen who have abandoned every shred of policy upon every question and who have got down to that one and only occupation as a political party, but with the report and findings of Mr. Justice Cassels. We will have an investigation upon all these insinuations under this statute and order in council which will enable us to have the findings and report so that we will understand the truth in regard to this matter. This inquiry is limited, is it?

The commissioner or commissioners may, for the purposes of the investigation, enter into and remain within any public office or institution, and shall have access to every part thereof, and may examine all papers, documents, vouchers, records and books of every kind belonging thereto, and may summon before him or them any person and require him to give evidence on oath, orally or in writing, or on solemn affirmation if he is entitled to affirm in civil matters; and any such commissioner may administer such oath or affirmation.

It gives him the fullest and most complete power in order that, if there has been wrongful dealing in regard to supplies, in order, if the officials of the department, not within the last year or two but at any time in the past, have been serving two masters he can find it out. So, it will be with reference to the whole catalogue and category of insinuations that we have heard upon this matter. This inquiry is not restricted. This inquiry goes to the very widest limit in order that there may be a most complete report in regard to anything that may be deemed to be wrong in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. So much for the question as to whether this inquiry is restricted. Some hon. gentlemen have suggested that if there were such and such a thing it would not be possible to investigate it. I am sure that my hon. friends who make this suggestion are dealing in casuistry. Does any one suppose that Mr. Justice Cassels, if he found, in any of these things, a suggestion of partnership on the part of any official or minister with anybody dealing with the department, disclosed upon any document which he has the right to scrutinize to the fullest possible extent and limit, would not report to this House and put on record before the House and the country what the facts may be in regard to the matter? I think it is not fair for hon. gentlemen to attempt to suggest that there is a restricted inquiry here. They feel their weakness on this subject because we have tacked on to this the weakest kind of an argument that could possibly be made

in regard to a subject of this kind. Now, one hon. gentleman lauds Mr. Justice Cassels at one moment and another hon. gentleman suggests that if the government had chosen the old Civil Service Commissioners to conduct this investigation it would have been far better. If Mr. Justice Cassels is the good, the upright and the honourable judge, if he is half as worthy as hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House tell us he is he is surely qualified to make this investigation. But, these hon. gentlemen tell us in one breath that he is an upright and honourable judge and in the next breath they tell us that he is not the man for the place. But, if he is half as worthy as hon. gentlemen on the other side contend he is——

Mr. WARD. Who said he was not the man for the place?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ward) could not have been in the House or he would have heard the hon. member beside him (Mr. Northrup) suggesting that it was an indication that the government did not want to get at the truth because if they did they would have left the matter to the old commission.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I raised no point as to the integrity of Mr. Justice Cassels.

Mr. FIELDING. But you said he could not get at the truth.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I would point out that hon. gentlemen occupy a very peculiar position. My hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) of course praised Mr. Justice Cassels at one moment and the next moment he pointed out that this government were worthy of condemnation because they had appointed Mr. Justice Cassels, asserting that he would not get at the truth quite as well as if the old commissioners had been allowed to continue the work that they had been doing for a long time.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I criticised the government for appointing Mr. Justice Cassels to conduct such a limited inquiry.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friend has been too long at the bar and has had too much experience not to know that if Mr. Justice Cassels is half as good a man as my hon. friend says he is he will, with the powers which he has under this statute and under this order in council, be able to investigate anything that my hon. friend has ever insinuated against the department during the past five or six years.

Mr. WARD. He will be hauled over the coals for going beyond his powers. The commissioners have been blamed for doing that.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Well, I can assure my hon. friend that there is not the slightest evidence of any restriction of the inquiry in this case. It is impossible for them to argue that there is. They have taken the position at one moment of saying that Mr. Cassels is a very able man and at the next moment declaring that this investigation would have been very much better conducted if it had been conducted by the Civil Service Commissioners. And then, as if they knew precisely the untenable position they were in they take the other course; they are driven to the weakest possible position. they turn around and abuse the counsel who have been called in by the government to take part in this investigation. At one moment they tell us that these gentlemen are able men, and as far as I have been acquainted with the jurisprudence of the great province of Ontario from reading its decisions in the courts, not merely in election proceedings, but in questions of great moment affecting all the great interests of the provinces and although I have not the pleasure of knowing the senior counsel in this matter personally and I only judge him as one lawyer would judge another in another province, yet I say that Mr. Watson enjoys a reputation not merely in Ontario but in all portions of this Dominion among lawyers as a man in the very front rank of his profession.

Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who are members of the bar know that there is no man at the bar of Ontario could reach the position Mr. Watson has attained, unless he was an honourable man and that coupled with his legal knowledge he possesses the integrity which every man in such a position must have. But because Mr. Watson is a Liberal we are told that this whole investigation is to fail. Mr. Perron also occupies a high position at the bar of Quebec and the same remarks apply to him. Of course the old game is to abuse the lawyer on the other side, and my hon. friends opposite have got themselves into the very weakest possible position when they say that though these are able men, yet they are Liberals and all kind of things must be suspected about them. I apprehend that the record of the Hon. Mr. Justice Cassels at the bar and the estimation in which he is held by all who know him must be known to these gentlemen opposite, and if Mr. Justice Cassels is to carry out his powers under the statute and under the order in council, it is a most unwarranted assumption that men of the standard of Mr. Watson and Mr. Perron would be found disregarding their oath not merely as barristers but as King's Counsellers, to endeavour to prevent Mr. Justice Cassels from conducting a proper investigation. I submit that when these gentlemen read the report of the Civil Service Commission they will find that the clause which is contained in this order in council is the only portion of the report which makes any imputation on that

department in the sense in which an investigation should be held. I submit that the statute and the order in council give the fullest possible powers to deal with the question, and as to the rest of the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite they are unwarranted and unfair, and such arguments would not be advanced if these gentlemen were at the bar discussing this question or anywhere else than in this House where they seem to constantly prostitute almost every public question for partisan ends.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel). We have had the pleasure of hearing the same stereotyped address from my hon. friend from Pictou when he rises so often in defence of everything wrong that is done by the present government of which he is such an ardent supporter. In the Public Accounts Committee when we endeavour to discover the wrong-doings of the government the hon. gentleman leads the forces in defence of every act of the government and we are therefore not surprised that to-night he should come to their rescue in this matter. Let me in the first place direct the attention of the Minister of Finance to a statement made by him this afternoon, that the Liberal Conservative party appointed a royal commission to investigate the civil service in 1891, and that when the report of that royal commission was presented to the House in 1892 the Liberal Conservative party pigeon-holed that report. I take up the 'Hansard' for 1893 and I find that the Liberal Conservative government introduced a Bill for the purpose of bettering the civil service and carrying out in some respects the recommendations of the royal commission. And Sir, we find the Reform party then in opposition condemning the Liberal Conservative government of the day for proposing to make changes in the Civil Service Act, and among the chief of those who objected was Mr. Laurier, now the Prime Minister of Canada. At page 2815 'Hansard' 1893. Mr. Laurier said :

> The hon. gentleman's demand is not logical. If I agree to the principle of the Bill, I would give every facility to perfect it, but we object to the Bill in toto and object that it should go any further.

In the discussion Mr. Laurier said :

> I look upon the Bill as a device to put pensioners upon the civil list, and there is no other reason for it. I therefore move that the Bill be not now read a second time but that it be read a second time this day six months.

Here we have it that when the Liberal Conservative government was making an effort to reform the civil service and carry out some of the provisions of the commissioners' report, Mr. Laurier moved the six months hoist. And in face of that the Minister of Finance stands up to-day and states that the Liberal Conservative party did nothing to carry out the recommendations.

Mr. FIELDING. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to show what important reform recommended by the commission was carried out ?

Mr. BARKER. That is not what you said.

Mr. FIELDING. I stated that for four years they had that report and no material part of it ever was adopted.

Mr. BLAIN. What the Minister of Finance said was that the Liberal Conservative party had pigeon-holed the report.

Mr. FIELDING. So they did.

Mr. BLAIN. Was that a fair statement of the efforts of the Conservative party to improve the civil service.

Mr. FIELDING. Show me what important feature of that report was adopted and carried out.

Mr. BLAIN. I am pointing out that the year after the report was presented a minister of the Liberal Conservative government introduced a Bill to make the conditions of the civil service better.

Mr. FIELDING. In what respect ?

Mr. BLAIN. And I am showing that the present Prime Minister moved that the Bill receive a six months hoist. The Minister of Finance cannot contradict that. The Minister of Finance asks what was made better by the Liberal Conservatives that the commission reported on. That is not the question.

Mr. FIELDING. I thought it was.

Mr. BLAIN. Whatever faults the Liberal Conservative party may have had in those days were dealt with in the general election of 1896.

Mr. FIELDING. And will be again.

Mr. BLAIN. The Minister of Finance may have some different history from the eastern part of Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, and in the middle too.

Mr. BLAIN. Yes, we have the Liberal party driven out of power in the province of Ontario for the next twenty-five years.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Huron for instance.

Mr. BEATTIE. What about Colchester?

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend need not worry about Huron.

Mr. JOHNSTON. It suits me first-rate.

Mr. BLAIN. It is strange these hon. gentlemen opposite are always referring to the Liberal-Conservative party. The government have appointed a commission to look

into some of the departments ; this commission has made a report such as was never presented to any other government in the history of this country ; and we have now the spectacle of one minister after another condemning the three commissioners. What the Liberal-Conservative party say is that after the government have appointed three commissioners to investigate the civil service and the question of civil service reform, and after the commissioners have at considerable expense travelled to different parts of the country, taken many pages of evidence, given their best attention to the question, and made a report, if there are to be any further suggestions, they should come from these three gentlemen, instead of another man being appointed to look into the matter. As to whether or not Mr. Justice Cassels is the proper man to make the investigation I have nothing to say. In any city in Canada you can find men qualified for such a duty. I will wait until Mr. Justice Cassels brings in a report, and I will judge from that whether he is the proper man or not.

The Minister of Justice twitted the Liberal-Conservative party with the statement that the Ontario government had appointed commissioners to look into various matters in the province of Ontario, and I am sure that the hon. Minister of Justice did not do any credit to the position he holds in this government when he said that these commissioners were political heelers. Mr. Whitney's government did appoint some commissions, and the men who composed those commissions were respectable gentlemen, eminently qualified to discharge their duties, and they brought in some reports that were rather damaging to the Reform government in the province of Ontario and the Reform party in Canada. I may point out that one commission they appointed was the School book Commission. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways will know something about that, because he voted in the Ontario legislature that the school-books were supplied to the children of the province of Ontario at the proper price ; and when the Liberal-Conservative party introduced a resolution to the effect that the price was altogether too high, my hon. friend supported a motion that the prices were all right. When the Liberal-Conservative party came into power, Mr. Whitney's government did appoint a commission to inquire into the school-book question ; and what did that commission find ? They found that the children were paying twice as much for their school-books as they should, and reported accordingly. Here is an object lesson for my hon. friend, if he is seeking one. When that commission reported, Mr. Whitney set about to take some advantage of the report, with the result that to-day the children of the province of Ontario are paying for their school-books less than half of what they did when the Reform party was in power.

One would suppose from this discussion that there was nothing wrong in any department except the Department of Marine and Fisheries ; but all that one has to do is to turn up almost any page of the commission's report to learn the contrary. For instance, my hon. friend the Minister of Customs thinks his department is all right. Let me read a paragraph at page 29 of the report, which says :

> Every collector of customs has been appointed from the ranks of the party in power at the moment. Many of the inspectors are in a similar position, and, under a clause of the Civil Service Act waiving the examination of persons appointed to positions requiring special and technical qualifications, almost all the appraisers in the outside service of this department have been appointed without undergoing the Civil Service examination.

When we say anything about men appointed to positions in the Customs Department, the minister's answer always is that they must pass the civil service examination ; and yet the commission reports that a large number of the men appointed by my hon. friend have not passed any such examination. Then, we have a comparatively new minister in charge of the Post Office Department, and I would like to draw his attention to what is said at page 31 of the report :

> Your commissioners found that in all the post office branches officials were employed who had failed to pass the examination laid down by the Act.

These hon. gentlemen came into office with the promise to the people of Canada that they would purify the civil service ; and when we charged that they were appointing political supporters regardless of their qualifications, we were met with the statement that they would be required to pass the civil service examination, and yet we find these commissioners saying that in the Department of Customs and in the Post Office Department officials have been appointed who did not pass any civil service examination whatever. Then, we have a new condition of things. According to this report, not only do the politicians who support the present administration use their influence to have men appointed to office, but they use their influence to have the same men promoted. At page 27 of the report the commissioners say :

> As a rule your commissioners found in the outside service that politics enter into every appointment, and politicians on the spot interest themselves not only in the appointments but in subsequent promotions of officials.

I do not, Mr. Speaker, wish to detain the House longer. I wish only to say that in

my humble opinion when an inquiry is commenced, and when men have been selected to make that inquiry, and they have done their duty up to a certain point, if there is a necessity for further investigation, it should be referred back to the same men to do that work ; and I am very much surprised that after the government appointed three gentlemen with special qualifications to deal with this matter, and after these gentlemen have brought in a report dealing with different departments of this government and stating that they have found some men making an attempt to serve two masters, we have the government appointing another commission to find out which of these masters these officials are serving.

Surely the men who are appointed to do that, who after examination found that such a condition of things existed, were better qualified than any other men to put their finger upon the men who are making an effort to serve two masters, which cannot be successfully done. I agree with the proposition of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) that the people of this country will not be satisfied. I think the mutual praise policy on the part of the Minister of Justice about his old companions in his happy days, that have gone by, in the province of Ontario should cease. When he knew that these men had been engaged in politics and election trials in the past, he should have attached some dignity to his office, if he had no dignity to attach to himself and have said that when a grave question of this kind presents itself to the people of Canada, he would not leave himself open to the suspicion that he appointed a political supporter of his to defend the government. As the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) has pointed out, he could have found honourable men in the profession in any city in Canada, who had no political bias, and I am sure if such men had been found the appointments would not be open to the same objection, and would not receive the same criticism.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Just a few words as my name has been mentioned. I did not intend to take any part in this discussion, but really I have been somewhat struck with the contradictory nature of the arguments, if you may call them so, of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I am trying to see where we are at in this matter. One fault that is found with the appointment of Mr. Justice Cassels is that it is an attempt to review the work of the commissioners, which they say is a highly reprehensible thing to do. Another hon. member says he has not been appointed to review the work of the commissioners at all, only to review one little thing in their report, which is so small that the hon. member for East Hastings wonders that the judge would so lower himself as to come down from the bench and deal with it.

Another thing that struck me as very remarkable is the attitude of gentlemen belonging to the legal profession. I am but a layman, and have been rather inclined on looking to them as a body of honourable men, men who, if they had a duty placed on them, would discharge it honestly. But if I am to take what I have heard from the member from Toronto, the member from Simcoe and the member from East Hastings, who belong to that great profession, their idea of the sense of honour that dwells in some of their number, is apparently such that one is tempted to ask if they could trust themselves in an investigation of this kind. Could my hon. friend have confidence in himself if he was appointed on a Whitney commission ? Surely he could, at least I think he could, although he has shaken my faith. The other gentlemen who have spoken, every one of them belonging to that profession, have taken the ground that men sworn to do their duty, sworn in a judicial investigation, will disregard their obligation. It is not my judgment.

The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) tells us this is a little, trifling, contemptible task to ask the judge to descend from the bench and undertake. In the same breath he tells us that this judge is a noble man. He must be that, for he has always had the admiration of my hon. friend, and that would prove him to be a noble man. This noble man so misapprehends the nature of the duties he has been asked to perform that he is not able to see, what the profound brain of the hon. member for East Hastings could see, that the inquiry is a little, miserable, contemptible thing that he should not have taken hold of. He was not compelled to do so. The government recommended him for appointment and he accepted the appointment. Why on earth did he do it ? Why could he not have some conception of the dignity of his office equal to that of the member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup). Why could he not have asked him, why has the hon. member, who loves him so, allowed him to accept it ? Why did he not go to him with that lifelong friendship and admiration and say : Judge, you will never think of taking that, surely ? Why it is the meanest, smallest, most contemptible task ever given to a man ! He did not do it, he has let the poor judge get into that scrape. Think of it ! He assures us that he took care to laud the judge to the highest point. So do they all, the member for Toronto, the member for Simcoe, they all upheld him in that.

These hon. members have their own appreciation of what members of the profession, sworn to perform a judicial act, will do. How do they know what they will

do ? Is it a common thing in the profession, has it been known in the profession that members act in that way ? If I should take that low estimate of these men, which I utterly repudiate, let us see how this admiration for the honour and ability of the hon. judge comes in. Surely, with his ability and his honour, if he found these gentlemen who are chosen to assist him in his duty, which is to arrive at facts, not to prosecute anybody, trying to hide the facts, trying to pervert the work they have undertaken to do, and if he allowed them to do so, he would not be of the character given him by the hon. members for East Simcoe, East Hastings and Toronto. They cannot take that position. You can see at once, Mr. Speaker, how bewildered I have been with the arguments of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Such a thing could not happen or Judge Cassels cannot be the man these gentlemen say he is. If he allowed that to take place he would lack either discernment, capacity or honesty, and they dare not charge him with such a lack. Is my argument good or not ?

He is appointed to do something which he does not consider beneath his dignity. It is true he is not asked to review the report of the commissioners. The government and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries are willing that this report of the commissioners shall go out, 10,000 copies of it, wherever the members choose to send it. They have the benefit of whatever weight it carries. We do not ask to have it reviewed, we do not ask to have the opinions in it qualified. We do not ask a commission to be appointed to see that if they cannot contradict what has already been reported. That is going out with all the condemnation that it will carry.

Mr. LENNOX. Ten thousand copies?

Mr. PATERSON. That is the number ordered to be printed, I think.

Mr. WARD. Two thousand copies.

Mr. PATERSON. It is immaterial. It is going out by thousands of copies. And this commission is not appointed to refute or contradict what they have said. But here is the statement of the commissioners that they believe that certain officials in that department are dishonest and corrupt. They do not give the names of these men, and this judicial inquiry is to ascertain whether there be such men in the service that they may be dealt with. And the investigator will report. We are asked : Why not have called upon the commissioners to do this? Well, I suppose the judge will be at perfect liberty—and for all I know he will do it—to ask the commission to give him the facts. He may say : Here is a charge you have made ; evidently you had reason to believe it is true ; would you please tell me the officers whom you suspect, or refer me to the files of the department that I may trace up the matter for myself? That is the point we wish to ascertain. Now, this is the one point in this report with which the minister could not deal. He wanted a judicial inquiry, and he is having it. The rest of the report, referring to the correspondence, the duplication of work, the lack of supervision and other weaknesses alleged are departmental in their nature and must be dealt with by the head of the department. And the minister is proceeding to deal with them—started long ago. He has examined into the working of his department, and he is examining into it to see where improvements can be made. The testimony of these commissioners themselves shows that. They say :

> There is not only a lack of efficient organization and method in the department. There would also seem to be a lack of conscience.

That is the subject of this investigation. But they say also :

> The lack of organization and of organizing power in the department has recently been very conspicuously and painfully illustrated by the fact that the accountant's or bookkeeping branch had apparently fallen into such confusion that expert accountants had to be called in to put things to rights and create some intelligible system. After months of work——

So the minister was at this months ago, according to these commissioners.

> After months of work by these highly paid experts the result has been at least greatly improved books as far as mechanical form is concerned, but probably little else; and this achievement has been accomplished at an almost fabulous expense.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PATERSON. That is in print and it is going out in these 7,000 or 10,000 copies. People will see, at any rate, that action was taken by the minister months before these gentlemen saw his department at all.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) allow me to ask a question? He has repeated his statement about ten thousand and seven thousand copies going out. Each member receives seven or eight copies, making two thousand in all. What becomes of the rest?

Mr. PATERSON. I am speaking merely from memory and am willing to be corrected if I am wrong. Tell me the number.

Mr. LENNOX. Two thousand.

Mr. LAKE. Can we have the ten thousand ?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know anything about it; that is a matter for the Printing Committee. It is going out in thousands at any rate. There is no attempt to hide it, is there?

Mr. LENNOX. I don't know.

Mr. PATERSON. It has been in the papers. At any rate, it is shown that the minister, months before these men saw his department, had recognized the weakness of the system and had engaged professional and expert accountants to inaugurate a new system of bookkeeping by which he will be able to check purchases made through the outside agencies of the department. That system these commissioners report to be a great advantage mechanically, but probably little more. I will not stop to ask whether that was a well considered or a fair expression on the part of the commissioners, for I am not here to criticise them. But if one were criticising he might ask how these men could know that the system was of little use, for that was a matter to be determined in the future and by experience. The minister was carrying on his reorganization. What does these hon. gentlemen opposite want? I would like to ask the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), if he were in his place, or the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), they being the only two gentlemen who have had the responsibility of administering a department, what either of them would have done if he had been at the head of a department and a report of this kind had been made? To hear hon. gentlemen opposite talk one would suppose that it was the duty of these commissioners to go into the Department of Marine and Fisheries, turn the minister out of doors and reorganize the business themselves. They did their duty when they pointed out what seemed to them weakness in the department—just as they did in my department. I have no fault to find with them for pointing out these weaknesses, for if there is anyone interested in knowing the facts concerning the management of the department it is the minister in charge. A minister values his reputation as hon. gentlemen opposite value theirs. If he has any ability he wants to exercise it and wants to get due credit for exercising it and for doing the best he can. What could these commissioners do except to point out where they thought weaknesses existed? The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) will not object to that. He will look through their recommendations and if he agrees that there are weaknesses he will strengthen the department at those points. That is what I would do in my department.

They did not come into my department, the inside. They asked the commissioner if Mr. Bazin and Mr. Fyshe would be allowed to come in. Why, he said, most certainly. And so they would. I would be glad to have them go through, and if they found any weakness, if they could suggest any better way of managing anything in my department, and my judgment agreed with theirs, I would adopt it. I may be egotistical, but I believe that I can run my department better than they can. I am not going to say that I would neglect any good suggestions they might make to me. I would examine their suggestions. I would test them, but I would not adopt them if they did not commend themselves to my judgment—not if I were a free agent. Even though these gentlemen should go cursorily through my department and think they saw on the surface some weak point which they thought could be remedied, I would listen to their suggestions, and I would accept them if I thought they were an improvement. If they found that some of the work was being duplicated in the Marine Department, if they found that some of the officers had not carried out their instructions, why, I have no doubt that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) would see what he could do to improve matters. He started in to do this months ago, and he is at it now, and he will accomplish it. I say to hon. gentlemen opposite that in all fairness they had better wait and see in what shape he gets his department, wait and see what the report of Judge Cassels is. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) says he is going to wait, he is not going to pronounce judgment until he sees the report of Judge Cassels. He is a wiser and more prudent man that the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Northrup) and some other gentlemen who are willing to judge the minister before they see the report. It would not be the part of wisdom for the minister to sit in a judicial capacity on these men in his department who are charged with being corrupt and dishonest; he asks for the assistance of a judge to look into the facts, and he gets that assistance. When the report is made it will be his duty to examine it and see if there are any suggestions in it that will improve present conditions. and if he finds any that commend themselves to his judgment, I have no doubt that he will give effect to them. Hon. gentlemen opposite have taken two lines of argument. First they object to this commission because they say it is going to review the work of the previous commissioners and upset it. Nothing of the kind. There are two specific instances which the commissioners give as acts of maladministration, namely in the purchase of coal and in the purchase of flour, but they did not follow their inquiry far enough to learn the facts of the case. But they put these two charges in their report, and that report goes out wherever this volume goes. The commissioners also make a statement with reference to my department. I do not speak of this with any idea of weakening their statement, but only to point out that in the short time at their disposal they were not able to get at the real facts of the case and to explain the situation fully and fairly to the people. The hon. member for Peel read

something that they said about my department in the outside service. He read this:

Many of the inspectors are in a similar position, and under a clause in the Civil Service Act waiving the examination of persons appointed to positions requiring special and technical qualifications, almost all the appraisers in the outside service of this department have been appointed without undergoing the civil service examination.

Yes, that is true I believe, in some cases it is, and I have never been able to see yet that a man passing the civil service examination was thereby a better appraiser than one who had not passed it.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. gentleman read the balance of that section ?

Mr. PATERSON. I am coming to that I think it was a collector of customs at Quebec that they were questioning, and I think he said that according to his recollection one man had been plucked because he did not know who the Druids were. He could not get through. Now I do not care whether an appraiser knows who the Druids were or not, but I want him to know whether goods are linen or cotton, or something else. In our department we need to appoint men who understand their business, and all the collegiate institutes or university training in the world will not make a man a good appraiser if he knows nothing about the quality of goods. But no man has been appointed appraiser without undergoing the technical examination which is prescribed in the Act and which is given him by a superior officer. If he passes that successively he is recommended to me by the commission.

Mr. BLAIN. Were there any cases of men who were plucked?

Mr. PATERSON. There may have been some cases where applicants to appraiserships were plucked because they were not sufficiently conversant with their business.

Mr. BLAIN. The commissioners complain that my hon. friend appoints appraisers who do not pass the civil service examination. My hon. friend says they do not require to pass it, but he has a special examination for them. Now when one of his supporters in the House recommends to him a man for an appraiser, has any one of these men been rejected because he could not pass the special examination he refers to ?

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot remember. But if none of them were rejected, it would show the discernment of our supporters in the House. But I only want to tell the hon. gentleman that he is not appointed on the recommendation of a member of the House unless he passes a practical examination. That is what we start with.

Mr. BLAIN. Although the commissioners condemn that policy of appointment without passing the civil service examination my hon. friend is not going to pay any attention to their recommendation ?

Mr. PATERSON. Their judgment and mine do not run in the same direction. Passing the civil service examination would not hurt a man. It is a literary examination. Who were the Druids ? What happened in King Charles time ? and so on. It would not hurt a man provided he had the technical knowledge as well, but to require a man to pass the civil service examination alone, which is purely literary and to accept him as an appraiser on that is not, I think my hon. friend will agree, the wisest thing to do.

Mr. BLAIN. What I say is that when we have the civil service examination my hon. friend should either apply it to the officers of his department or else abolish the examination altogether.

Mr. PATERSON. That is not necessary, because a part of the Civil Service Act expressly states that in the case of technical officers the civil service literary examination may be dispensed with.

Mr. BLAIN. Make it easy for political purposes.

Mr. PATERSON. No, no ; that is the Act. Now, the hon. gentleman asks me to read a little farther :

In the service of this department——

That is in reference to the Customs Department—

—there are many anomalies and incongruities. In order to avoid the necessity of an examination a new class has been created under the name of 'examining officers,' a class not found in the schedule to the Civil Service Act.

Is that the point that my hon. friend wanted me to read ?

Mr. BLAIN. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON. I am very glad he did. I ask the attention of the House to that especially as my hon. friend has called attention to it. It is a little valuable because it shows the care that was exercised by these gentlemen. There is a direct statement that :

In order to avoid the necessity of examinations a new class has been created under the name of 'examining officers,' a class not found in the schedule to the Civil Service Act.

Well let us see. Section 39 of the Civil Service Act reads as follows :

Notwithstanding anything in this Act a person who has served over three years as an officer or acting officer in the outside service of the customs may be appointed an examining officer in such service subject to such examination on the duties of office and other qualifications as is prescribed by the

deputy head in a report to be concurred in by the head of the department.

There it is. This commission say it is not to be found in the schedule of the Act.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it found in the schedule to the Act ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, look at page 20, Schedule. First there are the 'higher classes,' next 'technical officers,' next 'other classes' such as 'examining officers (including lockers and landing waiters)' with salaries from $400 to $1,000. That is going out in all these thousands of copies all over the country. It is going out to say that in order to avoid examination I have created a new class under the name of examining officers.

Mr. LENNOX. That is your royal commission ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. Appointed by the government.

Mr. PATERSON. I was not finding fault with it. I do wonder, however, that they should have overlooked the Act and not only overlooked the Act but should have put in the report a statement which, as you can see for yourself, is absolutely the reverse of what is in the Act. It is charged that I adopted this new class in order to avoid examination. You gentleman are guilty with me in this matter. A few years ago I was impressed with the fact that we had in the service scores and scores of men, some of whom had been appointed twenty-five years, some eighteen years, some fifteen years, some twelve years, and some later, under ourselves, although the great bulk of them had been appointed by my predecessors who were, to all intents and purposes, permanent officers. Year in and year out they were there. They were paid year after year, but they were not on the permanent staff, and, not being on the permanent staff, they were not entitled to their three weeks holidays a year and if, unfortunately, they became sick, the department had no power under the law to allow them their salary or to pay their wages ; whereas, if they had been on the permanent list they would have enjoyed the same treatment as that which those on the permanent list enjoy. Many and many—scores—I am not speaking extravagantly — of these men, faithful men, who had been there for years and years, and who were appointed in the days of my hon. friends opposite, were unable to pass the literary examination. I do not know whether I could pass it myself or not. I could have done so when I came out of school, no doubt. I question now whether it would not bother some of you to answer all the questions that are put. A number of these men who had been there for years and years could not hope to pass this examination. Men who had given faithful service for years and years, I thought, were entitled to fair treatment. I introduced into this House a Bill to amend the Civil Service Act in order to enable that to be done. These hon. gentlemen opposite as well as gentlemen on this side of the House endorsed that Bill. They were parties to it. I hold it was right. I glory that I did it. Many of these men, faithful servants, serving as faithfully as any man who had passed the civil service literary examination, which is all that is required under the Act, were in the position that I have described. Instead of, as the commissioners say, appointing that class with the view of avoiding examination it is provided that when they have been three years or more in the service you can prescribe a practical examination for them in the duties of the office they are discharging and if they pass that successfully—and what more do you want—then, on my recommendation, they are put on the permanent list, the men's hearts and the hearts of their wifes and families are made glad and justice is done to them and the country. Was it to avoid examination ? No, it was not that they could be put on as preventive officers without any examination at all, but it was because I wanted them to undergo an examination in the duties of their office. What surprises me is that it escaped the attention of the chairman of this commission when such a sentence as this was put in their report.

He was secretary of the treasury board for a considerable time after this was inaugurated and the way the special examinations take place is this : The officer applies for an examination, the commissioner prescribes the examination and I don't see it, it is sent to a superior officer who is generally the inspector of the division, the officer undergoes the examination and if he is successful the inspector reports to the commissioner and the commissioner reports to me and recommends that the appointment be conferred, and that report passes through the hands of the secretary of the treasury board, and a number of such reports must have passed through Mr. Courtney's hands. How such a sentence could be inserted there baffles me and leads me to think that some one who did not understand the thing is a party to it and not Mr. Courtney. Is my hon. friend from Peel satisfied I have read that now. Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that what the government have done in this matter will find justification in the country. While I recognize the right of the opposition to get all the advantage they possibly can in a fair and legitimate way, yet there is such a thing as pursuing certain tactics too far. I ask these gentlemen opposite : Have they in any degree whatever given fair play to that man who only came into his office two years ago and who of neces-

sity has been absent from it for months and months together, and especially when that very report states that months and months ago he started to get the department into better shape. Appoint your commission again if you want it to go through my department. I will welcome it and so would the Minister of Marine and Fisheries welcome it, but we would like them to go to the bottom of things and when they do report to be sure that they report facts, especially when their report is to go broadcast over the country.

Mr. BLAIN. What objection can the hon. gentleman have to referring the report back to these three gentlemen.

Mr. PATERSON. They finished their work. The government did not call them off. It was their duty to do that work and if they felt unwilling or unable to do it surely that is enough. We accept their work except where they make that insinuation or implied charge against the honesty of the officials of that department and we inquire into that. No man is more interested in having his department right than the minister in charge. And when these gentlemen opposite say the people of Canada will not be satisfied with our action, the true fact is that what they want is that the people of the country should not be satisfied. Did not the member for Beauharnois tell us that it means party advantage and gain to them, and how dear that is to their souls, their speeches of this afternoon show when they did not hesitate to insinuate against the honour of men of their own profession, and against the character either because of weakness or incapacity of an honourable judge who stands amongst the highest in the community.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I shall not detain the House long, but it would not be right to allow some of the observations of the Minister of Customs to pass unchallenged. The hon. gentleman said that the hon. member for Hastings complained that Judge Cassels should undertake such a limited task, and yet in the same breath declared him to be an upright, capable and honourable judge. No one on this side of the House refutes that. We do not complain of the character of the man but we do complain that the order of reference is so circumscribed that Judge Cassels can only deal with a small fraction of what in the interests of the country he should deal with. Did not the Minister of Justice complain that the old commission went outside of their order of reform ? Did he not cite two instances to prove this and did he not state that the allegations they made were not founded on fact. Then the Minister of Marine and Fisheries states that with regard to certain things in his department the allegations in that report are absolutely incorrect. When the Minister of Marine and Fisheries presented that report to the House he stated that some of the allegations in the report were wrong, and the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Customs endorse that statement, and they say another commission must be appointed presumably for the purpose of determining whether the allegations made by the first commission are right or wrong. This shows, Sir, that it is the Civil Service Commission that is on trial and not the department, and that is one of the reasons why the government were afraid to reappoint the same commissioners and allow them to finish the work which they declared they had not time to finish. The Minister of Justice stated that the leader of the opposition asked the government to appoint a Committee of the House or an independent commission, and that in appointing Judge Cassels they had followed the advice of the leader of the opposition. That statement is not correct. What the leader of the opposition said was that because the old commission had not inquired into one quarter of the things it should in the interests of the country have inquired into, and had only dealt in a perfunctory way with one or two departments, the matter should be referred either to a Committee of the House or to an independent commission to go through all the departments and to finish the work which the commission had only commenced. Has the government appointed Judge Cassels to complete the work which the Civil Service Commission left off ? Not at all. They appointed a commissioner but they limited the work of that commissioner and restricted him to an inquiry into one allegation against the Marine Department. That is not what the leader of the opposition suggested. Was the hon. leader of the opposition justified in saying that we required another commission ? If you take up the report of the commissioners you cannot reach any other conclusion. What did that report say ?

> Large amounts have been spent at several places in the Dominion for supplies bought from those enjoying political patronage at what may be called retail rates. Heavy expenditures have been incurred without necessary consideration or supervision, and while no doubt the several officers have thought themselves justified, owing to the expansion of the revenues, yet such conduct is contrary to the public interests and, in the opinion of the commissioners, ought to be restrained.

That applies to any department, and therefore the leader of the opposition said that we wanted another commission to inquire into that subject. Then, the commissioners take up the question of certificates which are made to the effect that the goods were required for the public services and that the prices were reasonable and fair. On this point the commissioners say :

> In the first place there is the question of certificates. These certificates are in general terms, that the articles have been received,

that the articles are necessary in the public interests, that the prices charged are according to contract, or that the prices are fair and just. In reference to the question of certificates, the Auditor General in his evidence pointed out that in one department he did not believe in the certificates received. This is a very serious affair.

The Auditor General did not regard the certificates as correct or reliable. Is this new commission to inquire into this subject? Not at all; it is not in the order of reference. Then the commissioners say in regard to the Department of Railways:

Your commissioners are of opinion that in many instances stores are ordered unnecessarily, and it may be doubtful that a good quality is always delivered. Mr. Pottinger states in his evidence that it is his opinion that the amount paid by the Intercolonial Railway for coal was higher than it ought to be. In instances which have been brought to the notice of the commissioners stores have been received which were not wanted and which it is difficult to get rid of. In fact, at different points stores have been shelved where in all probability they were unnecessary.

Will the new commission inquire into that or touch the Intercolonial Railway? Not at all. That is why we complain—because it has no power to inquire into these matters, which we think ought to be inquired into. I take another department, the Marine and Fisheries Department, as to which the commissioners report:

Your commissioners have spent a large amount of time in trying to get an insight into the general administration of the government business, as shown in the management of this department. They found that to make any efficient inspection was a matter of enormous difficulty.

Therefore they could not make the inspection they desired. Again they say:

There are officers enough in the department, both inside and outside, to do all the work efficiently, if they were properly trained and organized, but there is no efficient organization.

Who is responsible for the efficiency of the organization? Is it not the head of the department? Then the report goes on to say:

It is practically impossible to fix the responsibility on anybody. . . There is no sign visible of a single directing head, or an intelligent purpose, unless it be that of spending as much money as possible. . . The lack of organization and of organizing power in the department has recently been very conspicuously and painfully illustrated. . . . There is not only a lack of efficient organization and method in the department. There would also seem to be a lack of conscience.

This new commission is not empowered to make inquiries into the various ramifications of that department. It is empowered only to inquire into the allegations made in the order of reference, which applies only to a few sentences of the report. The commissioners say further:

The extracts from the 'challenged accounts' file show constant inquiries from the Auditor General as to prices, but there is always some more or less satisfactory explanation, ending with whatever certificates may be necessary, and further investigation baulked.

And yet this new commission is not to go into that inquiry. Are we not justified in saying that it ought to be given wider powers? We are not objecting to the commissioner who is appointed to do the work, if he is only given the power necessary to enable him to go over the whole field. The commissioners say further:

A new officer was appointed in connection with it called the commissioner of lights, whose whole time is now given to its management although it includes the management of a lighthouse depot established at Prescott, where a great variety of work is carried on connected with the lighthouse and buoy service. Your commissioners have to report that in their commission this new departure has been a most unfortunate one so far as the efficiency of the special work is concerned; and it certainly has not added to the general efficiency of the Marine and Fisheries Department.

They follow that up by saying:

There can be very little question that the Lighthouse Board has been the means of greatly increasing the expenditure of the department, and that much of the increase has been wasted.

Yet the new commissioner has no power to inquire into that. The commissioners follow that up by saying:

They have been able to go over only a very small section of even the Marine and Fisheries Department.

To do the work completely, that whole department should be gone over, and the new commissioner has no power to do that work.

Your commissioners have to confess that the general conclusions which they have formed regarding the administration of the department are most unfavourable. It seems to have few redeeming features.

Yet the head of that department is the one responsible for the organization; but the new commission has no power to inquire into that subject. It is because of this that we complain of the limited power given to Judge Cassels. The Minister of Justice argued that the other commissioners went outside of their order of reference; and if the new commissioner went outside of his order of reference a similar complaint would be made against him. If there is one thing more than another that a

judge or a lawyer always keeps in view, it is that he must be guided by precedent, and all precedent seems to demand that a judge or a commission should keep within the order of reference; and if they travelled outside of that, the government would condemn them, as the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Customs have condemned the Civil Service Commissioners. And then they have made the order of reference so narrow that he can travel over no field. They have touched on only one or two of the departments. We have many spending departments, we have the Post Office Department, and the great spending Department of Public Works, some transactions of which have been laid bare to the light of day. Even the Marine Department has only been dealt with in a perfunctory way. There is the Interior Department, which administers the lands of the country, the timber limits and immigration. The Militia Department has been barely referred to, and it has been declared that a great deal might be said of it. Then we have the Departments of Agriculture, Customs and Inland Revenue, which are not dealt with in detail. This new commission cannot touch any of these departments except the Department of Marine, and that, only with regard to one or two particular items in the report. It is because of this that complaint is made, and not because of the man who is appointed to do the work. We say there is more to be done and the country will not be satisfied until a full and free inquiry is made in all departments and a report made to the House, so that we will know where it is necessary to make amendments or to reorganize departments in the interest of economy and of honesty. When that is done and not until then, the country will be satisfied that the government have done their full duty in connection with these commissions.

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

Montreal—barracks for permanent corps, $20,000.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). This is a revote to provide towards the erection of barracks for one unit of the permanent corps in Montreal. A request for this building was made by the Department of Militia and it has been urged upon the Public Works Department upon several different occasions. Application was made as early as 1902 and it has been repeated since and the department is strongly of the opinion that this work should be undertaken. The appropriation of 1907-8 was the first vote.

Mr. SPROULE. Why was it not commenced?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is some land to be acquired by the Militia Department. The department has made a sale of St. Helen's island to the city of Montreal, for the sum of $200,000 and it is intended by the Militia Department when this money is paid over to appropriate part of it for the purcahse of a site. My information is that Montreal is now about ready to pay over the money and in that case a special appropriation will be asked for in the supplementary estimates to buy the land.

Mr. AMES. Is this vote conditional on the payment of the $200,000 by the city of Montreal?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot say it is conditional. It is not likely that the erection of these barracks will be proceeded with until the money is paid over.

Mr. AMES. Is it decided where these barracks will be erected?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I cannot say where they will be.

Mr. AMES. That is the most important question. Montreal has asked for these barracks for a number of years and I understand the Militia Department have found it impossible to decide on the location. It makes a great difference to the city where it is located. The location may give universal satisfaction or cause general dissatisfaction.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give the information but my hon. friend will understand that as in the case of a post office an effort will be made to locate it so as to give general satisfaction. The total cost of the building is expected to be $126,000. It is intended to provide quarters for single and married officers, men's barracks, hospital, guard room and cells, recreation room and also fittings for the buildings.

Mr. AMES. How much is to be paid for the land?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not intended to pay for the land out of this, that will come out of the $200,000.

Mr. AMES. Is it intended to build the barracks in the Parc Lafontaine?

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is great objection to having it built in that park. It is one of the few breathing places we have in Montreal and the citizens will object very strongly to having the barracks there. It is hard for the minister to say where it will be. If it is mooted that the land will be purchased in some part of the city, then as my hon. friend who has been in the council and understands land speculation knows, the competition for the sale of land to the department by speculators will be very marked. I do not think it wise now to say where the location will be.

Mr. AMES. Is it intended to build in the Parc Lafontaine?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would be impossible to say that; I am not informed that the location has been decided on.

Mr. AMES. The minister has said it would increase the price of land, but the park is the property of the government and that argument would not apply. I know that many citizens object to having it in the park and that is why I want to know if that question has been decided.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought I was very frank, I said that I was not informed where the location will be.

Mr. LENNOX. With reference to what the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) has said as to keeping this matter secret lest publicity should enhance the price of the property, I think that, perhaps, this side of the House are getting a little tired of that excuse—for we regard it as little better than an excuse. We find it merely a means to facilitate the work of the middleman, who comes in and taxes the people an exorbitant price. Members of the House are aware, that we have expropriation laws which protect the government and the people. When owners demand an exorbitant price, the proper method for the government to follow is to take expropriation proceedings and secure the land at such value as men on their sworn testimony prove to be fair instead of repeating such experiences as we had in Halifax, through Mr. Lodge and others, of being salted for an enormous price for the benefit of a middleman. I for one, take no stock in this excuse that the government is afraid to say that they want a particular property because the price will be put up. We have honest men in the country who will swear to the true value, if the government will make an investigation under the Act and take the property. The person who asks an exorbitant price and does not get it has to pay the costs of the proceedings, and after a few people have had experience of that kind, we shall get land at reasonable prices. Our experience has been that, while the government keeps the information from the House, they give it to one of their friends, on which he goes and gets options and the end is that we pay to this middleman a most exorbitant price.

Mr. AMES. Can the minister tell us whether this building is to be used for artillery, cavalry or infantry, and what number of men it is expected to accommodate?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is for one unit of the permanent corps.

Mr. AMES. Which includes——

Mr. PUGSLEY. I regret that the minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) is not here. He would be able to give the information. But my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) will understand that it is rather outside my department.

Mr. AMES. Can the minister say whether this unit includes cavalry and artillery? That has an important bearing on the situation, because the choice of location should depend a good deal on the nature of the building and how it is to be occupied, If this means keeping a large number of horses in a building in a thickly-peopled part of Montreal, or in a public park, of course that would be a disadvantage. Unless such details are furnished us, we cannot know whether this money should be voted or not.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it not be wise to wait until the Minister of Militia is here?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is only a re-vote.

Mr. SPROULE. But the information may not have been out last year, and it is desirable to get it out now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When the Minister of Militia is here and some other item is under discussion, if any hon. gentleman calls attention to this matter, there will be no objection to the Minister of Militia making an explanation as to the number of men to be accommodated.

Mr. AMES. With that understanding. it will be all right.

Montreal general post office—enlargement additions and alterations, including fittings, furniture, &c., $70,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote and it is required for the enlarging of the present quarters for the Montreal post office. As many hon. gentlemen are aware, there was an appropriation last session of $300,000. Out of that sum, a property which was owned by the proprietors of the Montreal 'Gazette' was purchased, and a contract was let for the erection of a building on this site, the contract being for $487,537. In addition to which, of course, there will be other expenditures for heating, fittings, &c.

Mr. SPROULE. What will be the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total estimated cost. including site is $762,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it in connection with the new post office that I saw that Mr. Wright had purchased an option?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, that was in connection with the new examining warehouse.

Mr. AMES. Who has the contract for building this addition to the post office?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Messrs. Peter Lyall & Son, Montreal. There were several tenders, of which Messrs. Lyall's was the lowest. A day or two ago, in answer to a question, I gave a statement as to the different tenders.

Mr. BLAIN. I noticed in the newspapers an account of a banquet in Montreal tendered to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) at which a Mr. Lyall was chairman; is this the same gentleman?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The very same gentleman—and a very excellent citizen of Montreal he is.

Mr. SPROULE. This would seem to be only an enlargement of the old post office?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is more than that. It is the building of an addition. The 'Gazette' property is on the opposite side of Fortification Lane from the post office, and is to be wholly occupied with the addition to the post office, connection to be made across Fortification Lane.

Mr. SPROULE. What area of land was purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the figures relating to the land before me, but it will explain the matter as well, perhaps. if I say that the addition is to extend from the present post office building along St. François Xavier street to Craig street, 126 feet, and along Craig street 96 feet.

Mr. KEMP. Then, this will be larger than the old building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think so.

Mr. KEMP. Does the government need as large a place as that?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Oh, yes. The present post office was built in 1874, and as my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) knows, is entirely inadequate for the postal service of Montreal. When the translantic mails arrive in Montreal, the condition of the post office is simply chaos. Even the offices of the postmaster and his assistants in Montreal are taken during the Christmas season for the foreign mail. Today we have no place for our employees, and it is a great relief to know that at last we are to have a decent building for our staff. The population is now nearly half a million. With the addition of the new suburbs Montreal is going far ahead of Toronto.

Mr. KEMP. But the revenue of the post office is not as great.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the statement I gave of the total cost I omitted the cost of acquiring in Montreal the right to utilize Fortification lane. The corporation require us to pay rent the same as they charge the Bank of Montreal. But they also agreed to commute that if we desired, and we decided to commute it into a capital payment I think of $11,000. That should be added to the total cost.

Mr. KEMP. I understood the government are spending some $762,000 in Montreal, and does he mean to say that the corporation are asking the government $11,000 for the right to cross Fortification lane?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The reason is that there is some law of general application, and the city requires us to pay the same as the Bank of Montreal. This building is to have a basement and a bridge 70 by 25 feet thrown over Fortification lane.

Mr. AMES. The Montreal public have, I think, been long suffering from lack of conveniences in the post office. They have pointed out many times to the Postmaster General that there was great congestion in the old building. I hope the Postmaster General realizes that when this new building is constructed it will be necessary also to reconstruct the entire postal staff as well as the building. I have in my hand a letter which was published in the 'Star' on the 8th April, signed by a well known lawyer, in which he draws attention to at least five cases where letters have been mailed and have never reached the parties to whom they were addressed. That I presume is largely due to the past state of affairs. We can only hope that when the new building is constructed there will be a complete remodeling, not only of the facilities, but also of the staff.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I must protest on behalf of the employees of the Montreal post office against a too severe criticism. There has been a wonderful improvement within a year or so. In the old days I know there were many complaints, due chiefly to the fact that the salaries were inadequate. I hope the new Civil Service Bill will provide better salaries for our employees. On the other hand, I am pleased to state that we have appointed as assistant postmaster in Montreal, Mr. Gaboury, who has given entire satisfaction to the citizens. The other day I was present at an interview with the members of the produce exchange and of the board of trade and they highly complimented Mr. Gaboury on the success of his new methods. I am aware of this letter published in the 'Star,' signed by my friend Mr. McCormick. When I heard of the complaints I ordered an investigation. I gather from reports I have that Mr. McCormick might perhaps publish another letter to say that the fault was not in the post office, but in his own office. However, the investigation will prove who was to blame. Within the last eighteen months we have reorganized the letter-carrier service and put it in a very satisfactory shape. I hope if the citizens will be patient a little longer they will have just as good a system of delivery as there is in other large centres. I admit that in the Montreal post office for some years past there has been at work some influence which prevented the staff from doing its duty towards the public. But since the appointment of Mr. Gaboury there has been a marked change for the better.

Mr. KEMP. What influence does the minister refer to?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The old officers had lost all control over the later appointments. We had men there who had been in the service for forty years, and they had no control at all over the employees, for reasons which I need not detail to the House. But since Mr. Gaboury's appointment there has been a great improvement.

Mr. MORIN. I would like to know why the people in the country districts should not be as well treated in regard to postal facilities as the people of cities. Why does the government build a post office in one place and refuse to build one in another equally deserving? I know of places with a population of 1,500 to 2,500 and the government will not build a shed for them. I will not speak of Dorchester county, for that has been on the blacklist for a long time. But take the county of Beauce. The towns of St. Mary, St. Joseph, St. François, St. George, Tring, St. Ephraim and like towns have two or three thousand of a population, and yet you will find the post office in a little room eight by ten feet, and a person who goes in before you has to come out before you can get in. There is no accommodation whatever. The government do not even pay rent to the people who keep the post office. Why cannot you do a little more for the rural districts and do a little less for the cities?

Mr. TALBOT. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) would not agree with that.

Mr. MORIN. I do not ask for a building in my own county. We have not one building erected by the government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I like to hear my hon. friend talk. He is very sensible and I think his views are very worthy of consideration. His views and mine are alike; I am a very strong believer in giving accommodation to the public in the way of post office buildings in various sections of the country. Of course, as my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) said last evening, we must go slowly and people must be patient. We cannot erect these buildings all at once. We are doing the best we can, we are proceeding with reasonable expedition and as the business of the country will permit.

Mr. MORIN. Some people appear to be welcome and others are not.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say, in reference to the observation of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot), that the hon. member for East Grey does not agree exactly with him. What was the principle I laid down? That where the government could not rent a building at a reasonable price they should erect one.

Mr. TALBOT. That is just the reverse of the position taken by the hon. member for Dorchester. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) says that instead of building they should rent.

Mr. SPROULE. Whenever the government cannot rent a suitable building at a moderate figure they should erect one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You and the hon. member for Dorchester cannot agree.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Dorchester says that you do not even pay rent for these buildings.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The salary of the postmaster is based on the revenue and on the revenue also is based the rental allowance which is given to every postmaster. A post office which gives a revenue of $10 or $15 is not entitled to a large rental allowance.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no rental for a small post office.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. What rental is there for a post office which gives a revenue of $50?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I cannot give it offhand, but I know there is an allowance.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no rental at all. It is not always according to the revenue, because no matter what the revenue is the postmaster gets $50. That is according to the Act.

Mr. LEMIEUX. $35 is the minimum. As to the rental allowance, I cannot give the graduation just now, but it is based on the revenue. I receive every day, letters from all parts of the country asking for increases and I spend my time signing letters explaining that the rental allowance is based on the revenue of the office.

Mr. MORIN. In the county of Montmagny there was a man who had a house. He could not sell it and he could not give it away. He is a gentleman in the Senate. We must not mention his name at all; his name is Mr. Choquette. Well, he got the Minister of Public Works to buy this building for $4,994.50. As I said last night, two years afterwards, the house fell down. What is the population of the town? 1,600. When that building went down, they said: We must build one or buy one. These people had to be accommodated because Mr. Choquette lives there sometimes. The county is a Liberal county and no matter what takes place they must be accommodated. Here is the town of Levis with a population of 7,783 and a $49,000 building is being erected. Is there any equality in the treatment of the people in that case? I will not say anything about Dorchester, but take the county of Beauce. Beauce has a population of 45,000 and there is not

a post office in it belonging to the government. The government have done nothing for the county in that regard. If you do not want to treat Dorchester right you are welcome ; we can get along without you ; we do not ask any favours, but why should you not treat the country on an equality ? It looks—I have said it in the House already and I am going to repeat it, and if the chairman wants to call me to order he may do so—as if the government were in this case, the biggest bribers in the world. Have I not heard time and time again members of this House say : I am afraid that I will be defeated in my county in this campaign, I am going to get them a post office or a public building or a railway, and that will help me. Then, they brag that they have got a building, or a wharf or a pier built in their county, and they say that it will help them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the hon. gentleman regard it as a bribe if we were to think it desirable in the public interest to erect a post office in his county ?

Mr. MORIN. Of course if we had to take your word we would do so, but you know very well you are not serious in what you say. If you are, I do not believe you. The government help these men to be elected in their counties. If a man has not the confidence of the people to be returned to this House, he should stay at home. Not very long ago, I heard a member boast that he had 65 miles of railway built in his county, and he would be elected for years to come, and another said his election was sure, because a wharf had been built in his county that cost $10,000 or $12,000. The government bribe people in that way, it may be indirect, but it is bribery all the same. In my county the government never spent a dollar, but we have to pay the bribes for other counties.

Mr. TALBOT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Morin) stated yesterday and he has repeated it to-night that Senator Choquette sold a building to the government for a post office and that after it was sold it fell down. Is the hon. member serious in making that statement ?

Mr. MORIN. I will tell you plainly, I don't want you to talk to me and I don't want to talk to you.

Mr. TALBOT. I shall not resent that impolite remark of the hon. gentleman but I thought he might address the chair. The statement made by the hon. member with regard to the post office is not correct. In the first place only part of the roof fell down and at the time it fell it was not occupied as a post office. It was only when the whole thing was put in proper shape that the post office was located there.

Mr. BLAIN. There was a total expenditure last year of $1,571 for a pneumatic tube system in Montreal which I understand has been abandoned. That requires some explanation. Then, the Postmaster General referred to the reorganization of the Montreal post office and he spoke of the deputy postmaster as carrying on this reorganization passing over the postmaster who is paid a large salary. Perhaps the postmaster was a political appointee and had no qualification for the office.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. Harwood who was a respected member of this House for years was appointed postmaster at Montreal, but unfortunately he had to undergo a severe operation which was the occasion of his ill-health for a year and a half, and on account of which he could not give to his duties the attention which he otherwise would. Fortunately Mr. Harwood has now recovered and is able to discharge his duties in the Montreal post office. He is a very able man and is much respected in the office. When I spoke of the reorganization of the office I referred to Mr. Gaboury, because it is Mr. Gaboury who has special charge of the employees. Mr. Gaboury started from the lowest grade in the service and has attained to his present position through his own merits. Mr. Harwood and he are working hand in hand and I am sure the results of their labours will give satisfaction to the city. As to the pneumatic system, when Sir William Mulock was Postmaster General he intended to introduce that system in Montreal and Toronto. It has proved a success in large cities like London, Liverpool, Berlin, New York and Chicago. But in view of the climatic conditions in Montreal and the large expenditure its installation would entail it was thought that for the present the money had better be applied to other more immediate needs in the postal service. Some pipe was purchased for the tube system and that can be sold by the Department of Public Works at any time.

Mr. AMES. Was land purchased opposite the Bonaventure station for the pneumatic system and is that land still owned by the government.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think it has been exchanged with the Grand Trunk Railway Company for another lot.

Mr. AMES. Where is the lot that has been given the government to exchange for the lot opposite the station.

Mr. LEMIEUX. On Imperial avenue.

Mr. AMES. What use does the government intend to make of the lot on Imperial avenue ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The intention is to sell it at a convenient time unless it may be used possibly for a postal station. In the meantime we are storing the pipes there and saving rental for storage. If the land is not

used for public purposes it will be disposed of at a convenient time.

Mr. FOWLER. Why did you not sell the original lot instead of trading it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was thought we made a good exchange.

Mr. AMES. Is this going to be a case of an exchange of a better for a worse article until finally the money is lost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think we made a very fair exchange.

Mr. AMES. I understand that an extensive set of plans, costing nearly $9,000, were prepared by Mr. Maurice Perreault. These plans, I understand, were paid for by the government. In whose possession are the plans to-day? The city of Montreal had an experience of a similar kind with this gentleman, and he undertook to hold the plans.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect tells me that the plans are in the department, the property of the department.

Mr. AMES. If the government decide to construct a system of this character, have they the full right to use these plans?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Certainly. They are the property of the department, and the department can use them at any time.

Mr. AMES. I understand that the materials purchased for this system are still in the hands of the department, and. will be sold as old junk for whatever they will bring.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have a certain quantity of pipes in Montreal and also a quantity in Toronto.

Mr. AMES. What is the value?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the particulars at this moment, as I did not expect this matter to come up under this item.

Mr. BLAIN. I think this is rather important. Here we have a government purchasing a large quantity of pipes, purchasing land, getting out plans and spending a large amount of money in connection with a system which they have abandoned altogether. Among the items we find that they are paying $75 a month to a political supporter in Montreal for the storage of the pipes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are not paying storage now. We are storing them on our own land.

Mr. AMES. When did the rental for the storage of pipes cease, and what property was being occupied before by the storage of those pipes?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The charge for storage ceased on the first of the present year, when the pipes were removed to a lot owned by the government, and were stored free of cost in a shed erected for that purpose.

Mr. FOWLER. What qualification had this gentleman for making these plans ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He was an architect.

Mr. FOWLER. And he was paid the sum of $9,000 to do what the chief architect at Ottawa, with his twelve assistants, could not do. Is this a part of that $100,000 which was paid out so generously by this government to the architects of Canada, or is it in addition to that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no information that $100,000 was paid to architects.

Mr. FOWLER. It was pointed out the other day that the payments amounted to $100,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was the figure of the hon. member for East Simcoe, and I did not feel like taking the responsibility of the correctness of his figures.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the minister say that $100,000 was not paid out to architects?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do. The hon. gentleman knows that included in the amount were moneys paid to the engineer in connection with the works at St. Andrew's rapids for engineering work, and also the amounts paid as prizes for competitive plans.

Mr. FOWLER. The amount paid to the engineer was a very small proportion of the whole, and I fail to understand the distinction which the hon. gentleman draws with respect to the prizes, which were payments to architects for plans, whether competitive or otherwise. They were plans for a new building that was to be erected by the government, and it was felt that the chief architect was not equal to the job, and therefore prizes were offered to other architects. I think the sooner the minister remodels his architectural department the better it will be for the country. It is one of the most outrageous things the way that branch of the Public Works Department is managed.

Montreal military buildings--new stores building, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is in the same position as the item for the Montreal barracks. I am asking for a revote, and the purchase of the land will be made when the money is received from the city of Montreal. The contract has not been let, and will not be let until that arrangement is made.

Montreal new postal station B--site and building, St. Catherine street, $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for the completion of postal station B.

Mr. KEMP. What does that building cost, including the site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Including everything, the cost will be $126,636.25.

Mr. KEMP. Is it expected that this will finish the building, and when will it be occupied?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I visited it on Sunday last.

Mr. AMES. When will it be completed ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is completed ; the men are working in the office.

Montreal, new postal station, Pointe St. Charles, $21,875.

Mr. KEMP. What will the site cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has not been purchased, we expect to close for the site shortly.

Mr. FOSTER. Have you no idea of the probable cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote. There has been difficulty in getting a site and plans will not be prepared until the site is obtained.

Mr. AMES. What did Mr. Perrault receive on the buildings he constructed ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 5 per cent.

Mr. AMES. On the extras too ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. What was it expected that this pneumatic system would cost ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think nearly half a million dollars ; we abandoned the scheme.

Mr. KEMP. To what account is the loss on that pneumatic tube system, which a merchant would call dead stock, charged ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When the money is paid out so much is charged and when the land and the pipes are sold that will be credited.

Mr. FOWLER. Are you using the motor cars that were in use some time ago ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, we are not using motor cars although we may later on. They can only be used in the summer.

Mr. KEMP. In Toronto they were used all the year round.

Montreal, eastern postal station, $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to purchase a site in St. James division of Montreal for the erection of a public building for a branch post office in the eastern part of the city. There has been a request by the Postmaster General for this as being very much needed for postal accommodation. This will be station 'C'.

Mr. FOSTER. What will it cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is in the same position as the other, no plans have been prepared.

Mr. FOWLER. Will it be better or worse than St. Charles ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Of course the people of the eastern portion of Montreal claim that they are as much entitled to a fine postal station as those of the west. My hon. friend (Mr. Ames) knows how important Ste. Catherine Street has become ; it is now so to speak the boulevard of Montreal. From a postal point of view, we thought we should divide Montreal into three stations, the central post office, section 'B' in the west and section 'C' in the east. That other station at St. Charles will serve some of the suburbs that have been annexed or will be shortly.

Mr. AMES. Does this come next to the Hochelaga district ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think the new postal station 'C' will be built on the confines of St. James and St. Maurice divisions. It will be quite a distance from Hochelaga.

Mr. CLEMENTS. What class of pipe is it that is stored on this lot which you purchased for the purpose ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We did not purchase a lot for it, it is the ordinary cast iron pipe, 10 inches in size.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The minister will agree that pipe deteriorates in value every day unless it is under thoroughly good cover and there must be a sufficiently good demand in Canada for pipe of that size for the government to dispose of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have been endeavouring to sell it and have received certain offers which we have not thought satisfactory. We are holding for a somewhat higher price.

Mr. CLEMENTS. How much did the lot cost on which this shed is put ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was bought some years ago, and I have not the figures in hand.

Mr. CLEMENTS. What did the shed cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A very small sum. We had the material on the lot and used that material. The cost was trifling.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The lot was not purchased for the purpose of storing the pipes. We purchased the lot near the Bonaventure station in order to have a station of our own near the railway. Before the new annex to the general post office was built, the newspaper part of the post office business took up too much space in the building. The bags containing the newspapers were sent to the central office, and there was al-

ways heaps of bags blocking the street and Fortification lane. We decided to have a special place of our own near Bonaventure station for our newspaper business. The different newspapers, the 'Star,' the 'Gazette,' 'La Patrie' and others would send their bags to the station and they would be taken by the railways just across the street.

Mr. AMES. Does the hon. minister say that this lot on Imperial avenue is to be used as the location of a station ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No. The lot near Bonaventure station was got for that purpose. When we got the addition to the post office, that station was no more needed. So, we were left with the original lot on our hands. The Grand Trunk wanted the lot for some railway purpose and we exchanged the lot for the present one which is used for the storage of pipe. I do not pretend to know the conditions of the exchange.

Mr. AMES. That is exactly the point I am trying to bring out. If we found the lot opposite Bonaventure station could not be used for the purpose originally intended, and the Grand Trunk wanted it, why did not the government sell the lot to the Grand Trunk for what they paid for it? Why did they exchange and get a lot on the side street, and now decide that they have no use for it and simply hold it ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend knows that if we get in exchange a value similar to that we should get in a sale, it is equivalent to a sale. The government has lost nothing.

Mr. AMES. Would the hon. minister (Mr. Lemieux) rather have a real estate in Montreal or money in the treasury ? Which is the more liquid asset of the two ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. With the boom there is in real estate in Montreal, land there is as good as hard cash.

Mr. AMES. I think the hon. minister will find it rather hard to dispose of the Imperial avenue property on the basis of value equal to that of the lot opposite Bonaventure station.

Mr. FOWLER. I am afraid the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) does not understand the business methods of this government. In this case, they have simply done what they have always done. They always do the wrong thing; never by any chance or accident do they do the right thing, the thing that any business man would do. The Grand Trunk wanted this lot opposite Bonaventure station—naturally they wanted it to enlarge their premises. Having a lot in an undesirable portion of the city from a business standpoint, and, desiring to get rid of it, they went to the government which is an easy mark—for its friends—and proposed an exchange, and, of course, the government got the worst of it. Probably the land they gave to the Grand Trunk was worth anywhere from three to five times that which the Grand Trunk gave to the government. That is the only way for this government to do business ; it is the way they have always done it. Instead of selling the lot as a business man would have done, they exchanged it for the property on a side street, which, I fancy, will be on their hands as long as they want a place to store pipes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. What is the approximate value of the pipe held in Montreal by the department ? Also, what did the government pay for the 10-inch pipe ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be glad to obtain that information for my hon. friend. He can understand that we are not dealing to-night with the question of the pneumatic system, a matter which was disposed of some time ago.

Mr. CLEMENTS. So long as the minister will bring down the information I am satisfied.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will get a complete statement of the cost and of the present situation.

Mr. CLEMENTS. And I would advise the government to dispose of that pipe for the best price they can get. The sooner they get out of it the better.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I agree that we should dispose of it, but at a fair price.

Mr. BLAIN. On page V—43 of the Auditor General's Report, I find an item in connection with the postal station on St. Catherine street :

Thomas Parent, clerk of works, 274 days at $3, $822.

What special qualification had this gentleman for this office ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He was employed in 1906. I have no definite information on this point to-night, but I am told that he was an experienced builder.

Mr. FOWLER. Perhaps the minister could tell me what official in his department made the negotiations for the exchange with the Grand Trunk of these two lots that have been referred to.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give that at once, because it was done quite a while ago and before I came into parliament.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the minister bring down that information ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. To verify the statement I made some time ago to the Postmaster General that in the smaller offices he does not give any rent allowance, I would refer him to appendix D of his report. He will find there such offices as Havelock, Hawk

Lake, Hawley, Hawthorne, and so on, and in none of these is there any rent allowance.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is included in the salary.

Mr. SPROULE. But the salary in these cases is $18.75. How much would the hon. gentleman allow for rent ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is more than that for salary, surely.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, the hon. gentleman's report is no use.

Mr. LEMIEUX. These post offices may have been opened after part of the year had passed.

Mr. SPROULE. The report gives forwarding allowance, salary based on the revenue of the previous year, $18.75, in a number of these cases.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is for part of the year only. These post offices may have been opened late in the year. In the salary are included the rent allowance and the fuel allowance.

Montreal—new examining warehouse, $405,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision for the balance due on the purchase price, which was $402,000. An agreement for the purchase of this property was arrived at some time ago for the sum of $402,000, but the payment is not to be made until the 1st of May. We expect probably that the time will be extended to 15th July. We agreed to pay $10,000 in cash, and the balance with 5 per cent interest. This amount will make 5 per cent interest up to 15th July next. The property was purchased upon the urgent representation of the collector of customs, Mr. White, at the port of Montreal, and Mr. McDougall, the Commissioner of Customs. Their opinion was that this was an ideal site for the customs building, and an opportunity arose to acquire the property. It consists of 67,800 square feet. It has a frontage of 495 feet on the north side of McGill street, and is substantially a lot of 400 feet by 140. There are a number of old buildings on it. The property is the old Grey Nunnery property, and is situated nearly opposite the new Grand Trunk offices. Mr. White's opinion was that the opportunity to purchase this land ought not to be allowed to pass. The question was forced to the front by reason of the fire which occurred when the examining warehouse was injured. It is supposed that this will be used for a custom house as well as an examining warehouse. We have not decided when we shall start to build.

Mr. SPROULE. $10,000, you say, was paid to secure the lot. Has the government become bankrupt that it had to pay in instalments?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This $10,000 was required to be paid by Governor General's warrant, and the collector of customs secured the lot by making this payment on the option.

Mr. KEMP. Is the property revenue producing at the present time?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are eight tenants on the property, paying a rental of about $4,800.

Mr. AMES. Can the minister give us an assurance that the work of erection will be undertaken at an early day? Since the fire in the Montreal custom house this work has become imperative, and we would be glad to know that the plans will be made and the work commenced soon.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give any assurance to-night. We are spending a good deal of money in the city of Montreal, and having acquired the land at a large expense, we think we have done pretty well. I am not able to say when the new building will be commenced.

Mr. AMES. When the government determine to build, will an opportunity be afforded to architects to submit plans?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot say.

Mr. FOWLER. I thought all these plans for public buildings were prepared in the department. We would like to have an assurance that in this case they will be prepared in the department.

Mr. FIELDING. One hon. gentleman wants competitive plans, and another wants them made at Ottawa.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give an assurance to both.

Mr. FOWLER. In the interest of the country I would like to have that assurance from the minister to-night. Will this expensive staff of his prepare these plans?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say to the hon. gentleman that the practice of the department is to prepare the plans in the department, and I have no reason to suppose that that practice will be departed from in this case.

Mr. FOWLER. The practice is quite otherwise.

Mr. PUGSLEY. With some few exceptions.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That proves the rule.

Mr. FOWLER. It is delightful to have the minister with a wave of his hand say 'with some trifling exceptions,' when we are paying out $100,000 for architectural assistance. I hope the Minister of Public Works will insist that the Architectural Department shall be something more than an Architectural Department in name only and that it shall actually do some work for the

country. It seems to be more ornamental than useful.

Mr. KEMP. I have totalled up the expenditure which it is contemplated to undertake in connection with new post office facilities in Montreal, including the addition to the post office, station B, station C and the Point St. Charles station, and it makes altogether $1,126,272. Adding to that the new examining warehouse site, which has cost $405,000, you have a total of $1,531,272.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Montreal has got to be a very important city. Last year the revenue from customs duties was $11,433,595, and from excise $4,496,431. The exports were $70,000,000 and the imports $73,000,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the minister mean by that that the city of Montreal did all this? How much of it was contributed by the country around ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Do you desire to vote against this item?

Mr. FOWLER. I think it is a poor piece of business to spend over $400,000 to buy a site you do not propose to use.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say that.

Mr. FOWLER. You said that you did not propose to use it now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said I could not give any assurance when the work would begin.

Mr. FOWLER. You are not proposing to use it or you could give that assurance. You are renting it for $400 a year which does not represent one per cent upon the value. The taxation upon it will be heavy.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There does not happen to be any taxation.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, that is very fortunate. If there were it would absorb the whole amount of your revenue.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the government for some information in regard to the amount of $25,000 which was paid in connection with this new pneumatic tube system. An architect was employed to prepare plans for the building that it was intended to erect, and the government have paid that architect more than $7,000 for the preparation of plans that were of no value to the government or anybody else. The government have purchased tubes and have paid large amounts of money for them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How do you know they were purchased in the United States?

Mr. BLAIN. I think that Sir Wm. Mulock said in the House they were purchased in the United States or in the old country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My information is that they were purchased in Glasgow.

Mr. BLAIN. Well, they were not made in Canada anyway. The department, after proposing to adopt a pneumatic tube system and after paying out a large amount of money, abandoned the whole scheme both in Montreal and Toronto. One would have supposed that when a new system was being adopted it would have been sufficient to have experimented with it in one city rather than in two.

Mr. LEMIEUX. But the old rivalry.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. Postmaster General has stated that the total expenditure in connection with this pneumatic tube system if completed would have been nearly half a million dollars.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am going to bring down a statement in regard to the pneumatic tube system showing what it cost and the quantity and value of the property on hand.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like my hon. friend to produce before the committee at some future date a statement of the total expenditure of money for every purpose by this government in connection with the adoption of the pneumatic tube system in Toronto and Montreal.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is what I promised to do.

Mr. BLAIN. At the same time showing what the government have on hand for the expenditure and what they propose to do with these tubes.

Mr. KEMP. I see by the Auditor General's Report, V—43, 'F. St. Germain, commission on valuation of property, $116.' I would like to inquire what property that was.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume that would be the lot of land that was purchased.

Mr. FOWLER. The Bonaventure station lot?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. KEMP. What would be the value of that property?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the vicinity of $25,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Who did the buying of this $405,000 property?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Wright.

Mr. FOWLER. What pay did he get?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He was employed by the collector, not by my department.

Mr. FOWLER. Did the collector of customs in Montreal, on his own initiative without the instruction of the department buy this land ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The collector of customs being of opinion it was urgent this

lot should be bought, communicated with the commissioner of customs and the commissioner of customs authorized him to get an option upon the property and he employed Mr. Wright to do so. My information is that there was no arrangement as to what commission Mr. Wright should get or as to whether he should get any commission. Mr. Wright has made a claim for commission which I have not recognized as yet.

Mr. FOWLER. How much ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it is in the vicinity of $2,000.

Mr. FOWLER. It is strange the collector of customs should take an option upon this lot on his own responsibility and pay $10,000 on the option.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not on his own responsibility. After he had made the preliminary arrangement the commissioner of customs came to me and requested me to approve of the option and I did.

Mr. FOWLER. And this $10,000 was paid by Mr. White, collector of customs, out of his own privy purse ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was paid by him, but I do not know out of what purse he paid it.

Mr. FOWLER. Was it paid by the minister ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A few days afterwards it was.

Mr. FOWLER. Never mind the number of days ; did Mr. White, collector of customs, pay this $10,000 out of his own pocket ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know that. I believe he paid it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. To the best of my recollection, Mr. White was authorized and he authorized a special agent. The object was not to let it be known who was to buy the property, because the moment it was known that the government was purchasing, the government would have gone up. Mr. White rendered service in that way and it was quite creditable on his part.

Mr. FOWLER. I have not as yet condemned the transaction, because I do not know what it is. It is laudable curiosity on my part, because it seems strange that a private individual should pay $10,000 to secure an option for the government. Did the collector provide the money himself.

Mr. PUGSLEY. All I know is that when the commissioner of customs told me that Mr. White desired to purchase the property, I told him I could not supply the money because there was no Governor General's warrant. The arrangement was authorized however, and Mr. Wright secured the option and a few days afterwards the Governor General's warrant was made out and the money transmitted to the Customs Department.

Mr. FOWLER. Was there need for great haste ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was.

Mr. FOWLER. Was the property in the market ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and others were after it.

Mr. FOWLER. The property had been offered for sale ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I believe not.

Nicolet public building, $10,000.

Mr. AMES. This Nicolet building has been in course of construction for the last two years. In 1907 $204 and in 1908 $136 or in all $340 was spent in advertising for tenders which is 2½ per cent of the total cost, or as much as the architect's fees.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is hard to please hon. gentlemen opposite ; if we don't advertise we are criticised, and if we do advertise we are criticised.

Mr. FOWLER. How much has the building cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total cost is a little over $26,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Who is the clerk of works ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Rivet.

Mr. FOWLER. What was his previous occupation ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He was a practical builder, I understand.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you find that in your notes or are you making it up.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You should not suggest anything of that kind.

Mr. FOWLER. How many days did he work there ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot say.

Mr. FOWLER. How long did his job last ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract was let on June 26, 1906, and it was to be completed October 30, 1907.

Mr. FOWLER. It is quite a graft this inspector business.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Don't say anything nasty at this early hour of the morning.

Mr. FOWLER. That is not nasty.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When you mention graft it is very annoying.

Mr. FOWLER. I quite understand it is to the hon. gentleman. What do you pay this inspector a day ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Three dollars.

Mr. BLAIN. I want to direct the attention of the minister to the precaution Mr. Hyman took when he appointed these inspectors. Mr. Hyman wrote a letter to those who nominated the inspectors which will be found in 'Hansard' 1906, page 6730 :

In recommendations for inspectors, foremen or clerks of works, to have charge of the construction or authorized to oversee and inspect the erection or repairing of public works, it is imperative that the party recommended have a practical experience and be capable of thoroughly understanding plans and specifications and of seeing that they are properly and correctly carried out. Attention to this matter will obviate delays which have taken place through men being recommended who, on inquiry, were found not to be qualified for the work and, therefore, could not be employed.

The hon. minister at that time said :

A copy of that letter is sent in every case when recommendations are made.

Does the hon. minister carry out the policy laid down by Mr. Hyman ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. minister lay on the table the letter addressed to this gentleman and his reply at the next meeting of the committee ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. All I can do is to give the hon. gentleman the form, which is a printed form on which the blanks are filled in.

Mr. FOWLER. Not only is this a printed form, but it is a mere form. It has no practical effect, and is not intended to have any practical effect. The only object of having this form of letter is to bring it down to this committee when the matter is under discussion. It is sent out of course, but the man who receives it pays no attention to it, and probably throws it into the waste-paper basket. The hon. member for Peel must know that.

Mr. AMES. In making calculations for public buildings for the coming year, does the hon. minister calculate on the same length of working day as hitherto ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I know of no difference.

Mr. AMES. Then, am I to understand that the Bill introduced by Mr. Verville for an eight-hour day will not be allowed by the government to pass?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would be a far-fetched conclusion.

Mr. AMES. The minister has just stated that the length of the working day would be the same as hitherto.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is the hon. gentleman in favour of an eight-hour day?

Mr. AMES. It is quite evident that the government is not in favour of it.

Plessisville—public building, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote. There was an appropriation of $5,000 last year, of which $2,800 was paid for the site.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the size of the village?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Its population in 1901 was 1,500.

Mr. FOWLER. How large is the site ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a corner lot, 50 feet by 100 feet.

Mr. FOWLER. From whom was it bought?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From Mr. Beausoleil.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the total cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The plans are not yet prepared, but it is supposed that it will be about $25,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the postal revenue?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was $1,327.30 for the nine months.

Quebec citadel—drill shed for school of gunnery, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote. This drill shed has been urged by the Minister of Militia and Defence since June, 1905. He regards it as most important that the service should be provided with it. The minister states that there will be accommodation for at least one of every type of gun used in Canada for instructional purposes. He also says that in winter instruction cannot be given for artillery work unless all guns for instructional purposes are kept in premises which are heated. The minister has urged this very strongly, and it is proposed to proceed this year with the building.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the total cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $50,000.

Mr. BLAIN. As the Minister of Militia should be here to explain this item, I think that it had better stand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We had better finish Quebec.

Mr. MORIN. There should not be so much delay at the beginning of the session. From November 22 to December 17 we did not earn enough to feed a cat and here we

are sitting at 1.30 in the morning and the minister is not satisfied with that.

Quebec citadel—Governor General's quarters, repairs, furniture, &c., $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision for some renewals, repairs, &c., to the Governor General's quarters in the citadel. The chief item is painting, $1,020.

Mr. FOWLER. At whose request are they made ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A request is made to the Public Works Department by the controller for His Excellency stating what repairs and improvements are needed.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this on account of the festivities.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, some further expenditures will be required which will be provided for in the supplementaries.

Quebec drill hall—addition to building and levelling ground $9,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to raise the roof of the armouries and to extend the drill hall on some land which has been expropriated to afford much needed accommodation to the new corps to be formed, the present accommodation being entirely insufficient.

Mr. FOWLER. We want information about this. Some people think that we have a sufficient number of these corps in the country. Is this cavalry, infantry or artillery ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give the information.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am sure it is infantry.

Mr. SPROULE. We are dealing with so many armouries to-night that the Minister of Militia should be present to give information about them. We receive only partial information, valuable information is not furnished ; we are going it blind.

Mr. MORIN. Who was the owner of the land expropriated ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The name is not given in my note. The property is situated on Grande Allée.

Mr. FOWLER. Perhaps the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Morin) could supply the name ?

Mr. MORIN. I know the man's name very well. That is why I ask you. He made a good many thousand dollars in a few weeks. And he is not the member for Dorchester, you can bet on that.

Mr. BLAIN. If there are middlemen in this transaction, I think that should be explained.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are no middlemen.

Mr. FOWLER. What was the cost of the land ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was $20,220.64. The land expropriated was 9,240 square feet. There are to be two additions to the building, one on each end.

Mr. FOWLER. Did you buy land on both ends ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think not.

Mr. MORIN. Can the minister give us the name of the man who expropriated the land ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Three valuators were placed upon the property, but whether in connection with the expropriation or not I am not aware. They were Alex. Gauvreau, F. Turcott, and L. P. Sirois.

Mr. MORIN. Three Tories. The man who owned the property, to blindfold the government, got three Tories to put a value on it, so as to hide the thing a little bit.

Mr. FIELDING. These Tories are always getting us into trouble.

Mr. MORIN. It was a trick. He knew that if Grits did the trick they would be blamed, so he got three Tories to do that kind of work.

Mr. BLAIN. How much were they paid?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This was four years ago, and I have not the figures at hand.

Mr. FOWLER. This was bought in 1904. At what time in 1904 ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. December 6.

Mr. FOWLER. Oh, that was carrying out a pre-election pledge.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How was that ?

Mr. FOWLER. It was done just after election.

Mr. MORIN. That man did not need an election ; he is in the Senate.

Quebec examining warehouse—alterations, fittings, &c., $1,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to put in an electric lighting system in the examining warehouse, as requested by the Customs Department in 1907.

Mr. FOWLER. What does it cost to make the change ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $1,500.

Quebec immigrant buildings—additions, renewals, repairs, &c., $7,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for work to be undertaken during the fiscal year.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this let by contract ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it is a number of small amounts and done by day's work.

Quebec immigrant hospital for trachoma and kindred diseases in Savard park—reconstruction of building destroyed by fire, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total cost of this work is $90,000.

Mr. FOWLER. This is for the immigrants brought in by the government. The $5-a-head immigrants, I suppose. Is the contract let ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the building is finished.

Mr. FOWLER. Who had the contract ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Messrs. Jinchereau & Lamonde for $65,000.

Mr. FOWLER. How do you get it up to $90,000 ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There were a number of items. That made the total expenditure up to November 30, of $71,790. Then there is an amount due on contract, $7,018; wiring, $777; call bells, $285; sidewalks, fencing and water service, $1,400; furniture, $1,000; contingencies and superintendence, $3,030.

Mr. FOWLER. I thought these people suffering from trachoma were sent back to the country from which they came.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They cannot be sent back immediately, and even when they are deported, we have to treat them like human beings while they are awaiting deportation.

Mr. FOWLER. Who was the clerk of works at the hospital?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. E. M. Talbot, the architect, was the clerk of works.

Mr. FOWLER. The Auditor General's Report differs from the statement of the minister. I find that not only was there an architect, Mr. Talbot, who got a commission of $911, but there was a clerk of works. Leo Vermette, and other clerk of works, D. J. Mullarkey.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Mullarkey was sent from the head office here.

Mr. FOWLER. We were told yesterday by the minister that this work was well inspected because Mr. Mullarkey was sent down as clerk of works. Now we have in this case an architect and we have two clerks of works. Mr. Mullarkey is paid $4 per day. So, the minister is badly informed. This only gives a partial account of the services of the clerk of works. The service is from July 1 to December 27. Let us see what further services were rendered by Mr. Vermette. Was there any further service?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not in my memorandum. You may have it in the Auditor General's Report. We have a resident agent at Quebec and I suppose he was employed by him.

Mr. FOWLER. Then who is Talbot ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. An architect.

Mr. FOWLER. Did he draw the plans ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. FOWLER. What did he do ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He superintended the construction of the work.

Mr. FOWLER. What did Mr. Vermette do ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He was engaged at $2 per day. I presume he was under Mr. Talbot.

Mr. FOWLER. And what did Mr. Mullarkey do ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Mullarkey would be sent to make an inspection.

Mr. FOWLER. But it was all inspected.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Vermette appears to have been paid $2 per day. Mr. Mullarkey is employed in the department and he is an expert in concrete work although well qualified to inspect all buildings. He is sent out here and there by the chief architect to inspect work which is in progress of construction and that is the way he did in this particular case. I understood that when we were discussing some other items the department were commended for having an expert of this character to inspect works from time to time.

Mr. FOWLER. No, that is not what was referred to at the time when that was spoken of ; it was another matter altogether. It was not in connection with Mr. Mullarkey. The minister stated that before these progress estimates were paid a gentleman went down from the department to inspect as to the progress estimates and that was commended as being a proper thing to do. Here we have an architect employed in connection with this work. Did Talbot draw the plans ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They were drawn in the department.

Mr. FOWLER. All he did was to inspect ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Would the minister bring down information as to how much was paid to Mr. Talbot, Mr. Vermette and Mr. Mullarkey in connection with this detention hospital ?

Quebec military buildings—main store building at Dominion arsenal, $21,000.

Mr. AMES. This is an item in regard to which there is a wonderful lack of information. The minister who is supposed to

give us information on military matters has not been here to-night, and it is unfortunate that when an item of $20,000 or $30,000 is called we cannot get the information which we require.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This item is to make provision for the construction of a main stores building at the Dominion arsenal. The land was purchased on the 6th of October, 1906. It is situated at the corner of Carleton and Arsenal streets.

Mr. AMES. Who was it purchased from and at what cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From A. Grenier at a cost of $3,000. The building will be three storeys, built on stone and cement foundations with a frontage of 91 feet on Carleton street and 53 feet on Arsenal street.

Mr. SPROULE. What is to be the total cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $50,587.82.

Mr. FOWLER. Where were the plans drawn ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The plans were prepared at Ottawa.

Mr. FOWLER. Who is the clerk of works ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The supervising architect is Rene Lemay.

Mr. FOWLER. And there is no clerk of works ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no memorandum of that here.

Mr. FOWLER. There is nothing there about Mr. Vermette ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. FOWLER. There is something about Mr. Vermette in the Auditor General's Report. His salary is $2 per day and there was $64 paid to him.

Mr. SPROULE. Was this work let by contract ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the amount of the contract ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $34,777.

Mr. FOWLER. And the total cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $50,587.82, but that includes the cost of the site, heating, electric wiring, fixtures, sidewalks, fences and elevator.

Mr. BLAIN. There is an item of $332 for advertising. Will the minister explain that ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would be advertising for tenders in the various newspapers.

Mr. AMES.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. gentleman give us a list of the papers in which the advertisement was inserted ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could not this evening but I would be glad to do so if the hon. gentleman thinks it important.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the policy of the department in that regard ? Is all the advertising given to his political friends or is the advertisement inserted in the principal papers in the district ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The general rule is that we select a number of the leading newspapers in the district where the works are to be advertised. I think I am safe in saying that the newspapers selected are friendly to the government.

Mr. BLAIN. In every case ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not in every case, but in the great majority of cases. We are careful to see they are newspapers of large circulation, so as to give full publicity to the advertisement.

Mr. BLAIN. Then I am to understand that in no case is an advertisement inserted in a Conservative newspaper?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman desires. I will be very glad to bring down a list of the newspapers in which this advertisement was inserted.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the policy of the department in this respect?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The policy of the department is to advertise as widely as is thought necessary to give full publicity to the call for tenders.

Mr. BLAIN. If a work is being done in a town where the Conservative newspaper has the largest and widest circulation, is the advertisement inserted in that newspaper?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Such a case has not yet been brought to my notice in the short time I have been minister as a Tory newspaper having the largest circulation, but if such an unusual thing should occur I would consider the matter.

Mr. BLAIN. In my own town the Conservative newspaper has the largest circulation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the name of your town?

Mr. BLAIN. I do not propose to take these flippant jokes from the minister. It is all very well for him to joke over these large expenditures, but it is a serious matter. The Conservative paper has the largest circulation in my own town, it is so in the adjoining county and it is so in South Simcoe.

Mr. LENNOX. Two or three of them.

Mr. BLAIN. I could name them by the hundreds in the province of Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. You may mention Owen Sound, Meaford and Collingwood.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister has not been very much in Ontario.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. I hope to be more.

Mr. BLAIN. I hope so, and I hope the minister will treat these expenditures more seriously. Then we are to understand that the policy of the department is that these advertisements are not to be inserted in Conservative newspapers.

Mr. CARVELL. Cut it short.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman was cut short in the elections in his province the other day.

Mr. CARVELL. That is ancient history.

Mr. BLAIN. It is not, as the hon. gentleman will find when he goes back for election. Is it the policy of the Minister of Public Works to advertise for tenders in the largest newspapers regardless of their policy ?

Mr. FIELDING. That has always been the policy in the past ?

Mr. BLAIN. It has not been the policy of this government in the past.

Mr. FIELDING. Or the other governments.

Mr. GRAHAM. Is it the policy of the Ontario government ?

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman was a member of the Ontario government, and he ought to know.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am speaking of the Whitney government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would I offend the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) if I asked him whether he was in favour of this item or not ?

Mr. BLAIN. The Minister of Public Works might try by asking me the question. I hope he will not deal with these questions in such a flippant manner.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was curious to know if the hon. gentleman objected to the item.

Mr. BLAIN. I want to know if any of this $500 was paid to any Liberal-Conservative newspaper.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Not very likely.

Mr. BELAND. If that is for a public work in Quebec, I can say that it was advertised in the Quebec 'Morning Chronicle.'

Mr. JOHNSTON. We will have to see about that.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I hope it won't occur again.

Mr. BLAIN. I want the hon. gentleman to bring down a list of the newspapers in which this was advertised.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. BLAIN. And I shall also ask him to announce the policy of the department in this matter at a future sitting.

Mr. FIELDING. I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) will, in the meantime, look into the policy of some few years ago, because it would strengthen his case very much if he could show that under the Conservative government any Liberal newspaper got an advertisement.

Mr. BLAIN. Whenever wrong-doing by this government is pointed out, the Finance Minister flies to a comparison with the old administration. He thinks it is right to advertise in party newspapers alone because the Liberal-Conservative government did it in days gone by. Surely that is not a sufficient answer. What I say is that where there is a Conservative newspaper which has the largest circulation in a town where work is going on, the department should advertise in that newspaper.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend really must not expect us to be too good. We are rising to great heights of virtue, but I am afraid we cannot get as much superior to the former government as the hon. gentleman wishes us to be.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. minister seems to think that there are no towns where Conservative papers have a larger circulation than Liberal papers. I could point to towns in the province from which he comes where that is the case. The Conservative newspapers in New Brunswick enjoy by far the largest circulation among the mass of newspapers in that province. Why was it found necessary to pay $332 for advertising for these military buildings when the advertising for the immigration building cost only $85 ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell that. There may have been a wider circulation given.

Mr. CROCKET. Were the advertisements confined to the Quebec papers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. They would take in the Montreal dailies, and possibly the Ottawa dailies, besides the weekly papers in the district.

Quebec east public building, $30,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What is this for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The post office at St. Roch's.

Mr. FOWLER. What did you pay for the site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $23,400.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the total cost of the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has not been erected yet.

Mr. FOWLER. How was the land purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. By arbitration.

Mr. AMES. From whom was it bought?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From three different owners. As it was done very recently, I have not the names here.

Mr. AMES. Who were the arbitrators ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. McCarthy, the engineer at Quebec, was the one acting for the government.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the building expected to cost when completed?

Mr. LEMIEUX. About $50,000.

Mr. CROCKET. What was the price the owners asked for the land?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know what the owner asked, but he is dissatisfied with the award.

Sherbrooke drill hall, $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for a drill hall at Sherbrooke on a site which has been already acquired. The contract has been let for the sum of $82,500.

Mr. STANFIELD. We have passed four or five items for militia buildings, and I think the Minister of Militia should be here to explain them. The Minister of Railways told me yesterday he did not think there would be enough money to put up a new station at Truro. I protest against these expenditures when there are other places where buildings are more urgently needed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The building is to be of brick with stone lintels, resting on a stone basement. The frontage is 157 feet on Bellevidere avenue.

Mr. BLAIN. When will this be completed ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract is to be completed by November 7, 1909.

St. Henri post office—improvements, $1,200.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for a fire-escape ladder and the construction of a granolithic sidewalk and also a basement.

Mr. STANFIELD. Does the government pay the whole cost of the sidewalk ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. STANFIELD. The minister said the other day that the rule was to pay only one-half.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think the rule can be uniform ; in some cases the town has the local improvement system and then they assess the owners of the property. The government, although not legally bound to do so, usually pays its share. The usual course is for the government to pay the whole cost of granolithic sidewalks around its own buildings.

St. Hyacinthe public building—improvement, repairs, &c., $2,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for a number of repairs and improvements, including a fire escape.

Mr. FOWLER. Some friend of the government must be making fire escapes and selling them for these various public buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand that since that very deplorable accident in Montreal in which a number of lives were lost, a municipal by-law has been passed requiring fire escapes to be placed on all public buildings.

St. John's military buildings—stables for cavalry, $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision towards the erection of stables for cavalry at the military buildings there. The work is under way, the contract has been let and the total probable cost is $37,188. The stables will accommodate some 85 horses.

Mr. KEMP. How many cavalry are there at present.

Mr. PUGSLEY. About 75.

Mr. SPROULE. I think we should have an understanding that, when we are dealing with so many buildings for the Militia Department, we shall expect the Minister of Militia to be here to give us information as to the needs which are said to justify these expenditures.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman got every information.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister gave us no information on that point. He simply told us that this building was to accommodate 85 horses. He has not told us anything of the strength of the force at this place or anything to show why the building is needed. Somebody must have asked for the building and must have asked for it on some data.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I gave the number of horses and men.

Mr. SPROULE. In a number of cases, my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) has asked questions, but got no information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I told the hon. gentleman this was for 85 horses and that the force there consisted of 75 men.

Mr. SPROULE. That was in this case, but in others in which the hon. gentleman

(Mr. Fowler) inquired, he got no information. We should have this information from the Militia Department. I do not know whether the minister (Mr. Pugsley) is sincere, or whether he is depending on jollying the House along. I think we should be treated more seriously, and I think we are entitled to all the information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What information would the hon. gentleman like with regard to this building ?

Mr. SPROULE. I am speaking of these items generally.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But take this item.

Mr. SPROULE. I will take what items I like. On this page that we have been going over, we have a vote for a quarantine station, and about that we got a little information. There is a vote for an immigration building, and we got very little information about that—the minister could hardly be expected to give it. There was a vote for the Montreal barracks, but no one representing the Militia Department gave us information about that. The Militia Department is spending very large sums of money and the country is beginning to get a little restless, regarding this expenditure as extravagant. On the vote for Montreal post office we got practically no information. Here was a vote for another militia building in Montreal and we got practically no information in regard to that. Then we took up the Quebec drill hall and got no information about that, then another military building in Quebec, about which we learned very little. There was a vote for the drill hall at Sherbrooke, and we were referred to the honourable member for the riding (Mr. Worthington), who happens not to be in his place and who, in any event, is not charged with responsibility of giving information to the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) says he gets very little information about these votes, but will he tell us what information he wants with regard to this vote.

Mr. SPROULE. I say that with regard to all these we are entitled to information from the Minister of Militia as well as from the Minister of Public Works, because the demand for these buildings comes from the Militia Department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman will tell me what information he wants——

Mr. SPROULE. I am talking about all these votes, and I am not going to be put off in that flippant way by the Minister of Public Works, and I want him to understand that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You don't want the information; you want an excuse for talking against it.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not talking against time or trying to kill time. The way the minister has acted for the last two or three hours would indicate that he is not sincerely endeavouring to do the duties devolving upon a minister in this House, and I think I have the right to speak about it. When we are voting $6,000,000 or $7,000,000 to be expended for militia purposes every year, we are entitled to know what the money is to be spent for. When it is proposed to spend $80,000 or $90,000 for the militia building, as in these cases, we want to know why the building is needed and how it is to be used. It may be said that the Minister of Public Works cannot be expected to give this information, I admit that. But for that very reason, the Minister of Militia should be here to give us the information we require. If a vote relating to the post office comes up, the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) is here to give us information. And, when we are voting money to put up these expensive buildings for the Militia Department, I think we shall expect and demand that the Minister of Militia be here to give us information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman want information about this building at St. Johns ?

Mr. SPROULE. How many men and horses compose the force there ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are seventy-five men and eighty-five horses.

Mr. SPROULE. How much is this building going to cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The estimate is $37,188.79.

Mr. SPROULE. The country should know that for eighty-five horses and seventy-five men it is going to cost about $40,000.

Mr. FOWLER. This is only for the horses, not for the men.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, the information given is not correct.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In what respect ? This building is for stables for the cavalry. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) asks how many horses are kept and how many men are in the force, and I tell him eighty-five horses and seventy-five men.

Mr. CROCKET. How long have the cavalry been stationed at St. John ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About three years.

Mr. J. DEMERS (St. John, P.Q.). Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I may say in connection with the item under discussion, that is the erection of stables for cavalry at the military school of St. John, that this school has 75 men in training, which involves the

use of 85 horses. These stables were built for the reason that the Militia Department has none at all there.

There was formerly at St. John a school of infantry, but some three years ago the department decided to establish a school of cavalry at that place, and of course stables had to be provided. These are beautiful stables. I am astonished that only about $35,000 all told, will have been spent by the government on that contract. St. John's military school is an old institution dating as far back as 1876, and I believe these stables were absolutely necessary to maintain its efficiency.

Mr. FOWLER. I want to say something respecting the necessity of the Minister of Militia being here when these estimates are going through. We have in this list of Quebec buildings seven that belong to the Militia Department, and the Minister of Militia is not here to give us any information with respect to the necessity of these buildings. The Minister of Public Works cannot give us the information. He draws largely on his imagination, he looks at the paper and says the first thing that comes into his mind.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What does the hon. member want to know about this item?

Mr. FOWLER. I want to know what necessity exists for this building that requires such a great expense. I think that the present stables at St. John's are quite sufficient for these horses without spending nearly $20,000 for new stables.

Mr. KEMP. What is the total number of troops at this station.

Mr. PUGSLEY. About seventy-five.

Mr. CROCKET. What accommodation has been provided for these horses since the corps has been established at St. John's ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was an old drill shed which was converted into a temporary stable for the horses, pending the erection of new stables.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you a clerk of works there ?

Mr. DEMERS. Evariste Gagné is clerk of works, a carpenter?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is paid on the basis of $3 per day, and is employed for about nine months.

Mr. KEMP. Where are the stables located ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the east side of the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. KEMP. Are they located inside of the old breastworks that were blown up about a century ago, or are they between the barracks and the river ?

Mr. DEMERS.

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the ground of the fort.

Mr. FOWLER. Of these military grounds?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. The government own the site ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. How many acres of military grounds have you there?

Mr. DEMERS. 12 x 8 acres.

St. John's public buildings, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote. It is for the purpose of continuing work in connection with the erection of a new public building for post office purposes and, I presume, for customs purposes as well. It is a building 63 x 44 feet, two storeys, basement and mansard.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total estimated cost, including everything, is $43,910.

Mr. FOWLER. Who has the contract ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. J. J. Collins, the lowest tenderer.

Mr. FOWLER. Who drew the plans?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Benoit.

Mr. FOWLER. Outside of the department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. How did that happen ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not able to give the hon. gentleman an explanation just now.

Mr. FOWLER. What did he get ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Three per cent for drawing the plans and 2 per cent for supervising the work, or 5 per cent in all.

Mr. FOWLER. That would give him $2,100. Cannot the architect say how it was that he had no time, with his twelve assistants, to draw the plans?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He cannot remember the circumstances just now.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the minister kindly look this matter up and give us the information?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will try and have the chief architect rake up his memory.

Mr. BLAIN. There is an item $321.12 for advertising. Perhaps the minister can explain this. What papers were these advertisements put in?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There would be no objection in the world, if the hon. gentleman

desires it, to bringing down a list of the newspapers containing this advertisement.

Mr. BLAIN. Then I do request that the list be brought down.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have it brought down.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. The motion for Supply will be renewed, and in Committee of Supply we will continue the estimates of the hon. Minister of Public Works.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3.05 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, April 29, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—STATION-MASTER AT RIVIERE DU LOUP.

Mr. MORIN—by Mr. Blain—asked :

Is Mr. J. A. Pratte in the employ of the government at Rivière du Loup as express agent? If so, since when, and what is his salary?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Pratte, who has been stationmaster at Rivière du Loup since 1878, is also agent for the Canadian Express Company, and is paid by the company for that work.

FISHING LICENSES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

1. Have fishing licenses been granted at Nanaimo, or other British Columbia points to Japanese fishermen?
2. How many Canadian fishermen of the Caucasian race of British stock were refused licenses at the same time?
3. Was the reason the British fishermen were refused licenses because the Japanese had been there a longer period?
4. Is the government aware that certain Japanese become Canadian subjects, and upon concluding their business in Canada return home Japanese subjects?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Fishing licenses are granted only to British subjects.
2. None.
3. Answered by No. 2.
4. No.

FISHING RIGHTS IN MATANE RIVER.

Mr. SPROULE asked :

1. To whom belongs the right to control the fisheries and grant fishing rights or licenses, to fish in the Matane river, the provincial or federal authorities?
2. Have the riparian owners the right to catch and take fish at any time except during the close season?
3. How many, and to whom, have licenses been granted to fish in this river since 1895?
4. What are the terms of said licenses, the consideration paid for them, the length of time for which granted, and if renewable, for how long?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. The federal authorities possess no proprietary rights of fishery in the Matane river. These rights belong to either the provincial government or the seigniors or riparian owners, and at present it is understood the latter are protesting against the exercise of the right to lease the fishery by the provincial government.
2. The riparian owners or whoever else may have the fishing right under lease, or otherwise, must comply with all the fishery regulations fixing times, places or methods of fishing, &c., which it is the exclusive function of the federal government to enact or provide for the regulation and protection of the fisheries.
3. None by the federal government.
4. Answered by No. 3.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—SUPPLY OF ICE.

Mr. STANFIELD asked :

1. At what points on the Intercolonial Railway has J. A. McDonald, of Piedmont, supplied ice during the season of 1907-8?
2. What price has he received for supplying each place, respectively?
3. What is the freight rate per ton from Piedmont to each point, respectively?
4. What price is paid for storing ice at each point?
5. What price was paid for storing ice at Truro in 1906-7, and to whom was it paid?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Truro, New Glasgow, Mulgrave, Point Tupper and Pictou.
2. Mr. McDonald's contract is for 39 cents per ton of 2,000 pounds delivered on cars at Piedmont.
3. Freight rate to Truro, $1.40 per ton of 2,000 pounds ; to New Glasgow, 80 cents

per ton; to Mulgrave, $1.40; to Point Tupper, $1.40; and to Pictou, $1 carload rates.

4. At Truro, 17 cents per ton; at New Glasgow, 58 cents; at Mulgrave, 58 cents per ton; at Point Tupper, 58 cents; and at Pictou, 46 cents per ton.

5. $1.74 per ton of 2,000 pounds packed in icehouse. Little & Connolly, Truro.

ANGLO-AMERICAN TREATY.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether there is any further information as to when the treaty between Great Britain and the United States with respect to Canada will be laid upon the table of the House.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). These treaties have been received. We are in communication with the imperial authorities and as soon as we have received their assent they will be brought down.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. E. GUSS PORTER (West Hastings). I would like to inquire of the government once more—I think this is the fourth occasion that I have inquired about it—with regard to the return ordered on the 15th January with reference to royal commissions appointed by this government since 1896, their cost and the legislation arising out of the reports of these commissions. It seems to me that a long enough time has elapsed to enable the government to make that return.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will see about it immediately.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—EMPLOYEES KILLED ON CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to inquire from the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) if he has any further information with respect to the large number of employees who have been killed on the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I have no more information as to the facts. I have been in communication with the chairman of the National Transcontinental Railway Commission who is taking the matter up with the contractors. I may have something to give to my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) in a few days about it. I called the attention of the chairman immediately to the discussion in the House, and he is I think discussing the matter with the contractors.

Mr. GRAHAM

SUPPLY—QUEBEC TERCENTENARY.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I have a matter that I wanted to bring up particularly with the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden). Is he here?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I have received some communications—I hold in my hand one which is a sample of others—from the Army and Navy Veterans Association and this letter which is from Toronto contains a request such as I think has been submitted to the Minister of Militia: That a representation of this association shall be sent to the Tercentenary celebration at Quebec. Attention is called to the fact that this association is made up of soldiers who have seen war and active service in almost every part of the globe; that they are, most of them, in possession of medals as rewards for special service and bravery; that so many of them as were in the vicinity of Toronto paraded at the time of the visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales and were particularly commended by him; that he spoke to some of them and expressed the desire that he might see them again when he came to Canada. One can easily see the motives which inspire a request of that kind, and if a representation of 28 or 30 of these men were sent to Quebec the cost would not be much, and it would be a very graceful recognition of men who have not done simply paper service, but who have upon them the scars of war and the merits of many campaigns. I urge upon the Minister of Militia that he should take that question into his consideration and if possible to favourably consider it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Do they belong to the active militia?

Mr. FOSTER. I imagine not. I think they are men who have been in the imperial service in different parts of the world and form an association by themselves.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman will understand the difficulty. The Minister of Militia is taking steps to have the militia of Canada represented on a large scale at the Tercentenary celebration and I believe every one agrees that is proper. If organizations outside the active militia are to be dealt with it would require a special appropriation by parliament. However, parliament has appropriated $300,000 towards the Tercentenary celebration and if this petition is sent to the minister I am quite sure he will call the attention of the commission to it. The commission has a large sum of money which they are at liberty to distribute as they decide best, and perhaps the object of this Veterans As-

sociation might commend itself to their judgment.

Mr. FOSTER. I will hand this letter to the Minister of Militia.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I understood that the commission was to report to parliament or to the government. When may we expect to get that report?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I suppose they will report when they have completed their proceedings for the year, or perhaps after the Tercentenary celebration has taken place.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I understood they would not spend any money until they reported.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The money has been placed in the hands of the commission for distribution according to its judgment. The appropriations are sent to us and approved by the Governor in Council.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the commission advise with the government as to how the $300,000 will be expended? I understand that they practically are to get the assent of the government.

Mr. FIELDING. They make recommendations for providing the money for certain services and they inform the government of their proposals in that respect, which are confirmed by order in council.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not insist very much upon it, but the government might consider as to whether they would place that before the House.

Mr. FIELDING. I think they have made appropriations to the extent of about two-thirds of the total sum approximately. I see no reason why the report should not be brought down.

THE WOOD PULP INDUSTRY—PRESERVATION OF RESOURCES OF THE FOREST.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron). I wish to trespass on the time of the House for a moment to impress upon the Prime Minister and the government the immediate necessity of some action being taken in reference to the appointment of a committee of members of this House to ascertain the official facts as regards the forest resources of Canada and the United States. I do so at this time because of articles which have appeared in the public press and because of the action taken by the United States House of Representatives, the Speaker of which has appointed a select committee to investigate into wood pulp and print paper, and which committee is already at work. I wish to impress upon the Prime Minister certain editorials which have appeared in the Canadian press in reference to this matter, particularly an editorial in the 'Globe' of April the 6th also editorial of 'Industrial Canada' for April, and an editorial in the Ottawa 'Free Press' of April the 27th, from which I quote:

The Pulp problem.

As the year advances it is quite apparent that the seriousness of the situation which confronts this country as to the future of its paper supply, and as to the absolute necessity of putting an end to the wastage of the timber resources of the two countries principally involved is more and more impressing itself upon the public mind.

But as we secure additional information upon the predations of the pulp and paper industry of the United States upon our pulp wood resources, and as we learn, as we do learn every day, that the situation in the United States is rapidly approaching the stage where they must procure their pulp from Canada, the question arises whether this issue has not approached the proportions of a national, and a vitally national, question. . . Why should Canada consent to allow these pulp areas to be depleted without adequate return to the workers of this country in the future as has been our policy in the past?

There is one way to get out of the difficulty, and one only. The federal government should appoint a commission which shall go into the whole question and investigate its true bearings from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Such a commission would be able to secure official information which would be invaluable in enabling the government to deal with the problem from a national standpoint. Sir Wilfrid Laurier has already hinted that he has some such an idea in his mind, and it is to be hoped that the session will not close without the idea coming to fruition. . . .

It would be a new departure in Canada and we are sure that such a legislative committee would prove of untold value in the solution of the problem.

I ask that the Prime Minister should grant a committee of the House for two reasons. First, a Royal Commission would make a cut and dried report, but the members of a committee of the House would be able to explain their report on the floor of parliament as is the practice in the United States. The second reason is that a committee of the House would not be as costly as a royal commission, because the members of that committee would be in receipt of their indemnity and would not receive anything further than their expenses. I would advise that a small committee of the House should be appointed to get the official facts, to sit during recess and report next session. This is not a new matter. So long ago as June the 7th, 1904, a prominent Canadian newspaper editor, Mr. John D. Grace, published in the 'Financial News' of London, England, an article with reference to this matter. That article was quoted by the great English statesman Mr. Joseph Chamberlain in his fiscal policy speech of 1905, and in that arti-

cle, the statement is made that the United States is almost at the end of its forest resources and that Canada, Norway and Sweden are the only three countries which can export pulp. Mr. Grace wrote:

When European experts are saying that a timber famine is within sight, the forests of this country become a possession which cannot well be overvalued. Our timber will be as valuable as our grain.

I state that I believe Norway and Sweden are now at the end of their resources for export to any great extent and I ask the Prime Minister to question the geological surveyors of Canada as to whether there is an inexhaustible supply of timber in this country. For the last thirty years parties of from ten to thirty—this year I believe there are thirty parties—have been exploring this country from one end to the other, and they are able to give accurate information. I do not ask for any speedy legislation. This is a large matter; it is a serious matter. But I ask that the Prime Minister will take some immediate steps to organize a committee so that we can get exact information. Another reason for action is this, that the president of the United States has called a congress or convention of the governors of the different states of the Union to assemble during the coming month of May for the purpose of discussing this question. I have had communication on the subject with the United States Consul at Ottawa, and he informs me that he has no official information, but that he believes that the date set for the convention is May 13. I believe that it would be a very proper thing for Canada to be represented at that convention, where we could probably get invaluable information. The Owen Sound 'Times' of January 9, and of March 19, 1908, has excellent editorials on this same line. So also the Seaforth 'Expositor' of April 24, 1908. The 'Canadian Journal of Commerce' of March 20, 1908. If legislation is enacted, as I hope it will be, on this question, it could be so framed as not to interfere with the rights or the profits of any of the farmers of Canada, as some fear it would.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Before my hon. friend takes his seat, would he be kind enough to state to the House the points that he would desire to have investigated by this committee?

Mr. LEWIS. The committee should have power, in the first place, as now is the opportunity for doing so, of finding out what are the timber and pulpwood resources of the United States—both of supply and demand; also the resources of Canada, and as to whether the supply is inexhaustible, as has been stated for years; also the visible supply to-day in other countries; also what would be the possible result of an export duty or the adoption of some other means by which the manufacture of our crude product could be carried on in Canada also the best means to preserve our forests. A Royal Commission could be appointed, composed of members of parliament. They would be without pay except as regards their expenses. I contend that while we have only six or seven millions of people in Canada, the questions affecting this last great nation are just as great as they would be if we had eighty millions; and when we have only 214 representatives for this vast country, I contend that the full time of these men should be given to their legislative duties—not here, however; because I think the lengthening sessions are interfering with the business of the country. They interfere with the business of the departments while we are here. Shorter sessions would be better; but the whole time of a member of parliament should be given to the interests of this country. It takes very little to occupy one man's time; and if he devotes that time to one great question——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member is rather wandering away from the question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, the question to which my hon. friend has called the attention of the House is one which at this moment is engrossing the attention not only of the people of this country, but also of the people of the United States, and which should, in my humble judgment, engross the attention of the whole civilized world. Nothing is more important, I believe, than the preservation of the forests; but unfortunately, we are all guilty, not in this country, but in all countries, with the exception of very few, of taking the forests too much as a negligible quantity. My hon. friend has stated that the opinion is entertained in this country that our timber resources are inexhaustible. If such be the opinion of some, it is certainly not my own opinion. On the contrary, I believe that our forest resources are very far from being inexhaustible, and if the present waste goes on, it is not difficult to foresee that before many years pass over Canada will be very much in want of timber and of wood generally. If the committee which my hon. friend wants had for its primary object the seeking of means and methods whereby the waste of forest lands could be prevented, I would be very much in sympathy with it. I think there is no more important problem at the present day than to find ways and means of preserving our forests. In one respect the great enemy of the forest is the railway; another enemy is the fire. Railways have to be built; but whenever a railway is brought into a forest it brings with it the danger of the destruction of the forest itself. I would not be adverse to the suggestion of my hon. friend to have either a committee or a commission appointed chiefly for the purpose of finding

ways and means to prevent the waste which is taking place annually, not only in this country but all over this continent. The government will be happy, on the suggestion of my hon. friend, to take the matter into consideration, and I may be able to give an answer at an early date. I notice that my hon. friend has suggested that we should be represented at the convention which has been summoned by President Roosevelt, and which is to sit at Washington during the month of May. I may say to my hon. friend that if we were invited we would be only too glad to accept the invitation. But as I understand that it is purely a convention of governors and officials of the United States, I do not suppose that we would have any standing in it. If we had, I would advise the government to send a representative.

THE IMMIGRATION BONUS SYSTEM.

Mr. LORENZO ROBITAILLE (Quebec County). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair, I would like to draw the attention of the right hon. leader of the House to an article in the 'Canadian Gazette' of London, of February 6, 1908. The subject of the article is 'The Emigrant Bonus System,' and it states that application was made to Sir Marcus Samuel, judge of the Guildhall court, for the renewal of a license of an emigration agent and passenger broker. The judge was inclined to refuse the application, and Dr. Ginsburg, representative of the board of trade of London, appeared to oppose the application, and the Hon. Charles Russell represented the Dominion government and tried to induce the judge to grant the application for the license, which seemed to be in doubt. Hon. Charles Russell was about to address the court, when Dr. Ginsberg objected, saying that he failed to see his locus standi. The judge thought that the immigration agent caused certain advertisements to be published relative to the demand for immigrants in Canada, containing inaccurate representations. It was only by this action of the board of trade through Dr. Ginsburg that attention was called to the matter. It goes to prove that on the other side the system of bonuses incites the greed of graft and it is not to the benefit of Canada. This report continues :

Dr. Ginsburg. I say that the Dominion government have no more to do with it than any one in the street, and I protest against it.

The Hon. C. Russell. These proceedings are taken at the instance of the Board of Trade in the protection of intending emigrants.

Further on it says :

Sir Marcus Samuel. This case is assuming an aspect of the greatest gravity and importance. It is a most serious thing if the government of Canada have been paying a bonus of £1 a head on emigrants, and paying it to any person who can use every ruse they can devise to obtain emigrants.

Evidence having been given by Mr. C. A. Allen and Mr. Conrad Just, from the Immigration Department of the Canadian government, said he felt a great deal of difficulty in dealing with the case, for one was always reluctant to cause an injury to an individual, but it appeared to him that the whole system was at fault. The Board of Trade had very rightly interfered. It was a very strong inducement for persons to insert these advertisements when they knew they would get a capitation grant of £1 per head. He felt there was no very great difference between this system and that of the 'crimp' obtaining sailors for ships. He held that the advertisements continued after due warning had been given, and he hoped it would act as a warning in other cases.

I wish to ask certain questions relating to this matter. What sums were paid to Mrs. Kendall, the party in question ? How many emigrants did she book to Canada ? Has this case or any similar case been brought to the attention of the government by Mr. Jury, Mr. Walker, Mr. Just or any official of the Immigration Department in London ? Did the department try to obtain a refund of the bonuses paid upon inaccurate representations ? Is it the intention of the department to adopt the suggestion of the Liverpool 'Journal of Commerce,' which in commenting on this case says :

If the Canadian government offers bonuses in the way which seems to be indicated by the facts of this case, it would be worth their while to consider whether they could not make it a condition of their contract with the passenger agents whom they employ that all advertisements bearing on the subject of the prospects for workers in Canada should be submitted to them before insertion, and should be re-examined from time to time as conditions change.

I think this particular portion of the article is most important, and that the suggestion should be adopted if this policy is to be continued. It would be a guarantee to bona fide immigrants that they would actually know the conditions in Canada before starting from England instead of coming here and being forced upon the cities.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is a special case and I am sorry my hon. friend has not given notice to the Minister of the Interior of his intention to ask these questions. I shall see that the minister gives my hon. friend the information desired.

Motion agreed to and House went into Committee of Supply.

Public Works, buildings—Ontario—Arnprior public building, $500.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). This is to complete the payments on a tower clock in the Arnprior building.

Belleville armoury, $75,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision for continuing the work upon the Belleville armoury during the coming year. The total estimated cost will be $139,776

Mr. SPROULE. This again raises the question which I brought up last night, in the absence of the Minister of Militia during the discussion of votes for military buildings. If he is not present we are not able to secure the requisite information concerning the purpose and the necessity of these works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I mentioned my hon. friend's complaint to the Minister of Militia here this afternoon but he said he was sorry he could not be present as he had an engagement in Montreal and had to leave by the afternoon train. I am willing to allow the item in connection with military buildings to stand over if my hon. friend think it best to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that is the only proper thing under the circumstances.

Mr. PORTER. I understood the minister to say that this grant of $75,000 would bring the total cost of the building to $139,000? This work was let by contract for a certain sum.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract price is $87,777.

Mr. PORTER. Then, what is the explanation of this difference between $87,777 and $139,000 ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The amount paid for site was $9.000; paid to the Architectural and Engineering Company for making plans, $1,755; surveying site, legal expenses, printing, advertising and clerk of works' salary, $1,555.31; paid the contractor on account to December 31, 1907. $28,750; making a total of $41,060.31. The amount due on the contract and for additional work is $73,350, making about $14,000 additional to the contractor. There is some additional work which increases the amount from $87,000 to $101,000. Then, there is heating, $5,000 ; electric wiring and fixtures, $2,500 ; fittings and furniture, $10,000 ; sidewalks and fencing, $1,000 ; contingencies and superintendence, $6,866, making a total estimated cost of $139,736.31.

Brantford public building—improvements, $500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This vote is to complete the improvements and alterations, fittings and general repairs in the post office at Brantford. The total cost of the improvements has been about $13,000, of which $12,510.75 has been spent, leaving $489.25 to complete—or, say $500.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The amount spent seems to be large considering the changes made and the work done. I do not see where they have put $13,000. However, this year the minister proposes to allow us $500. This seems a very large amount to give out of a total of appropriations of $119,000,000. Does the minister really feel that he can afford this $500 for Brantford? And on what ground has he made the calculation? On that point. I would like to inquire on what basis the distribution of public buildings is made. Has it any relation to the requirements of the people, the amount of business done or the revenue received? If these matters, which, as a business man, I think are very proper to take into consideration, are the basis on which the department proceeds in these cases, I submit that the amount the minister is placing in the estimates for Brantford is totally inadequate for the requirements of that city. I do not think the hon. minister (Mr. Pugsley) has ever visited Brantford, and of course, I cannot blame him for that, for he has not been very long in his present office. But I can tell him that this is not a new question in this House, for we have drawn attention, year after year, to this post office building. This building, it should be understood, houses not only the post office but the Custome Department and the Inland Revenue Department in a city of 20,000 people. Let me give the figures of the revenue collected in that building according to the latest statistics I have at hand. These, I believe, are the returns for 1907, but whether for the full year or for nine months I am not quite sure. The postal department yielded $37,328, besides over $700 for rents of boxes. In round figures, the postal revenue of Brantford is about $40,000. The custom house collected $308,000, and the inland revenue collected between $70,000 and $75,000—a total of something over $400,000 paid into the coffers of this government from the city of Brantford. In return for this vast amount paid in by the city of Brantford and surrounding district, we have the munificent sum of $500 placed in the estimates this year to be spent in that city. This building stands practically as it stood twenty-five years ago, when the city of Brantford was about one-third its present size and the revenue was not 25 per cent of what it is to-day. We have asked, time and again. for a new public building. And I might call the attention of the minister to the fact that this is almost the only way in which the Dominion government can spend money in the city of Brantford. We have no use for the breakwaters and wharfs that are built in some other places—we have some water there, but we do not feel that a breakwater would do much good. We do not ask for dredging as do some of the sea and lake ports. But, surely, when the government has only the two avenues through which it can spend money in a community such as

Brantford—the armoury and the post office —we are not asking too much when we say that we should have a post office building commensurate with the business to be done and the revenue received. To properly house these three branches of the public service, we should have in that city a building worth from $125,000 to $150,000. There are places in many parts of Canada giving a much less revenue than Brantford in which public buildings are put up costing from $75,000 to $150,000. And still, we are using the building which we have used for twenty-five years, and which is totally inadequate. Our people must walk up a winding stair to pay their customs duties. If there were any competition, no one would do business with the government. But there is no one else besides the government taking customs duties. But our citizens must climb this winding stair as they have been doing for about twenty-five years to pay about $300,000 a year into the coffers of the Dominion treasury. And they must climb a winding stair to pay $75,000 to the Inland Revenue Department. We are not asking for anything extravagant or anything but what is required by the public service. But we think that, when it comes to a city like Brantford, with its revenues, we should have a building more commensurate with the business done than the one we have to-day. I would ask the Minister of Public Works if, in deciding with regard to the location of public buildings, he takes into consideration the amount of business done and the revenue received?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) that in considering the desirability of erecting a public building in a city or town, the importance of the place, the business done and the public requirements are all taken into careful consideration. As to Brantford, I take it that my hon. friend would not suggest that we should ask the committee to vote a larger sum than is necessary to finish the improvements that have been undertaken. When only $500 is required, to vote more would be a mere waste of the public money. So far as the erection of a new building in Brantford is concerned, I have not had the pleasure of any communication from the hon. gentleman who represents the riding in which the city of Brantford is situated, urging that a new public building should be erected there. Although I have been for several months in the department, the hon. gentleman, as the one who is entitled to speak for the people of that district, has not made any communication to me in this direction, nor has any one else.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the request was made in the House at a former session.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That may be, if so I was not here to receive it. I recognize the importance of the town of Brantford, I recognize that a large business is done there and a large revenue is collected. I can say to my hon. friend that I shall have much pleasure during the recess in looking into the matter and seeing what the requirements are, and will give the suggestion of my hon. friend a very careful consideration.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The minister rather criticises me for having failed to wait upon him or write him in connection with this matter. I have taken this, the earliest opportunity when the matter was under discussion, to bring it to his attention. His predecessor was asked on more than one occasion on the floor of the House, and was personally interviewed by myself, and if there are no records in the department of that kind, it is of little use for us to make these requests from time to time. I have made these requests on the floor of the House, and also personally, and the minister apparently now hears of them for the first time. I waited upon Mr. Hyman myself, and I think other citizens of Stratford have waited on him and I think considerable correspondence has been held with the government about this very matter, namely, the inadequacy of the Brantford postal facilities and the inadequacy of the inland revenue facilities. It is not a new question, and if the minister has not searched his files, or if these requests have not been placed on file, that is not my fault. I have made the request from time to time, and at every opportunity during my term in this parliament. The buildings have been inadequate for some years, and when these votes were made of $10,000 or $12,000 for repairs, I pointed out to Mr. Hyman that it seemed to me a comparative waste of money to tinker up an old building that was never going to be satisfactory, and that it would be better to take the matter up in a broad sense, as it should be, in order to satisfy the requirements of the city, and give us a public building worthy of Brantford and commensurate with the very large business that is done there. We do not ask for a lavish expenditure, but we do say that any business house in the city of Brantford doing a large business, would have premises erected a great deal more up-to-date than these government buildings. It is only because there is no competition in the revenue or customs business that so large a business can be done in these old premises. I trust the minister will carry out the promise he has made on the floor of the house, and that he will visit the city of Brantford at an early date and see for himself the great commercial and industrial activity prevailing there, and will give us a building suitable to the requirements of the city. I thank the minister for his promise, and trust that he will not forget it.

Mr. BLAIN. I feel it my duty to endorse what my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) has said as to the necessity of an expenditure for public buildings in the city of Brantford. I am much surprised that the Minister of Customs has not communicated to the Minister of Public Works in reference to the needs of Brantford in this respect. May I ask the Postmaster General if any requests have been made to his department for better service in the city of Brantford, and a larger building.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I could not answer offhand, but I think we have received a petition to that effect.

Mr. BLAIN. If the Postmaster General has received a petition to that effect, I suppose he would communicate it to the Minister of Public Works. I should also suppose that my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, as an old resident of Brantford, and a representative of that constituency for many years, would have interested himself on its behalf. The hon. gentleman has been in this government since 1896. Now one of his colleagues says that no request has been made for a better service, and a larger post office building in the city of Brantford. Surely the Minister of Customs has not forgotten his old city that elected him to parliament for the first time. I would ask the hon. gentleman if any demands have been made upon the government for increased accommodation in the city of Brantford for the various services of the government, a city which is contributing so large a sum to the revenue. I certainly endorse what my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) has said. I have heard him myself several times on the floor of the House pressing the claims of his city upon the government for a more liberal expenditure, and suggesting that some of the money that is being wasted in other directions should be put to good use in the city of Brantford. On this side of the House we do not advocate a larger total expenditure by this government, but we desire to see the middleman dispensed with and the money wisely expended. A few years ago the government were proposing to inaugurate a pneumatic system of distributing the mails in Toronto and Montreal. Instead of wasting money on schemes like that, let some of it be expended in important centres like Brantford where there is so evident a public need of better facilities. I think the Minister of Public Works is not doing himself justice when he suggests that the member for Brantford has not directed his attention to the fact that a larger expenditure is necessary.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no suggestion about it ; it is a fact.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman has given that as a reason why larger appropriations were not made for the city of Brantford. I am sure that the people and his own friends in the city of Brantford will not appreciate that reference to my hon. friend who so ably represents them on the floor of this House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not intend to say anything which would reflect upon the hon. gentleman who represents the city of Brantford. All I desired to do was to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that, although I had been eight months, yesterday, in the department, I had not had the pleasure of having any communication from him upon the subject. Neither had I received any petition, or communication from anybody in Brantford urging that increased accommodation was necessary for post office and customs purposes. Now, the hon. gentleman makes the statement that he had, upon previous occasions, in this House, brought the matter to the attention of the then minister, and also that certain communications had been forwarded. I do not intend to reflect at all upon my hon. friend but only to state a fact which might, in some measure, at all events, explain why there is no provision being made at the present time for any new building for these purposes in the city of Brantford. As far as the present vote is concerned the improvements are quite considerable. We have provided for new fittings in the post office, new granite steps, new letter boxes and brass work, letter receiver, recutting of stone work, improved heating apparatus and an iron fence around the building. We have done electric wiring and improved the buildings by painting, graining and varnishing, we have made a number of repairs to the wood work, we have put in new furniture and we have done what seemed to be reasonable and necessary for the building.

Mr. J. D. REID. Was it done by contract or day's work ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Part by tender and part by day's work. I think that the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) did not need the assistance of the gentleman who sits in front of him (Mr. Blain) because the hon. gentleman took my assurance in good faith and with apparent good feeling that I would be very happy to make inquiry into the necessities of the city of Brantford in this particular and give the matter my prompt consideration. I recognize just as well as the hon. gentleman who represents that important constituency does that it is my duty, administering the Department of Public Works, to pay attention to the necessities of all parts of this country and that it would not be proper that I should neglect or overlook the reasonable wants of a place so important as the city of Brantford.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I do not wish to have it understood that I felt in any way hurt

at what the minister said, but I think that he was a little unfair in saying that I had not presented the claims of the city of Brantford because they had been forwarded to the department, and that the reason that I had not presented them again within the last few months was that I was awaiting the opportunity that arose to-day. If the minister carries out the promise that he has made it will be all right. The trouble is that this request has been made to the Minister of Public Works on two or three different occasions and unfortunately to two or three ministers. I think we began with the late Mr. Sutherland, we continued it with Mr. Hyman and now we are continuing it with the hon. gentleman who occupies the position to-day. The department changes its head so frequently that we are required to put in these applications a little too often. I think the records will show that the board of trade of the city of Brantford spent more than one evening discussing the inadequacy of the buildings in Brantford and that they placed their views on record and sent them down to this government. The hon. the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), who is an old resident of Brantford, certainly knows the inadequacy of these buildings. He knows the immense amount of revenue that his department and the Post Office Department are obtaining from the city of Brantford, and I think it is nothing but reasonable that the Minister of Customs should back me up when I make the reasonable request that I am making, and when I say that the city of Brantford should have a little of this vast expenditure that this government is making annually. We do not ask for any extravagance, but we do ask that legitimate business requirements may be provided for in the city of Brantford. Instead of this small vote the department should make one job of it and put up a new building. I admit, as the minister has said, that they have improved the inside of the building considerably, that they have given us modern fittings and a certain amount of that kind of expenditure is all right, but it is only a temporary arrangement because the building is inadequate and it cannot be increased to the size which is necessary. I should say in justice to the hon. the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) that I do not think anything has been actually placed before himself at all but he will see that the very same argument that has been made with respect to the Department of Public Works also applies to his department. This matter was taken up when Sir William Mulock was Postmaster General. I think the records in that department will show that petitions came down to the department some four or five years ago and I may say they were endorsed by the citizens generally. I remember that an inspector was sent up by the Post Office Department. I had the honour of being one of the committee that awaited upon him. We pointed out the inadequacy of the arrangements and we had a special committee that sat for weeks and months to endeavour to get the department to deal with this very matter. Although all of this had reference to the Post Office Department the hon. gentleman who occupies the position of Postmaster General is not responsible in that respect because the request was not made to him. We made it to his predecessors and we made it also to the predecessors of the Minister of Public Works. Now I renew it to-day to two of the ministers—to three of them for the matter of that, because the Minister of Customs should be included also. His department obtained $308,000 from the city of Brantford alone last year. The building is in the same condition, so far as I know, as it was twenty-five years ago. It was built in Sir John Macdonald's time, long before this government came into power, and we have had no addition to it from that time to this. There has been no change, I believe except some small changes in the interior fittings. The population of Brantford is three times what it was, the business is probably ten times what it was and the revenue is probably three or four times what it was when the building was put up. If business is business it is right that the large amount of business which is done in Brantford should be housed in proper quarters. I am not going to find fault with the promise of the minister, only I ask him not to take too long to carry it out because it has been before the House on several occasions. We have pressed it upon the attention of the government and practically nothing has resulted. I have just had placed in my hand the answer which was given by the Hon. A. B. Aylesworth, then Postmaster General, to a question which I put to him in the House on March 19, 1906, and which will be found at page 339 of Hansard of that year. I shall read the answer in order that the present Postmaster General may see what has been done in Brantford within the last few years. The Hon. A. B. Aylesworth made the following statement:

1. Revenue—

1900	$26,550 78
1901	28,796 67
1902	32,349 07
1903	33,748 43
1904	36,773 56
1905	42,921 10

2. Value of postal notes issued—

1900	$ 2,641 24
1901	2,999 19
1902	2,818 15
1903	3,920 38
1904	4,862 49
1905	6,903 85

3. Value of postal notes redeemed—

1900	$ 9,328 21
1901	10,093 10
1902	10,927 02
1903	11,032 88
1904	15,427 51
1905	16,061 53

Every single year during that whole term, each one of these sources of revenue from the city of Brantford steadily increased. The Postmaster General does $60,000 worth of business in the city of Brantford, not to speak of the returns from the customs and inland revenue and all this business is housed in the one inadequate building. I think the minister must recognize the necessity for increased accommodation at Brantford and I trust that year after year I will not be compelled to bring this matter to his attention. When Mr. Hyman was minister and when he heard the statement I made in the House he said to me privately, but I think I may mention it: Cockshutt you ought to have a building in Brantford costing not less than $125,000. Mr. Hyman practically gave us to understand that in the very near future this would be done, but to-day we have a paltry $500 in the estimates for Brantford.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). I am surprised that the Minister of Customs sits silent without a word to say for the good old city of Brantford. When the Conservatives were in power, although he represented the constituency, they generously erected a building in Brantford which was sufficient for the business done at the time, but, the Liberals have studiously neglected that city. After hearing the statement of the hon. member (Mr. Cockshutt) I do not wonder that Brantford rejected the Minister of Customs because evidently since the Liberals came into power he has not been able to get the claims of that city recognized. To-day when the hon. member (Mr. Cockshutt) pleads for the assistance of the Minister of Customs the Minister of Customs has not a word to say. The minister owes it to the city of Brantford to state whether there will be sufficient accommodation afforded that city and whether he will use his influence in that direction. Now, this item like all others includes a charge for architect's fees although one would suppose that if the Public Works Department were run on business principles it would have a sufficient permanent staff of architects and engineers to do all this work. There is a general impression that the Public Works Department has been running wild; first one minister is brought in to improve it and then another until it is brought down to the present minister. I was much astonished the other day when I heard that contracts for dredging were to be given without tender.

Mr. COCKSHUTT.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why not discuss the item before the chair. As a matter of fact the contracts were not to be given without tender; it was only an extension of the time of the old contracts.

Mr. J. D. REID. I mentioned this to show that the Public Works Department wants reorganization worse than the Marine Department. Here, as was shown by the hon. gentleman from Simcoe (Mr. Bennet) the other day, the Public Works Department paid in nine months $27,500 to one outside architect, when one good permanent employee at a salary of $5,000 a year could have done all the work. Either the department has not competent men to do the work or else they are farming it out amongst friends of the government so that large profits may be made by them.

Mr. BENNETT. They are afraid of their own architects since the Laurier tower fell.

Mr. J. D. REID. That may be and probably they are afraid of their inspectors as well. It would be much better in every way to have a well paid and competent permanent official who would look after this architect work, and he would not be likely to be so susceptible to graft as the superintendents who are indiscriminately employed throughout the country. I believe that we should have a permanent officer of this kind and that he should be paid a sufficient salary. Take the case of the little armoury at Belleville and an Ottawa architect has to be called in and everybody knows he is the son of the chief architect. He may be as good a man as any other, but it strikes me that if the chief architect should have a man in his department who is qualified to make plans for a building such as this——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why discuss everything under the sun on this item?

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not think that I am out of order in giving this as an instance of what is being done in the department. I object in the strongest possible manner to the Public Works Department spending $100,000 to employ architects outside of the department. I claim that the minister should employ a sufficient number of men to do the work in the department and not farm it out in this way to the disadvantage of the public.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry that my hon. friend should think it necessary, on this small item of $500 to finish certain work on a public building at Brantford, to go over matters which have been already discussed again and again in this House. Let me say to my hon. friend, with all respect, that repetitions of this kind are actually costing this country more than would erect a new public building. With regard

to Mr. Taylor, the gentleman who supervised this work, he was acting as the clerk of works. My hon. friend must know that there must be somebody on the spot to see that the work is well done; we cannot leave it to the different contractors without supervision; and the item to which my hon. friend makes great objection amounts to $195.42, as will be found at page V—48 of the Auditor General's report. Will any one say that this was an unreasonable sum for looking after a work costing upwards of $13,000?

Mr. TAYLOR. I find that a namesake of mine, L. H. Taylor—I do not think he is of the same politics, or he would not get it—was paid 2 per cent on $6,173.74 and 5 per cent on $1,014, and $10 for a special report, making $195.42; but I find that the Schultz Bros. Co. were paid for alterations in the post office $3,295, and for sundry repairs $433.12. The money spent does not represent the money on which the architect was paid the commission.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Part of the expenditure was made in previous years.

Mr. TAYLOR. If we look at V—60, we will find Mr. Taylor figuring again on the construction of armouries at Brantford, on which he was paid $504.86. When a minister comes here and makes a statement, we ought to be able to put it down as being as true as the gospel; but the hon. gentleman stated that there was only $10,000 paid to outside architects during the last year, whereas we find that Mr. Perrault alone, on the new postal station on St. Catherine Street in Montreal and on the plans for the general post office on St. James Street, drew nearly $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The question was put as to how much we paid out each year for architects, and the chief architect told me that he thought it would not exceed $10,000, taking one year with another.

Mr. TAYLOR. We find on almost every item we touch that fees are paid to outside architects. I venture to say that if you go through the Auditor General's report you will find that these payments will amount to several hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. PATERSON. In case I should be considered wanting in courtesy to the hon. gentleman who alluded to me, I wish to say that when I came in I did not know what this discussion was about. I understand that it is on an item for a further expenditure of $500 for some improvements in the existing building in Brantford, on which in the last two or three years there has been $13,000 expended. This expenditure manifests, I think, that the convenience of the people there is not being disregarded. Brantford is a city to which in the past I have owed a good deal; my home was there. Therefore, I would be very pleased to see a fair measure of justice done to it. I cannot myself see that injustice has been done to it. The member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid), speaking without full knowledge of the fact, alluded to the Conservative government having erected the present building, and suggested that it might have been partly the cause of my temporary defeat there, because I had not accomplished more with the Liberal government. He is a little wrong there, I was at that time a humble member of the House, and I believe that it was on my recommendation that the public building was given to Brantford. It was given before our Conservative friends came into power the last time, so if there be any credit for that, though I do not claim credit, as the place deserved the building, it was my representations that the building was put there. Subsequently a large armoury was put there in my time. That was under the Conservative government.

Mr. BERGERON. You were then in opposition?

Mr. PATERSON. I was in opposition as I was for eighteen years, which the hon. gentlemen will find to be a very long time. The old shed was dilapidated and had lost its roof, and on my representations the building was erected. The city of Brantford contributed one-half the cost, $10,000, doing more in that respect than other municipalities. Since this government came in the armouries have been greatly enlarged, $20,000 or $30,000 have been spent and they are now equal to any in the country. The hon. member for Brantford will admit that this government have not been disposed to slight Brantford simply because it was represented by an opposition member. It is a large and growing city, and we all know that the business has largely increased, possibly to such an extent that at times there may be a little inconvenience. As far as the custom house is concerned, we have room enough to do our business. Of course the climbing of the stairs to the customs house and inland revenue office, which, as so often happens, are situated above the post office, is inconvenient, and I think it is right that the government should ascertain whether the business of Brantford has so increased that the public interest would justify the erection of a new building, perhaps for the post office, giving the whole of the present building to customs and excise. I have no doubt that if representations are made to the minister, he will consider them. My hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) has been re-elected president of the Bell Memorial Fund, an honour which is only his due. That fund is national in one respect and therefore the government felt that they were justified in meeting the request of that committee and granted $10,000. I think

my hon. friend will be generous enough to say that since he has represented the riding the government have not turned a deaf ear to requests by him to which they felt themselves able to accede.

Mr. BLAIN. Have any new public building been erected in Brantford since the present administration came into power?

Mr. PATERSON. I am not aware of new buildings but there have been great enlargements and improvements, notably in the armouries.

Mr. BLAIN. The revenue from custom duties in 1900 was $178,540.10, and by annual increases it grew to $225,662.86 in 1905, showing a large increase. The complaint is that there has been no corresponding expenditure to provide better accommodation for those paying the duty, and ciizens in general.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentlemen opposite do not want to have money expended simply because the revenue in a particular line has increased, if the existing accommodation will suffice. From the remarks of hon. gentlemen that is evident. My hon. friend has been in Brantford and I have no doubt that the citizens would show him the very handsome building erected by the Mackenzie government many years ago and improved by the present government.

Mr. J. D. REID. I think the minister did not understand me and did me an injustice. I was not complaining about Mr. Taylor. my objection was not to the payment of so much to one architect, but to the practice of having so much work done by outside architects that should be done by the architects of the department. I do not believe that the work is done as well in the public interest or as economically as it would be if we had well-qualified and properly paid officials in the department to do this work.

Dominion public buildings—renewals, improvements, repairs, &c., $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the usual vote, and about the same amount as usual. In 1906-7 the sum of $12,198.08 was expended. This includes some thirty different buildings. We are asking now to cover about fifty different buildings, the amount being $20,000.

Mr. BENNETT. On this item of repairs, improvements and so on, I desire to call the attention of the committee to the fact that an enormous bill is creeping up for furniture and fittings for these several public buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think that this item includes the Ottawa public buildings.

Mr. PATERSON.

Mr. BENNETT. But the remarks I have to make relate to suplies for outside buildings as well. It would seem that it is becoming a serious question with the Department of Public Works and other departments to find places to stow away the articles that their friends provide at the public expense. Two returns have been made on this subject which I desire to place on 'Hansard.' I will first deal with the Eclipse Company. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) asked the following questions :

Mr. BLAIN. 1. How much money has been paid since 1896 to the Eclipse Manufacturing Company, of Ottawa?

2. How much each year?

3. What was the general character of the supplies furnished?

These questions were replied to as follows :

1. $215,468.06.

2.

1896-7	$ 448 00
1897-8	339 65
1898-9	13,388 46
1899-1900	12,659 35
1900-1	19,915 25
1901-2	22,754 95
1902-3	4,299 78
1903-4	16,315 43
1904-5	24,098 63
1905-6	29,164 72
1906-7	30,294 12
1907-8	41,789 12

3. Steel cases and filing cabinets.

I moved for another return of the goods bought from the Office Specialty Company, and the figures of the purchases from that company are as follows :

1896-7	$ 70 00
1897-8	78 94
1898-9	4,797 86
1899-1900	2,903 44
1900-1	11,457 15
1901-2	19,269 79
1902-3	9,021 09
1903-4	26,530 58
1904-5	50,272 38
1905-6	66,505 75
1906-7	53,189 37
1907-8	78,714 61

Now, these figures show that these two companies alone have been paid for fittings and furniture of this kind the enormous total of $538,278. That is, in round figures, $70,000 a year has been spent in this way for a number of years past. And it is to be remembered that furniture is bought for the different public buildings from hundreds of other sources besides, but these two companies alone have succeeded in getting this colossal sum of $538,278 out of the people of Canada. The figures seem almost incredible. There is only one explanation, and it is to be had by referring to the records showing who was the Minister of Public Works at that time. Mr. Hyman made his appearance on the scene in 1902-3. And what was the result? The

bills of this Office Specialty Company jumped at once from $9,000 to $26,000, and went on in succeeding years, $50,000, $66,000, $53,000 and last year $78,714. It is well to understand who comprise these companies. The head and front of the Office Specialty Company is Mr. G. M. Reid, of London. And who is he? He is one of the quartette who are to-day awaiting sentence for criminal participation in the London election frauds. It is no wonder that this man could come to Mr. Hyman and take him by the throat, having all the evidence that he must have had in his possession. When brought before a trial judge he was convicted, with three others, of complicity in these stupendous frauds which not only astonished the country, but brought Ontario into disgrace in the eyes of the Dominion and of the world. And let it be clearly understood—let there be no mistake about it—that Mr. Reid is not only one of the large stockholders of this concern, but is an influential member and one of the directors.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) says that Mr. Reid has a large interest in this concern. Will he state what it is?

Mr. BENNETT. I will gratify the curiosity of the minister—and of the deputy minister, for I saw him suggest the question—the amount is $12,000——

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the total capital ?

Mr. BENNETT. ——and there is a suspicion that some of the stockholders are there as representatives of others.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the total capital ?

Mr. BENNETT. I cannot tell the minister. Probably the deputy minister can tell him—for the deputy seems conversant with the whole thing. I notice that it is becoming a habit of deputies, when they attend the House, to intervene very much in matters when any political question is coming to the front. Well, take this Newmarket Company, with Mr. G. M. Reid, of London election fame, as one of the directors—how did they get these contracts ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) will allow me a moment, I may say that there is not a single item connected with the Office Specialty Company or the Eclipse Specialty Company in the item under discussion. This is simply the ordinary repairs for about seventy different public buildings all over Canada. I think that when a particular item is before the committee members should confine their remarks to the discussion of that item instead of being allowed to roam to other items in various parts of the estimates.

Mr. BENNETT. Reference to the Auditor General's Report will show that supplies are sold by this company for different buildings under this vote.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like your ruling, Mr. Chairman, on the point I have raised.

Mr. BENNETT. Surely the minister will not say that on a general item which covers the placing of letter boxes in post offices, &c., this discussion is not in order. If he will look at the Auditor General's Report he will see that he is mistaken. Now, let us take the composition of this other company, the Eclipse Company——

Mr. PUGSLEY. What do I understand your ruling to be, Mr. Chairman ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is a question of relevancy. This vote is for 'Dominion public buildings—renewals, improvements, repairs, &c.' I do not know what the '&c.' means. There is another item later in the estimates for the Ottawa public buildings. Another item is $131,000 for public buildings generally. Then there is one for repairs, furniture and heating for Ottawa buildings specially.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman really desires to discuss it upon this item, I will withdraw the objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Now this Office Specialty Company sells under these circumstances. Some repairs had to be made in the Barrie post office and tenders were called for. One would have assumed that when tenders were called to furnish public buildings, other contractors would have been asked to tender on the whole thing, but they were not. This Office Specialty Company must have a part out of every appropriation made by this department of Public Works. I am not laying this at the charge of the present Minister of Public Works, because he is innocent as to past transactions, and these are past expenditures that I have referred to. But I want to warn the minister that these two companies are on his heels, and will be on the heels of every Minister of Public Works, because they have been strongly entrenched in the past. Take the Eclipse Company, that is another political company. It is common talk here, if you talk with any person conversant with these matters, that A. W. Fraser, barrister of this city, is one of the large stockholders in that company, and is one of the leading lights of the Liberal party. These two companies have been allowed in the past to secure a monopoly to the extent of selling, in about eight years, no less a grand total than $538,000 worth of furniture. Take some of these returns and look at them. One would imagine that if, for instance, away down in Nova Scotia, the public building at Antigonish wanted four desks, or four chairs, these could have been purchased from some local manufacturer. Surely the whole pro-

vince of Nova Scotia can produce chairs, there are furniture dealers there. But under past Ministers of Public Works this furniture is all bought from this favoured company of Mr. Reid. Of course Mr. Reid was taking long chances to act as he did with the ex-Minister of Public Works. The evidence alone of this George W. Reid before the commission showed that he was the man who took thirteen men into the riding of West Elgin when the election atrocities were committed there, and among the thirteen men he took in there was Pritchard, the man who admitted on oath that he was concerned in the offending in that riding. Take another place in this return, Saskatoon, three desks, $150, nine chairs, $113.75. Surely furniture can be purchased at Saskatoon. There is another case at the Toronto post office. It is true they have a large office there where they seem to sell thousands of dollars worth. Then take another case, London.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think this company has agencies in various sections.

Mr. BENNETT. I should not think they would have an agency in Antigonish. But take the city of London. Apparently Mr. Hyman was in the grip of Mr. Reid, when they had to send down to this Office Specialty Company to buy a $7.50 table. It is not a question of the country really requiring this stuff, but this company has the stuff to sell, and the department has to take it from them. Now how did the department deal with these two favoured companies when it purchased over $538,000 worth? Under the Act the department is bound to call for tenders, and then there is a nice little game of love taps going on between the Eclipse Company and the Office Specialty Company which results in the Office Specialty Company getting one good job and the Eclipse Company getting another. The country is paying two prices for what it gets from these two companies. The minister has lying in his department an estimate from a firm in the United States for a certain lot of steel fittings to cost $17,000. They could be laid down in Canada for that, freight and customs paid, and actually they paid this Office Specialty Company $22,000 for the same articles.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That estimate was the cost at Washington, including transportation and duty.

Mr. BENNETT. Where the prices of labour and transportation are higher than they are in Canada. What was the result? These American people were not invited to tender at all, and the minister replies by saying, oh well, here are two concerns in Canada who tender.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to say, according to his memory, that the estimate given by the chief architect was not the cost at Washington, not of the goods laid down in Canada, but the cost at Washington with the duty and transportation added?

Mr. BENNETT. I admit that it was the cost at Washington, but if they can make and sell the goods for $17,000 at Washington, why can we not make them at Newmarket or Ottawa for the same money?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a very different thing. In a great country like the United States where they have hundreds of thousands of customers, we know that goods can be produced more cheaply than they can be produced in a country where the demand is comparatively small. Why do we find it necessary to protect our manufacturers? How is it, even with quite a high duty, that we are not able to protect them, and foreign goods do come in? It is because in the United States, in Great Britain and other countries, they are producing such enormous quantities and are selling such enormous quantities, that they can cut the price very much below the price at which goods can be sold in this country where the market is comparatively limited. That is the answer I make.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, a company that can sell in eight years $322,000 worth of goods to the government, besides the rest of the Dominion to supply, has not got a very limited market. But this is only on a par with the extravagance in every department of the government to-day, and it is only on a par with the same principle of benefiting party friends at the expense of the country generally, because there is practically no competition. These are startling figures to go out from this House to the country, that two favoured concerns have, in the past eight years, succeeded in depleting the coffers of this country of $538,278 worth of these supplies. And mark you, there are thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars paid out in addition to what is paid these two companies, because there are some members of parliament who, I assume, have stood on their rights and have told the Minister of Public Works that if he wanted to buy a chair or a table in their riding for a public building, the department was not to go to George W. Reid and Company to buy it, but they must patronize some local concern. Let any man go through these buildings at Ottawa within the past five or six years and he will understand what it means, they will see furniture thrown out on the snow in winter, splendid hardwood and pine, cupboards and cabinets that would suffice for every purpose of filing, but they have all got to be torn up and thrown out as waste, simply that Mr. Reid's company or Mr. Fraser's company may sell the departments at Ottawa hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of supplies. Now I hope that the minister, with this evidence before him, will call a halt on these two companies, and will

allow the necessities of the case only to govern purchases in the future, and not buy great quantities of goods when really it is difficult to find a place in the departments to store them.

Glencoe public buildings, $3,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This vote is——

Mr. BENNETT. I want an answer from the minister as to these fittings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman has made his statement in committee.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, then, the minister will make a statement in reply or I will make another one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not necessarily. It is not necessary that I should answer every statement that is made. This item——

Mr. BENNETT. The minister will not get away in that way. The minister came to this House——

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am addressing the chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The Minister of Public Works has the floor.

Mr. BENNETT. I am waiting for his reply to my question.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This item of $3,500——

Mr. BENNETT. Answer the question I asked on the previous item.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That item is passed.

Mr. BENNETT. No, it is not passed. I was waiting for the courtesy of a reply from the minister and if the minister cannot give me a reply I will continue. I desire to protest——

Mr PUGSLEY. That item was passed.

Mr. BENNETT. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, as to whether that item was passed or not? The chairman decided that it was passed.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not think it was decided.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understood it to be passed when no member objected. If nobody says anything I conclude it is passed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think I am called upon to make any reply and I may say frankly to the hon. gentleman that it does not seem to me that, upon the discussion of this item for the ordinary repairs to the buildings throughout Canada, I am called upon to enter upon a general discussion of the goods which have been bought for other purposes.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman said that he withdrew his objection.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It does not seem to be so.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman is the greatest withdrawer in public life today. He withdraws from everything.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What did I withdraw from now?

Mr. BENNETT. The minister proposed to give dredging contracts for the coming year at the same prices as were paid last year and he withdrew from that. The minister can sometimes be firm and sometimes very infirm. He was very infirm on that question. A few weeks ago Mr. Mackay, the leader of the opposition in Ontario, and some other political henchmen of the hon. gentleman were at the door of the department asking that these dredging contrastc should be extended for another year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I rise to a point of order. I do not think that the hon. gentleman is discussing the point under consideration. I appeal to the good sense of the hon. gentleman himself. I can assure him that the country is watching the discussions which are going on here.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And I am sure that the country expects us to discuss the items of Supply which are before the committee and not to seek to introduce a thousand other things which have nothing to do with what is before the committee.

Mr. BENNETT. If the question of whether $538,000 is paid out to the hon. gentleman's political friends is of no interest to the hon. gentleman, it is a matter of great importance to the country, and so long as I am a member of this House I am going to protest against Mr. G. M. Reid or any other political henchman, having the power to take the minister by the throat and force his goods on the country when the country does ont require them. Does any one think that Mr. Geo. Reid, if he did not know what he does in connection with elections in London, could have forced his wares on the country as he has? It was political leverage that enabled him to do so. When did Mr. Reid become a stockholder to the extent of $12,000 in this company? Probably the deputy could inform the minister. It is a very close corporation, and before Mr. Reid became a member of the company it was not vending any hundred thousand dollars worth of goods to the country. After Mr. Reid became a director the figures grew. Twenty-six thousand dollars in one year doubled into $50,000 in the next year. Next year it had risen to $66,000 and they made a grand finish last year with sales to the government amounting to $78,414. Has the minister a report from his architect pointing out any further points in or about any of the buildings at Ottawa

or elsewhere where the wares of this company may be deposited in the coming year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are applications from various departments for these steel fittings which are considered to be very desirable. I do not know what the amount of these applications is, but it is very considerable.

Mr. BENNETT. I think the minister had better let us know in prospective what Mr. Reid is going to get out of this long suffering country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know Mr. Reid at all.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Reid and the Office Specialty Company are one and the same concern.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman said that he was a stockholder.

Mr. BENNETT. I said also that he was one of the directors of the company and the deputy and the officers of the department can probably verify that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman has a great fashion of picking out some one person who may have a small interest and calling the company by the name of that individual.

Mr. BENNETT. It is a new system in this country for people who are not in a particular style of business to be in touch with that business. The hon. gentleman should not run away with the idea that Mr. Reid always had $12,000 worth of stock in that company. He had not. Great oaks from little acorns grow. Whether it is Mr. Reid's money which is invested in that company I do not know and I care not, but I know that his holdings increased very largely in the company, and as his holdings increased so did his sales. A gentleman who has a prospect of going to Kingston for doing something on behalf of Mr. Hyman should be attended to by Mr. Hyman. A man who takes his life in his hand—I will not say his life, but his liberty to go and debauch the electorate, as he did and which Judge Winchester found he had been guilty of doing, is entitled to some consideration at the hands of the minister, and he got that consideration at the hands of Mr. Hyman. The minister must know what requests for steel fittings have been received for the coming year and whether they are to be purchased from this company or not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If we come to any item which involves steel fittings I shall be very happy to give the information. In the meantime I have not the information at hand in reference to steel fittings.

Mr. BLAIN. Before the Ontario items are taken up, I asked the minister for a statement of the papers in which advertisements calling for tenders for the erection of two buildings in the province of Quebec were published.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have the information which the hon. member desires. It was in regard to the newspapers in which the advertisement appeared for the post office in St. John, Quebec, and also for the Dominion arsenal at Quebec. The statement is as follows :—

St. John, province of Quebec, post office.
St. Johns, 'Le Canada Français' (St. John and Iberville).
Valleyfield, 'Le Progres.'
Acton Vale, 'La Revue D'Acton.'
Arthabaskaville, 'L'Union des Cantons de L'Est.'
Joliette, 'L'Etoile du Nord.'
Buckingham, 'Post.'
Richmond, 'Times.'
Sorel, 'Le Courrier.'
Sherbrooke, 'Le Progres de L'Est.'
St. Hyacinthe, 'La Tribune.'
St. Hyacinthe, 'L'Union.'
Hull, 'Le Spectateur.'
Hull, 'City Advance.'
Shawenegan Falls, 'L'Industriel.'
Quebec, 'Telegraph.'
Quebec, 'Le Soleil.'
Montreal, 'Le Canada.'
Montreal, 'La Presse.'
Montreal, 'Witness.'
Montreal, 'La Patrie.'
Montreal, 'Herald.'
Montreal, 'True Witness.'
Montreal, 'Le Moniteur du Commerce.'
Montreal, 'Insurance Chronicle.'
Montreal, 'Le prix Courant.'
Montreal, 'Shareholder.'
Montreal, 'Journal du Commerce.'
Montreal, 'Le Bulletin.'

Quebec—Dominion Arsenal store building.
Quebec, 'La Vigie.'
Quebec, 'L'Echo de Quebec.'
Quebec, 'Le Soleil.'
Quebec, 'L'Union Liberale.'
Quebec, 'Daily Telegraph.'
Quebec, 'La Semaine Commerciale.'
Quebec, 'Budget.'
Arthabaskaville, 'L'Union des Cantons de L'Est.'
Montmagny, 'Le Courrier.'
Shawenegan Falls, 'L'Industriel.'
Richmond, 'Times.'
Sherbrooke, 'Le Progres de L'Est.'
St. Hyacinthe 'La Tribune.'
St. Hyacinthe, 'L'Union.'
Sorel, 'Le Courrier.'
Berthier. 'La Gazette.'
St. Johns, 'Le Canada Français.'
Baie St. Paul, 'L'Echo de Charlevoix.'
Levis, 'Le Quotidien.'
Nicolet, 'Le Progres.'
Chicoutimi, 'Le Progres de Saguenay.'
Chicoutimi, 'Le Travailleur.'
Rimouski, 'Le Progres du Golfe.'
Rivière du Loup, 'Le St. Laurent.'
Roberval, 'Le Lac St. Jean.'
Montreal, 'Le Presse.'
Montreal, 'La Patrie.'
Montreal, 'Le Canada.'
Montreal, 'Witness.'
Montreal, 'Herald.'
Montreal, 'Le Bulletin.'

Mr. STANFIELD. I did not hear the name of the Quebec 'Morning Chronicle.' Last evening, or early this morning, an hon. gentleman said that he had seen the advertisement in the Quebec 'Morning Chronicle.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. He must have been in error.

Mr. BLAIN. I may say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Beland) met me outside today and stated that he could not find the advertisement in the 'Chronicle.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. Sometimes newspapers publish these advertisements without being authorized. For instance they appear in the Montreal 'Star,' and I am not aware there is any authority to publish them. It may be that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Beland) saw the advertisement in the 'Chronicle' in that way.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I must come to the rescue of my hon. friend from Beauce. I myself have seen long advertisements of the Transcontinental Railway Commission in the Quebec 'Chronicle' which is a Conservative paper. There are no contracts in my department which necessitate calling for tenders by long advertisements in the newspapers, but I have asked that certain public works advertisements be published in 'Le Progrès du Golfe,' a Conservative newspaper.

Mr. BLAIN. I am glad the Postmaster General is broadening in his politics. I assume that 99 per cent of the papers in which this advertisement appeared were Liberal papers. Is that right?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume so.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the Minister of Public Works going to adopt the suggestion of the Postmaster General and insert the advertisements in the newspaper having the largest circulation in the district?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If there were two newspapers published in a city, one Conservative and one Liberal I would pursue the policy which has been pursued since confederation of giving it to the newspaper which is friendly to the administration. I say that frankly, but I may tell my hon. friend that in the case of a great public work like the Transcontinental Railway, when I was asked the names of different papers in the province of New Brunswick in which the advertisements should appear, I mentioned among others the St. John 'Daily Telegraph' and the St. John 'Times,' both of which were formerly Liberal papers, but which have been purchased by a strong Conservative and are now Conservative papers.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister has not answered my question. For instance, what is the policy of the government with respect to advertisements in newspapers in the province of Ontario?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no change. It is the same as for the last forty years.

Mr. BLAIN. Where there are two newspapers in a town having the same circulation and the newspaper supporting the government is selected I do not object, but where the Conservative newspaper has the largest circulation will the minister insert the advertisements in that paper?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Certainly not; not simply because it has a somewhat larger circulation.

Mr. BLAIN. Then it is the policy of the minister to advertise in the newspapers supporting the administration regardless of their circulation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say that. I do say that if in order to give proper publicity it was necessary to avail myself of the columns of a Conservative newspaper I would not hesitate to do so.

Mr. BLAIN. That is a very nice story, but it does not answer my question. If the newspaper having the largest circulation in the vicinity where a public work is to be done is a Conservative paper, will the minister publish the advertisement in that paper?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hope my hon. friend will not think me discourteous if I answer that when the contingency arises it will have consideration. That is as far as I can go.

Mr. BLAIN. Very well, I will probably renew the question.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Next year.

Mr. BLAIN. Before that. Now, with regard to the Brampton post office; the Minister of Public Works told me last night he did not know where Brampton is, and I may inform him that it is in the county of Peel, province of Ontario, twenty miles west of Toronto, on the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And gives a good Tory majority.

Mr. BLAIN. Is any of this money we are now voting to be expended on the Brampton post office?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I find that at Brompton (it is probably a mistake in my notes for Brampton) there was an expenditure last year of $388, and I assume there will be an expenditure this year at Brampton.

Mr. BENNETT. Who looks after the framing of these advertisements? I see in that great family journal the Ottawa 'Free Press' a long advertisement calling for tenders for dredging at different points. There is a long list of places which I need not read. In another column of the same paper there is an advertisement calling for tenders for dredging to be done at Tiffin and at Victoria Harbour. I think it should not take a great stretch of imagination on

the part of the clerk preparing these advertisements to see that he might have added to the former list Tiffin and Victoria harbour. What is the sense of having over a quarter of a column occupied with an advertisement inviting tenders for these two places when they might have been included in the list?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The work at Tiffin and at Victoria harbour is somewhat special in its charaacter. The department may recommend that the dredging shall go to a depth of 25 feet and that the channel for the Canadian Pacific Railway at Victoria harbour and the channel for the Grand Trunk at Tiffin shall be completed by the 1st of October. So that the advertisement required to be separate.

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps that might very well have been added as an 'N.B.' to the other advertisement. But the hon. gentleman is perhaps a little tired of N.B. They are very cabalistic letters—they stand for New Brunswick.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Can the hon. minister state what part of this money is to be spent at Chatham?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not able to say. This is a vote which is taken every year. It is assumed that it takes from $15,000 to $20,000 to make these general repairs and whatever amount is needed for repairs at Chatham will be expended. The amount expended last year on the Chatham public buildings was $230.72.

Mr. J. D. REID. Does the hon. minister insert advertisements calling for tenders in independent newspapers? If so, I would like to know why he singles out the Montreal 'Star' especially.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will tell my hon. friend very frankly. I have noticed from time to time that the Montreal 'Star' has published advertisements calling for tenders for various public buildings. As these advertisements have not been ordered by the department, I assume that they are published as news items.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Then why does the hon. minister leave out a good Grit journal like the Montreal 'Star?' It is as bad a Grit journal as the 'Herald.'

Mr. BLAIN. Are advertisements in the Montreal 'Star' referred to by my hon. friend paid for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think not.

Mr. BLAIN. Then they are unauthorized? We were dealing with the authorized advertisements.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have always looked on the Montreal 'Star' as an absolutely independent newspaper. We are to understand, then, that the 'Star' is not on the patronage list—is that the position?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I think not.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then what is the exact position as regards the Montreal 'Star' getting any advertisements?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware that since I have been a minister there has been any advertisements of my department published in the Montreal 'Star.' It is a good paper, but I have always looked upon it as a very strong Conservative paper.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask my hon. friend what is necessary for a newspaper to get on the patronage list?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not very different from what it was twelve or fifteen years ago.

Mr. BLAIN. I was not asking what was necessary twelve or fifteen years ago, but what is necessary now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A man must be thoroughly reliable in the article in which he deals; he must be honest; he must furnish a good article, and he must furnish it at a low price.

Mr. BLAIN. I am sure the committee are very much refreshed at that statement, if my hon. friend proposes to put it into operation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I propose to continue that in operation, and if it is not in operation in my department I propose to put it in operation.

Mr. BLAIN. An hon. friend suggests that one qualification is to be a good Grit, whatever that means.

Mr. FISHER. That would be prima facie evidence of honesty.

Mr. BLAIN. The Minister of Agriculture is always ready to come to the rescue on a question of moral reform except when it refers to a definite important question. Will the minister say where in the province of Ontario the balance of this money is to be expended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not able to tell my hon. friend in advance. For instance, last year repairs and improvements were made on 70 public buildings in Ontario, on which $15,559.53 was expended, running from 60 cents up to $1,115. The different superintendents of buildings make reports as to what is needed, and the repairs are made as they are required.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to state to my hon. friend that in the Brampton post office additional accommodation is required for the additional amount of business being done. There is plenty of space in the building, I think, if it were properly arranged. There is not sufficient room for people coming to get their mails. I think some rearrangement of the boxes and of the interior generally is necessary. May

I ask if some portion of this sum will be spent for that purpose?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be very happy to have the matter looked into.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the minister set apart any portion of this money for the purpose of reorganizing the postal service in the House of Commons, which at present is the same as it was in the days of Noah?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, there is nothing in this vote for that purpose.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does that come under the minister's direction or under the Speaker's?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it is under my direction.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I wish the minister would look into the matter and replace the present pigeon holes with drawers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that the question of making improvements in the postal service of the House of Commons has been brought to my notice. Plans have been prepared and I have authorized the chief architect to have the improvements made. They could not be made very well during the session. They will be made during the recess.

Mr. BARR. In the Auditor General's Report at V—95 there is an item :

Orangeville, Ontario, by tender, Library Bureau of Canada, fittings, $1,950.

There is another item :

Office Specialty, Limited, boxes (a) 384 at $1.80; (b) 64 at $2.55; (c) 16 at $2.75; freight, $6.

This makes $825.39 for the lock boxes. I would ask the minister how many tenders were received for the fittings and I would like information as to the purchase of lock boxes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Tenders were received for the fittings but I have not the number here.

Mr. BENNETT. Who is the president of the Library Bureau ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know.

Mr. BENNETT. I may inform the minister that one of the large stockholders is Senator Edwards.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A very good man.

Mr. BARR. I would be very glad to receive the information for which I have asked.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member must know that when I come to the House to ask for the passing of appropriations itemized in the estimates, I would not be supposed to have information with me about some other work done two or three years ago and not mentioned in these estimates. If my hon. friend will write a letter asking who tenderers were and the amounts of the tenders, I shall be most happy to give him the information.

Mr. BARR. This was not two or three years ago, this was in 1907.

Mr. BLAIN. Out of what vote was this money of which my friend from Dufferin (Mr. Barr) speaks, paid?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would be paid out of the vote for post office fittings and supplies.

Mr. BLAIN. A similar expenditure for this year would be paid out of the item now under discussion ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would be paid out of the same vote as last year.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister meet the wishes of the member for Dufferin and bring down the information ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall be most happy.

Mr. BLAIN. And he will bring the information to the committee?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member, surely, does not want me to bring down information as to buildings completed years ago, and for which no vote is asked.

Mr. BLAIN. But the minister is so willing——

Mr. PUGSLEY. But the hon. gentleman should not ride a willing horse to death.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister told the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Barr) that there was no part of this vote for the post office at Orangeville. This is a general vote for the buildings in Ontario, maintenance, repairs, &c.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But the money paid for the post office at Orangeville was taken out of a different vote.

Mr. TAYLOR. This goes to prove that my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) is not well acquainted with his estimates. There is another vote for post office fittings and furniture——

Mr. PUGSLEY. I know that, and the sum to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barr) referred was paid out of that.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. minister will look at the Auditor General's Report, page V—19, he will find that there was an expenditure for repairs to the Orangeville post office last year. Out of what was that paid ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Out of a vote similar to the one now before us.

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly. And with it there were other items—for instance, the pay of a caretaker.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) has not understood me. The amount referred to by the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Barr) was paid out of the vote for repairs.

Mr. TAYLOR. But the hon. minister said no part of this vote was to go to Orangeville and asked to have the item passed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No part of it for the purpose to which the hon. gentleman referred.

Mr. TAYLOR. But he has just stated that the money paid last year was paid out of this vote.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was paid out of the vote last year, but it does not follow that a dollar of this appropriation will be used for Orangeville.

Mr. TAYLOR. What was charged to Orangeville last year ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $120.42.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, what was this $877.67 at page V—119 of the Auditor General's Report ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not out of this vote.

Mr. TAYLOR. One of these items is Robert Irvine & Son, repairs to post office as per tender $324. That is out of the vote of last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) has not the Auditor General's Report for 1907-8 yet.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am reading from the report for 1906-7, and that comes down to March 31, 1907.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But this $120.42 was expended during the fiscal year 1907-8.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is the latest Auditor General's Report we have, and the only thing that we can refer to for the discussion of items before us. Here was a total of $877.67 paid for repairs, &c., for Orangeville, and a portion of this vote will have to be for Orangeville this year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That will depend on whether repairs are required or not.

Mr. TAYLOR. But the hon. gentleman said emphatically that no portion of it was for Orangeville.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said no portion of it was to be taken out of this vote. It is to be taken out of the vote for fittings and furniture.

Mr. BARR. Whether it comes out of this vote or not, makes little difference, but the minister proposes a departure from the usual proceeding. When we call attention to an item in the Auditor General's Report, and ask questions concerning it, the minister says : Write me a letter and I will send you the information. But the information is wanted by the House and the country. My constituents ought to be allowed to know how many tenders were put in and where they came from.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The amounts to which the hon. gentleman refers were paid out of a vote for post office fittings and supplies. He will find, at page 53 of the Estimates a number of items under 'rents, repairs, furniture, heating, &c.' When we reach that vote, I will have at hand the information the hon. gentleman desires.

Mr. BENNETT. In bringing down that information, will the hon. minister be ready to tell us whether public tenders were called for, or whether there was merely an invitation to the Library Bureau to put in a tender ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will get that information.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Reverting to the House of Commons post office, we have been promised these changes every year and I would urge upon the minister the desirability of expedition in the matter. I hope that when these lock boxes are put in they will be of the most modern type, that there will be no job in connection with them and that the country, in one instance in the history of this administration, will get value for their money.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This matter will be attended to as early as possible.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the minister know of a man being killed by a fall of ice and snow off the public building in Barrie last winter and if so have steps been taken to prevent a recurrence of such an accident ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Precautions to prevent a recurrence were taken at once.

Mr. BENNETT. Has a claim been made by the relatives and if so who are the solicitors ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A claim has been made but I do not remember the name of the solicitors. A letter was received but I am not sure if it came from the firm of solicitors.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the claim been settled ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Has a fiat been granted?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think there is any fiat yet.

Mr. BENNETT. On page V—95, there is an item of expenditure for the Toronto post office, $595 to the Canadian Revolving Door Company, Limited, for a revolving door. Will the minister bring down the information as to that, please ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I should be glad to do so.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who is Mr. D. J. Mullarkey, who does some inspecting for the department ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is a gentleman attached to the headquarters branch of the Public Works Department. Whenever there is inspecting to be done regarding which he has special knowledge—his specialty is concrete work—he is sent to make the inspection and report, and, sometimes, to remain on the spot and see that the work is done.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is he paid an annual salary ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is paid $4 a day and his expenses when on duty outside of Ottawa.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is he paid for Sundays as well as working days ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is in the permanent employ of the department, and his pay includes Sunday.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is he a permanent employee ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In that sense, he has been attached to the department for two or three years.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is he paid by the day or by the month ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My deputy advises me that he is paid by the month—$4 a day, including Sundays.

Mr. J. D. REID. Where did Mr. Mullarkey come from ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He has lived in Ottawa for a number of years and he has worked himself up to his present position. He is a practical man in concrete and masonry.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Was he the man who mixed the concrete for the Laurier tower ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, he had nothing to do with the Laurier tower. The concrete work belonged to one of these important bridges that cross the river. He has had large experience, and is regarded by everybody as an expert.

Mr. J. D. REID. I see on V—69 that Patton & Crowe supplied 50 fire extinguishers at $15. Where were these placed ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have that matter looked up and tell the hon. gentleman later.

Mr. J. D. REID. I see the Empire Electric and Manufacturing Company, of Ottawa, supplied one Westinghouse motor, 5 horse-power, where was that placed ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are sent out to different buildings where they are required.

Glencoe public building, $3,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote towards the erection of a public building in the town of Glencoe. The site was purchased out of a previous appropriation of $5,000, and the amount paid for the site and the total expenditure up to the 31st of March, was $1,500 altogether, leaving a balance of $3,500 to be revoted. The site has been purchased, but the contract has not been let. The chief architect is preparing the plans.

Mr. BLAIN. Now we have here a case in point, where a public building is to be erected in the town of Glencoe, in the county of West Middlesex, which is represented by the chief whip of the government party (Mr. Calvert). The newspaper having the largest circulation in that western district, the London 'Free Press,' goes into almost every home. Now I want to ask the minister to insert his advertisement for this building in the London 'Free Press' when he asks for tenders.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is there no other paper in London ?

Mr. BLAIN. There is a paper called the London 'Advertiser.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. Has that got a good circulation ?

Mr. BLAIN. Considerable, but nothing approaching the circulation of the London 'Free Press.' Now in view of the fact that the London 'Free Press' is the leading newspaper in that district, may I ask my hon. friend, when he is calling for tenders for the erection of this building, if he will insert the advertisement in the London 'Free Press' ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If in my opinion it should be necessary in order to give proper information to intending contractors, I will do so. But that will be a matter for consideration.

Mr. BLAIN. What does my hon. friend consider proper information ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the circulation of the 'Advertiser' ?

Mr. GORDON. It has quite as large a circulation as the 'Free Press.'

Mr. BLAIN. Does the hon. gentleman really believe that the 'Advertiser' has as large a circulation as the 'Free Press' ?

Mr. GORDON. I think so.

Mr. BLAIN. Now we will watch with interest the policy pursued by the minister in respect to advertising for tenders.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They will be very widely advertised.

Mr. BLAIN. Who made the request for the expenditure ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This expenditure has been urged by petition from the town of Glencoe, also by copy of a resolution from the town council, and that petition and resolution have been very warmly endorsed by Mr. Calvert, member of parliament for the riding in which Glencoe is situated.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the population of Glencoe ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. By the census of 1901, 1,034.

Mr. CLEMENTS. From whom was this site purchased ? and was there any middleman engaged in it ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The site was purchased from Mr. P. D. Keith. I do not think there is any middleman interested, not only in this case but in any of the properties required by the Public Works Department, I never heard of any. We endeavour to get land or supplies at the lowest possible price, after all reasonable effort is made for ascertaining those prices. The lot is a corner lot with a frontage of 100 feet on one street and 165 on another, and it cost $1,250.

Mr. CLEMENTS. As regards the intervention of middlemen in purchases made by the Public Works Department, I will give a case in regard to which I have correct information. It was not in the time of the present minister. The site for the Sandwich post office was bought from A. J. Healey. Mr. Healey is a young lawyer and prominent politician in that district, and is associated with the Liberal party. I understand he is connected with a dredging concern there.

Mr. BENNETT. Keep your eye on him.

Mr. CLEMENTS. He bought a lot having 208 feet frontage on one street and 52 feet on another, for $1,600. He sold one-half of the property to the government for $1,700, making exactly $1,500 on this lot. There was a house on the lot when he purchased it, and he realized $400 out of the house, besides the $1,500 profit he made out of the lot.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What was the size of the lot sold to the department?

Mr. CLEMENTS. One hundred and four feet fronage by fifty-two feet depth.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At what price?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Seventeen hundred dollars.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was that a high price?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Well, it was a high price; it was just twice the price that he purchased it for.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Do you say that it was an excessive price?

Mr. BLAIN. I say that it was in the town of Sandwich. This gentleman acted as a middleman and made $1,500 out of this government. Before the item passes, I want to draw the attention of the minister to a matter that I took up personally with the late minister, Mr. Hyman. I refer to the erection of a public building in the village of Tilbury. I see that Glencoe has a public building and I have nothing to say in opposition to it. I congratulate Glencoe upon getting this building, but I say that other districts should be similarly treated. Tilbury lies between the constituency of the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Clarke) and my own constituency. I made representations to Mr. Hyman some time ago as I was requested to do by the residents of the district. Tilbury is a very thriving village, and I think it is deserving of a public building. It is one of the best villages in that district, and I trust that the minister will grant the application and see that provision is made for a building at that place.

Mr. PUGSLEY. An application has been received for the erection of a public building in the village of Tilbury. I recognize that it is quite a thriving place, and the matter will have very careful consideration. I am in hopes that before very long I shall be able to meet the wishes of the people of Tilbury in this respect.

Mr. BARR. I would like to know what the policy of the government is in connection with the erection of public buildings? Here we find a village, not a very thriving one, but a village having 934 inhabitants is to receive a post office. The village I live in has 1,200 or 1,300 people and we have the post office in a little room in connection with the town hall. Why does Glencoe get this favour? It is represented by the government whip in the House. That is an important consideration, but there is a much greater one why the hon. member who represents that riding ought to get something. It is not only represented by the whip, but it is represented by a would-be minister of the crown. That hon. gentleman claims that the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) has his position as Minister of Public Works. In order to soothe his injured feelings and to show his constituents that he is doing something for them it is necessary to erect a building in Glencoe. I would like to know why a little village like Glencoe should receive this consideration, when Shelburne, a flourishing and growing village, should not receive similar consideration. If it is the policy of the government to supply villages of 1,034 inhabitants with post offices, then, I submit that it is the duty of the government to supply a village of that size. It was contended some time ago that it was only towns that should get post offices. I know that Orangeville did not get a public building until it had reached the status of a

town. We have two flourishing villages in my constituency, both of them larger than Glencoe, and I ask why it is that these villages are overlooked and that Glencoe is provided for. This is public money that we are using, we should lay down some rule and there should be some reason why two towns occupying the same position should be treated differently, why one should receive a public building and the other should not. We have no customs house at Shelburne. I have been unable to obtain anything along that line, but I think I should receive the same consideration as other places have received. We should have a policy announced. We should know that when we reach a certain position we shall be entitled to a public building not simply because some hon. gentleman has a pull with the government and therefore can obtain greater consideration than others, but because the conditions are such as to warrant the expenditure of the money. The present practice is not just or fair to the country. It is not using the public money to the best advantage, and therefore we should know what policy this government intends to pursue in the future.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the policy of the minister the same as the policy stated by the hon. Minister of Finance the other night that if it could be shown that no public money had ever been spent in a riding it was the duty of the government to place a public building there? Is he in accord with the sentiments or the views of the Minister of Finance?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance put the matter upon a very reasonable and very fair basis. I understood him to say that even in the case of small towns in a riding in which no public money was being expended; that is to say no money for public buildings, and more especially, if it were a county town—I think perhaps he limited it to that——

Mr. BENNETT. No, the Minister of Finance did not limit it to a county town.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think he said a county town. At all events he spoke of one town, and he said it was not unreasonable that a public building should be erected there. But, he further said at the same time that people must be patient, that these things could not all be done at once. While I am on my feet I may say to the hon. gentleman who represents the riding of Dufferin (Mr. Barr) that I am very much pleased to hear him speak so highly of the village in which he lives. I am glad to hear that it is a thriving village, but I may say to the hon. gentleman that if the village which he represents is entitled to a public building perhaps he is a little open to the criticism—I do not make it here as a criticism against him—of not having in any way directed my attention to the necessity which existed for a public building in that locality.

Mr. BARR. The hon. gentleman must remember that he has not occupied that position long. I can assure my hon. friend that I did bring it to the notice of his predecessor, and that he promised to give it careful consideration. I thought that consideration was being given to it. However, I will not fail to remind my hon. friend, the good-natured Minister of Public Works, that we are very anxious to have a post office in Shelburne and that we think we should have one.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I think that my hon. friend from Dufferin (Mr. Barr) was hardly to be blamed for not having brought this matter to the attention of the minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not blame him very seriously.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I had not the opportunity of hearing the minister when he spoke in Montreal the other evening, but I have had the privilege of reading the account of his remarks as published in a newspaper, and I see that he laid down the principle that public buildings were erected for the education of the people, that the people required something in the nature of culture and education in some parts of the country. He declared that where ignorance, stupidity and bigotry reigned, it was necessary that public buildings should be erected. We will see at once why the hon. member for Shelburne had no opportunity of procuring a public building for his town, and why villages of 1,000 inhabitants do obtain them. Up to the time the minister made the explanation. no man in Canada could understand why there was not a public building in Shelburne.

Mr. FOWLER. The Minister of Public Works is reported in the press recently to have said that a member from his own province had made an onslaught on him. I do not know to whom the minister refers, whatever suspicion I may have. The minister also stated that the gentleman who made the onslaught on him was not often to be seen in the House. If I had my suspicion in the first instance as to whom the minister was referring that suspicion would be dissipated by this latter statement, because if he was referring to me in his first statement he certainly could not be referring to me in his last statement, because so far as attendance in the House is concerned I have been a more regular attendant than the minister himself. If his remarks with regard to public buildings are not more truthful than these other remarks of his, they are not worthy of much credence.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I represent a large and important constituency and I think I

may say that there is not a single public building in that whole constituency.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the size of the largest town in my hon. friend's constituency?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. My own town is larger than Glencoe, where you are erecting a public building; it has 1,200 inhabitants. I do not object to the erection of a public building where it is necessary and where the expenditure is not too great, but I have already made representations in this regard with respect to my own constituency and I would like to know why Glencoe in Ontario with 1,030 people should pay $1,250 for a site for a public building when I will guarantee that I will get a site in my own town of 1,200 inhabitants for half that amount. It is about time that the town of Boissevain should have a post office. If I were speaking about the man who has charge of postal affairs in that town for the past five years I would have something to say, but that is not at present under discussion. I rose to make as strong a plea as I can to the Minister of Public Works to take active steps as early as possible to build a post office in the town of Boissevain, which is larger than the town of Glencoe.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend comes from a town which has a population of 1,200 and he urges very strongly that it would be a proper expenditure of public money to erect a public building in that town.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is entitled to speak for his constituency and if he makes a proper representation to me I will be very glad to consider it between this and next session.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. Let me tell the Minister of Public Works that for several years I have impressed on his department the necessity for erecting public buildings in the riding I represent. We have some large towns in that constituency, but yet there is not a public building within its borders. Delegations have come from one of these towns on different occasions asking that a public building be erected there, but no action has been taken and in the meantime little villages all over Canada, one-third the size of any one of three towns in my riding, and where there is no warrant, comparatively speaking, for the erection of a public building, have been favourably considered by the government. There is in my riding a town of 3,000 population, giving a postal revenue of $5,000 a year, and there are two others which give a slightly smaller revenue, and these towns deserve consideration from the government. I have urged the matter on the attention of the government and delegations have come here to support my representations, but yet there is no sign in the estimates that any provision is to be made. Is there any underlying principle which guides the department in this matter? They seem to follow a happy-go-lucky method by which little villages get consideration and large towns are neglected. It is time some principle should be laid down which would guide those who are administering public affairs in this matter. We have gone on too long on this principle of spending public money without any consideration as to the requirements of the case.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the name of the town in which the hon. gentleman thinks a public building should be erected?

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. If you give me any encouragement to think that you will make use of the information to give the matter consideration I will name you three towns in my riding.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will consider it carefully.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. Bracebridge, Huntsville and Gravenhurst.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I came in as a new minister last summer and if I have not before heard from my hon. friend that there was necessity for a public building in any one of these places he can hardly blame me for not having provision made in the estimates. I have not hitherto, directly or indirectly, had any representation from my hon. friend that there should be a building erected in any of these towns. Of course, in considering whether we should at once erect public buildings in the riding the hon. gentleman represents, it must be remembered that there is a very urgent demand, which does not seem to be unreasonable, for the expenditure of money on public wharfs in that constituency, and it may be that the people of that riding have felt that it would be more desirable, at present at all events, to have money expended in affording facilities for transportation and trade rather than in erecting public buildings. That consideration may have had some influence. I may say that the question of giving increased wharf accommodation in the hon. gentleman's constituency is receiving my very earnest attention, and I hope I may be able to meet the very reasonable expectations of the people in that respect. With regard to public buildings, I will also say that I take the way in which my hon. friend has approached the question to-day as an expression of his desire that there should be more public buildings there, and I will give that matter my earnest attention.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. The minister lays down the rule that we must make our applications to every new minister. I under-

stood that we made application to the department, and that that department had an official head and a deputy head, and that a record would be kept of the applications that were made. But if every time there is a change in the Minister of Public Works we have to renew our applications, it is as well that we should understand that. However, with regard to wharfs. I may say that there have been two or three built in my constituency since this government came into power, probably costing all told $20,000. As to that, I am not making any great complaint, as I have seen a deputation who waited on the minister a week or so ago, and they have stated that he distinctly pledged himself to put a sum in the estimates for a wharf at the town of Gravenhurst. I do not know whether that has been definitely decided upon, or has been merely taken into consideration.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nothing is definitely decided on until it appears before the House in the estimates.

Mr. MARSHALL. I do not know whether there has yet been a requisition for a post office in Aylmer, Ont.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. MARSHALL. I may tell the hon. minister that we have been promised a post office for the last fifteen years, and the promise generally comes just before a general election.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would take it back to about 1893.

Mr. MARSHALL. We had a promise of a post office from the old government, but did not get it. However, I am living in one of the nicest towns, as far as business is concerned, in Canada. I think the hon. Minister of Customs will bear me out in that; he has been in our town, and we are always pleased to have him. I have been living there about thirty years. I have no objection to any town getting a public building. Glencoe is a smart business town, but it does not compare with the town of Aylmer. The population of Aylmer is about 2,500. It is a manufacturing center. The post office is inappropriate to the town. We have also a custom house which is not in keeping with the character of the place. I would like to have a promise if I can get one from the minister to amend matters for us. We have not only a beautiful town, but a fine country. I do not think the hon. Minister of Public Works has ever been in that section. We would be glad to have him come, even at election time. We are always glad to see distinguished gentlemen come there, no matter what their politics are. During my campaign we were visited by five very prominent gentlemen who are sitting in this House the hon. Minister of Justice, the hon. Mr. Hyman, the hon. gentleman who has just left the chair, the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) and the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German), and you know the result—to me it was very satisfactory. North Bay is a town that does not compare with Aylmer, and you are spending $66,000 on a public building there. Welland has a population of 1,863, and is getting a new post office costing about $27,000. Leamington is another place which I understand is to get a post office building. It has about the same population as Aylmer, and is a very beautiful little town. I would be very glad to have the views of the minister as to giving Aylmer a post office building, which we have been promised for years.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that considering what a very nice, progressive town Aylmer is, its population, and the energetic representative it has, I am certainly surprised that although I have been here for several months, I have never heard from the hon. gentleman that there was the slightest feeling among the people that there should be a public building at Aylmer. It may be that the people of Aylmer have heard so much talk on the part of the opposition about the great extravagance which has been shown in the erection of public buildings in various cities and towns, that they have been rather timid in making application for a public building. But, from the discussion which has taken place to-day, I am very glad to see that there is such a consensus of opinion in favour of going to a reasonable expenditure in giving to the people in thriving towns accommodation in the way of public buildings. My hon. friend must not expect us to attend to all the wants of the people at once. We have to proceed reasonably, in a way which may appear to some people to be somewhat too slow. I am sure the hon. gentleman will not expect us to rush at once into the construction of public buildings all over the country. We must look to the wants of the people, and as these wants are urged upon our attention, endeavour to supply the reasonable needs of the people. I shall be very glad if I can have the opportunity of visiting Aylmer and shall be only too happy to take into consideration the wants of the town.

Mr. BARR. I wish to correct a statement of a few moments ago, as to the revenue of Glencoe and Shelburne. The revenue of Glencoe is $2,150.80 and that of Shelburne, $2,670.21. The expenditures in Glencoe were $816.65 and in Shelburone $991.18. We are not complaining about the progress that is being made in the country in the building of post offices and public buildings, all we complain of is that they are not distributed properly and we say they should be placed where there is the largest population and where the largest revenue is brought into the treasury, not in accord-

ance with some influence that may be brought to bear.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand you entirely approve of what we are doing but complain that we do not go far enough.

Mr. MARSHALL. I neglected to state that I have the honour to represent a riding having 22,000 population and we have not a government building in that riding.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I wish to urge a suggestion which I have made unsuccessfully to several Ministers of Public Works, that a regulation should be adopted that all public buildings should be isolated from other buildings, that some safe distance, possibly 100 feet, should be left between public buildings and other buildings. In this case, for instance. I am sure that for the money spent in Glencoe the minister could have procured a square in which the building could have been placed

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is very desirable undoubtedly, but in cities especially it would very greatly add to the cost. As to the cost of land in Glencoe this is a corner lot, 100 by 165 feet ; my information is that Glencoe is in the centre of a very rich and progressive agricultural district and is quite an important railway centre. The price is $1,250 and I think my hon. friend is entirely mistaken in saying that the cost is too high.

Mr. BENNETT. I think it only fair to place on 'Hansard' what the minister did say on the occasion referred to. He is reported in the Montreal 'Gazette' of last Monday as saying :

In fact he believed that any government would also be justified in spending a limited amount on public buildings in quarters where other expenditure was not large, so as to cultivate public taste, to stimulate citizens and make the people contented and proud of the locality in which they lived.

I would ask him what amount of lethargy, discontent and lack of pride must be manifested before the minister will give a locality a public building ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The report from which the hon. gentleman has read, while it gives a portion of the remarks I had the honour to make on the occasion to which he refers, does not profess to be a verbatim report. Some of the observations I made which are not contained in it would somewhat qualify the remarks quoted making my statement more in accordance with what I have said here to-day.

Mr. BENNETT. If the minister was misreported, would he repeat what he did say ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say that I was misreported, but some remarks were left out which would qualify those printed.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister might have answered that where the population of the district had shown discontent, lack of pride and lethargy by electing a Liberal representative, it would be necessary to give them a public building.

Mr. BLAIN. Again referring to the advertising, I stated that the newspaper having the largest circulation in the section of the country where the money we are now asked to vote is to be expended, is the London 'Free Press,' a morning newspaper. The London 'Free Press' had a circulation——

Mr. PUGSLEY. I suppose my hon. friend would not for a moment think that I would wish him to justify the waste of the time of the House and the country beyond the extent to which he has wasted it this afternoon, by asking him for information as to the circulation of the London 'Free Press.' Do not let him excuse himself by suggesting any such request by me.

Mr. BLAIN. I am not paying any serious attention to what my hon. friend stated. I asked him the policy of his department in respect of advertising for public buildings. He was unable to state the policy and said in reply that when he was considering the advertisements that were to be published in newspapers for this public building now under discussion he would consider it. The London 'Free Press' had a circulation of 20,012 on April 26, 1908. As to the London 'Advertiser,' although the figures are not published in the paper itself, I am informed on the very best authority that the circulation of that newspaper is less than 12,000 and it is an evening newspaper, the circulation being largely in the city of London, while the other circulates in every part of western Onario. The hon. gentleman is going to advertise for tenders for a building to be constructed at Glencoe. I am asking whether he will select the leading newspaper or will reject it for its politics. I do not expect an answer from him. Nor am I consulting the hon. gentleman particularly as to the waste of time he is causing this afternoon. I am directing his attention to facts which are worthy of his consideration, if he intends to spend the public money appropriated for advertising in that way to do the most good. But, if he proposes to spend it in the interests of his political party, as he has been doing, the information I have submitted will be of no value to him, and will not be taken note of. Now, I would like to ask out of what vote passed last year was $1,250 paid for this site ? Also has the site been paid for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The site has been paid for, the money being taken out of an appropriation of $5,000 passed last year.

Mr. BLAIN. What will be the cost of the building ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Something about $20,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Including heating and everything ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. GANONG. Is this a customs port of entry ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, customs as well.

Mr. GANONG. Lest the minister should think me remiss, as he has suggested other gentlemen have been, I would call his attention to the fact that in the county I have the honour to represent there are three towns, more important, I believe, than Glencoe, and certainly more important than Knowlton with its 760 population which has been given a post office building. These towns are known to him, but not so well, probably as to me. St. Andrews, in the county of Charlotte, is one of the most important watering places on our Atlantic sea-board, and one of the oldest towns in eastern Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is its population ?

Mr. GANONG. About 1,300 or 1,400. Then, there is Milltown, an important manufacturing place, with a cotton mill employing about 800 hands, and St. George with large industries. All these are incorporated towns. If it is necessary for us to repeat our applications to every new Minister of Public Works who comes into office, and if the changes are to be as frequent as they have been in the last ten years, I think an officer should be appointed and blank forms supplied so that these applications may be kept before the head of the department without undue labour. I observe that the minister has adroitly passed over the question suggested by the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Barr) and others as to the general policy of the government in regard to these buildings. I hope he will take note of the three towns to which I have called attention.

Mr. J. D. REID. In my county I have a town which I believe is more important than Glencoe, the town of Kemptville, which has a population of about 2,000, and a postal revenue of $2,600 or $2,700. But we have other places where public buildings are more necessary than in Glencoe, though I am not objecting to this Glencoe public building. Take, for instance, the town of Morrisburg on the St. Lawrence, a place of about 3,000 people and a fine town. In view of these cases, I think there should be some statement from the minister as to his policy.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is nearly six o'clock, but before the committee rises, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Reid) whether he is opposing this vote for Glencoe or whether it is that he thinks that others ought to be included ?

Mr. J. D. REID. This appropriation for Glencoe has my approval, and would have my vote if necessary. But I say that there are other places requiring public buildings whose cases should be considered. There was a case mentioned a little while ago of a town in Quebec with about 700 population, which is given a post office. These cases indicate that some special influence must be brought to bear to direct the action of the government in these matters. For instance, in the case of Glencoe, probably the chief whip of the other side (Mr. Calvert) must have brought pressure to bear on the minister in favour of that place, for I do not think this post office is given to Glencoe because of the great interest the Minister of Public Works takes in that village.

Mr. BLAIN. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) must not go out and say that the members of the opposition are pressing for increased expenditure. It is quite plain what my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) is asking for, and I want to put myself right—and I am sure I speak for others about me. The opposition say that the government spends enormous sums of the public money uselessly, and that the government has no policy except a political policy in the spending of this money. A village represented by a Reformer is given a post office, but an important town represented by a Liberal Conservative receives no appropriation for that purpose. That is what we object to. And we object to the increased expenditure of this country and say that it ought to be reduced.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would ask the minister if plans and specifications of this building in Glencoe have been prepared so as to show not only the cost of the building, but the cost of heating, fittings and furniture as well? The committee will then know exactly what this building is going to cost before we vote this money. The minister will remember that a few days ago I drew his attention to this point, that before any money should be voted for the erection of a public building the minister should state definitely the outside amount he proposed to expend so that the committee may know how the money of this country is going to be expended. I for one would object to this vote going through unless the minister is prepared to say that full specifications have been prepared, and that every dollar he intends to put into the building has been determined, and that it is the purpose of the government that this amount should not be exceeded. I hold that is the only way in which the expenditure can be controlled. If the minister is not prepared to say how much money he is going to expend on this building, I think he had better let the item stand until such time as he has arrived at a conclusion. I am not very particular as to the amount, but I want a definite promise from the min-

ister so that those of us who may be here next year when another vote is asked for will know whether the government is prepared to abide by its estimates.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote. There was a vote of $5,000 last year. The site has been purchased, and the chief architect has been instructed to prepare the plans and to limit the total expenditure to $20,000, and he assures me that he will see the expenditure does not exceed that amount.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Is this vote agreed to ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Before the House rises—I have here a copy of the Toronto 'Mail and Empire,' which says that a Liberal member of parliament, the hon. member for Kings county, P.E.I. (Mr. J. J. Hughes), is being sued for $12,000 for having furnished supplies to the government.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is not relative to the question before the House.

Mr. BLAIN. I will take another opportunity of bringing up the matter.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. SPROULE. What business does the government propose to take up to-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Supply, in the same department.

At six o'clock House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, April 30, 1908.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION—CEMENT.

Mr. J. D. REID asked :

1. Has the Montreal Harbour Commissioners lately given a contract for cement?
2. If so, was the quantity 30,000 barrels? If not, how many barrels were contracted for?
3. To whom was the contract given?
4. Is it a fact that this order is to be imported from Belgium?
5. Is the government aware that there are cement manufacturing industries in Canada, making first-class cement?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The first four questions are answered on information received from the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

1. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON.

2. The quantity contracted for is 100,000 bags of 94 pounds each, the commissioners to have the option of reducing or increasing the quantity 25 per cent.
3. Dillon's Limited, Montreal.
4. Tenders for the cement were called for by advertisement. The lowest and most advantageous tender which complied with the specifications was accepted. The brand to be supplied is 'North's Condor' made in Belgium.
5. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. I omitted to ask the price paid for the cement. Will the minister get that information.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will inquire.

MICHAEL J. WALLACE.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

1. Is one Michael J. Wallace employed at Windsor, Ontario, by the Customs Department?
2. If so, when was he appointed, and what is his salary and duties?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. Yes.
2. He has been employed since 19th of June, 1907. His salary is $90 a month, repayable by the contractors of the Detroit River tunnel, as special services. His duties are to keep a check of materials imported for the tunnel.

IMMIGRATION ACT.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. Has an order in council been passed pursuant to an Act of this session intituled 'An Act to amend the Immigration Act,' Bill No. 135?
2. If so, will the minister bring down and lay on the table this order in council?
3. If not yet passed, when does the government propose to take action, and what is the cause of this delay?
4. Will the minister bring down the order in council when passed?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). A memorandum to council is being prepared and will be brought down when passed.

DOKIS INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. PERLEY asked :

1. In what newspapers has a notice been published regarding the sale of the timber on the Dokis Indian reserve?
2. On what day was the first insertion of the notice printed in each of these newspapers?
3. What is the total number of insertions authorized by the government to be published in each of them up to the day of proposed sale?

4. Have the lines been run on the ground dividing the said reserve into the different timber berths which are advertised to be sold separately?

5. If so, when were these lines run, and where can a record of the same be seen?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1 and 2:

Paper authorized and date of authorization to King's Printer.

April 9, 1908—
'Barrie Examiner,' Barrie.
'Brantford Expositor,' Brantford.
'Collingwood Bulletin,' Collingwood.
'Manitoulin Reformer,' Gore Bay.
'Hamilton Times,' Hamilton.
'North Bay Times,' North Bay.
'Free Press,' Ottawa.
'Examiner,' Peterborough.
'Advertiser,' Sturgeon Falls.
'Algoma Advocate,' Thessalon.
'Globe,' Toronto.
'Herald,' Montreal.
'Le Soleil,' Quebec.
'Manitoba Free Press,' Winnipeg.
'Mining News,' Cobalt.
'Sault Express,' Sault Ste. Marie.
'Sudbury Journal,' Sudbury.
'Pembroke Observer,' Pembroke.
'North Star,' Parry Sound.

April 13, 1908—
'Burks Falls Arrow,' Burks Falls.

April 22, 1908—
'Times,' Peterborough.
'Wiarton Echo,' Wiarton.
'Herald,' Hamilton.

April 24, 1908—
'Canadian Freeman,' Kingston.

April 27, 1908—
'Gazette,' Barrie.
'Trade Review,' Montreal.
'Canadian Congregationalist,' Toronto.
'Hull City Advance,' Hull.
'Dominion Presbyterian,' Ottawa.

3. One insertion each week, between authorization and date of sale, 24th of June, 1908.

4. No, but a surveyor has been instructed to do the work, and it is expected that he will be on the ground this week.

5. After return of survey has been made, record thereof may be seen in the Department of Indian Affairs.

BRITISH PENSIONERS.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

1. Has there been issued to British pensioners residing in Canada a notice from or through the Department of Militia and Defence to the following purport:

'Acting under instructions from the Postmaster General in England, I have deducted from your pension the sum of ,' being 3 per cent, for the period May 1, 1906, to August 31, 1907; the 3 per cent tax to continue during residence in Canada.'

2. If so, under what authority and at whose instance was this notice issued, and when was it issued?

3. What is the object and upon what grounds is this deduction made from the income of these pensioners?

4. What are the circumstances attendant upon the action of the Department of Militia and Defence in this connection?

5. Is it intended to discourage the residence of these pensioners in Canada?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (for Minister of Militia and Defence). If any such notice was received by an imperial pensioner resident in Canada, it was sent by the army officer paying pensions acting under instructions from the imperial authorities, and for which neither the Canadian government nor the Militia Department is in any way responsible.

UNITED STATES WARSHIPS ON GREAT LAKES.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

1. Does the government propose to make any inquiry as to the armament and crew of the following United States training ships or war ships upon the great lakes: (a) 'Yantic,' (b) 'Hawk,' (c) 'Fern,' (d) 'Dorothea,' (e) 'San Juan,' (f) 'Essex,' (g) and 'Sandoval'?

2. Does the government propose making any inquiries as to the crew and armament of the 'Nashville,' a United States war ship or training ship which is to pass through the canals into the great lakes during the year 1908?

3. Does the government consider that the matter of the armament and crew of these vessels has any relation to the convention of 1818 with respect to naval forces upon the great lakes?

4. What are the terms of the convention or agreement of 1818 with respect to a naval force upon the great lakes?

Right hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Minister of Militia and Defence):

1 and 2. The Department of Militia is obtaining information on this subject. (Note. 'San Juan' should read 'Don Juan.')

3. The government is not in a position to express an opinion at this moment.

4. In April, 1817, an agreement was entered into between Great Britain and the United States to the effect that the naval force of the respective countries, on the lakes, should be confined to the following vessels on each side, that is to say:

On Lake Ontario, to one vessel not exceeding 100 tons burden and armed with one 18-pound cannon;

On the Upper Lakes, to two vessels not exceeding like burden each and armed with like force;

On Lake Champlain, to one vessel not exceeding like burden and armed with like force;

No other vessel of war to be built or armed on the lakes.

The agreement is terminable by either party giving six months notice of its intention.

HARBOUR OF LOUISBURG, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens) asked :

1. Who was the harbour master at the Port of Louisburg, Nova Scotia, for the year 1906, and what remuneration did he receive for his services?
2. What was the amount of harbour dues collected at the port of Louisburg, Nova Scotia for the year 1906?
3. What amount of the harbour dues collected for or during 1906 has been forwarded to the department and at what date?
4. What remuneration did H. C. V. LaValle receive for his services as harbour master at the port of Louisburg, Nova Scotia, for the year 1907?
5. What amount of harbour dues collected during 1907 has been forwarded to the department?
6. Who is the deputy harbour master at the port of Louisburg, Nova Scotia, when was he appointed, and what remuneration?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. H. C. V. LeValle, $200.
2. $405.50.
3. $55.50 in March, 1907.
4. $200.
5. $128.50.
6. John Townsend, sr., appointed 1st May, 1899, $150 per annum from the fees collected.

SECTION 16, 15, 27, WEST 4TH MERIDIAN.

Mr. HERRON asked :

1. In respect of section 16, 15, 27, west 4th meridian, what is the history of this section?
2. Who were the original homesteaders, if any?
3. Have patents been issued? If so, to whom, and on what grounds?
4. If sold, what was the price per acre and what were the reasons for and condition of sale?
5. To whom does the section now belong?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Section 16, 15, 27, west 4th meridan, less area patented to the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company for right of way, was entered for as homesteads in April, 1903. On the 27th April, 1904, Mr. J. Bailey Powell was notified at Ottawa that the Northwest Ranching and Packing Company Limited, were permitted to purchase for the purpose of their business, at the current rate of $3 per acre, sections 9, 15, 17 and 21, in township 15, range 27, west 4th meridian, and to acquire from the homesteaders on section 16 their rights to that section. Terms of sale were that patent would be issued when payment was made in full, that $40,000 be expended in bona fide improvements and buildings within two years ; one-half the purchase money must be paid at once, and should the conditions not be fulfilled the lands should revert to the crown. The homesteaders on section 16 abandoned their entries and the lands were sold to the company at $3 per acre. Being unable to fulfil the conditions of the sale, owing to a difficulty with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, under authority of an order in council dated 31st August, 1907, the amount paid by the Northwest Ranching and Packing Company, was applied in full payment for the N.½ of the N.½ of section 9, and the whole of section 16, less right of way, and the sale of the remainder of the lands was cancelled and patent for the said section 16 and N.½ of N.½ of section 9 was issued to the company on the 14th October, 1907.
2. N.E.¼, William Fisher ; N.W.¼, H. J. Parkhill ; S.E.¼, William J. Parkhill ; S.W. ¼, J. B. Powell.
3. Yes, to the Northwest Ranching and Packing Company, Limited. See answer to No. 1.
4. $3 per acre. Answered by No. 1.
5. The government is not in possession of any information as to the present owners.

RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. DANIEL asked :

1. How long has Mr. G. M. Ryan, late superintendent of Railway Mail Service, been dead?
2. Has any one been appointed to fill this position? If not, why not?
3. If no one has yet been appointed, who does the work, and under what conditions?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

Mr. Ryan died 28th June, 1907.
2. No. The question is under consideration.
3. The work is performed by Mr. C. A. Murray, a first-class clerk in the railway mail service at St. John, N.B.

THE WOOLLEN INDUSTRY.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL asked :

1. How many people were engaged in the woollen mills of Canada in the years 1897 and 1907, respectively?
2. How much capital was invested in the woollen mills of Canada in the years 1897 and 1907, respectively?
3. What was the value of the output of the woollen mills of Canada in the years 1897 and 1907, respectively?
4. How many woollen factories, both large and small, were in operation in Canada in the years 1897 and 1907, respectively?
5. What was the total value or amount of the wool and woollen manufactures imported into Canada during each year, from and including the year 1897 down to and including the fiscal year 1908?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). We have no statistics of the production of woollen materials for 1897 and 1907. The statistics for the years 1900 and 1905 as shown by the censuses of 1901 and

1906 are as follows, for works employing five hands and over :—

Classes.	No. of establishments.	Capital.	No. of employees.	Value of products.
		$		$
Woollen goods, 1900	157	10,486,198	6,795	7,359,541
Woollen goods, 1905	103	6,808,233	4,587	5,717,735
Woollen yarns, 1900	6	57,400	68	86,350
Woollen yarns, 1905	3	163,177	80	154,000

Statement of the quantity and value of raw wool and the value of woollen manufactures imported into Canada during the fiscal years ended June 30, 1897-1906, and the fiscal years ended 31st March, 1907 and 1908 :

Year.	Wool, raw.		Woollen manufactures.
	Quantity.	Value.	Value.
	Lbs.	$	$
1897	5,704,194	878,339	7,094,909
1898	11,785,899	1,885,489	8,115,909
1899	9,413,739	1,335,096	9,674,775
1900	8,054,699	1,574,834	9,973,307
1901	8,574,605	1,292,895	9,830,402
1902	10,360,738	1,374,054	10,962,608
1903	7,994,702	1,239,998	13,612,942
1904	7,339,369	1,319,735	15,219,721
1905	7,617,211	1,553,431	15,607,010
1906	6,311,837	1,489,268	17,482,570
1907 (9 m.).	3,928,791	853,152	14,873,114
1908	6,129,216	1,407,274	21,213,234

The statement of imports is taken from the trade tables for the 11 fiscal years 1897 to 1907, as published in the tables, and for 1908, as procured from the Customs Department.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MR. JUSTICE CASSELS.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the First Minister if the instructions which were issued to Messrs. Watson and Perron, and which were alluded to by the Minister of Justice in his speech the other evening, can be got and laid on the table of the House for the present discussion.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. So far as the instructions to Mr. Watson are concerned, there is no objection, and I will lay them on the table at any time. I had no communication with Mr. Perron except a short verbal interview.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask whether that verbal interview has been reduced to writing ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Not in any way.

Mr. FOSTER. It ought to be.

BOUNDARIES OF MANITOBA.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I would like to renew a question which I asked in the Prime Minister's absence prior to the Easter holidays, and to which the Finance Minister was unable to give me a definite reply, that is, when we may expect the Bill which was promised for this session, I believe, to extend the boundaries of the province of Manitoba. The session is wearing on, and this is a very important measure, and I would like to know if the government have considered such a Bill and if it is their intention to introduce it this session ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The government have considered the question and it is their intention to introduce a Bill this session.

WHARF ON RIVER THAMES.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I have information that the wharf at the mouth of the river Thames is in danger of being carried away. I called the attention of the minister to this some time ago and would again ask him to have it attended to.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Where is the wharf ?

Mr. CLEMENTS. The river Thames wharf at the lighthouse at the mouth of the Thames river.

HOSPITAL LOT, BELLEVILLE.

Mr. PORTER. A return was ordered on the 18th March last regarding the purchase by the government of property in Belleville known as the hospital lot. I think it was purchased as a site for a drill shed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall have the matter looked into.

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION REPORT—Mr. JUSTICE CASSELS.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to make some observations to the House with respect to the report of the Civil Ser-

vice Commission. That report has naturally attracted a good deal of attention, not only in the House but throughout the country as well. I was somewhat misled when I first took up a copy of this report, because in glancing over it hurriedly I imagined for the moment that I had in my hands some of the campaingn literature issued by hon. gentlemen opposite in the good old days before they were elected to office. At page 37 of the report I observed the following remarks :

It is true that the salaries of most of the civil servants are not equal to what they were thirty or forty years ago, in consequence of the greatly increased cost of living, the obvious and logical result of our wasting, impoverishing and demoralizing system of protection.

That phrase has a singularly familiar sound. I commend it to my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) as the report of one of his own commissioners who seem to entertain a different view of the present tariff from that which the hon. gentleman is so ready to place before us. There is this difference however in the character of this utterance as compared with that of similar utterances which were made by hon. gentlemen opposite in the days gone by. The utterance of Mr. Fyshe—as any man who knows him will be willing to testify—is absolutely sincere and would be the rule of his conduct if he were in power to-morrow. But the similar pledges of these hon. gentlemen opposite, though made with all the vehemence of Mr. Fyshe, were utterly forgotten when they attained the power to fulfil them.

Coming to the report itself, it naturally deals with the subject of civil service reform. I do not intend to speak of legislative reform to-day at any great length because I do not desire to forestall my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who has had on the Order Paper a motion with regard to that particular subject which he intends bringing before the House, and which he dropped some time ago because the report we are now considering had not been printed. Civil Service reform had its commencement in England early in the last century. It had its origin then in an attempt to reform the Indian civil service. Some advance was made later on in 1832 ; and in 1854 or 1855, the government of Great Britain, being unable to obtain the assent of parliament, took the matter into their own hands and determined by executive action that appointments to the civil service should be made upon merit alone and from men selected after competitive examination. Parliament shortly afterwards fell into line, and to-day the civil service of Great Britain challenges and commands the admiration of the world. Not only in Great Britain has the work of civil service reform made itself manifest to the advantage of the country. Had not a similar service been accomplished in India, even before reform was brought about in England, we would in all likelihood see a very different condition of affairs in India to-day. Were it not for the reform of the civil service in India, I verily believe that the power of Great Britain in that country would probably have come to a termination before this, and the fact that that great country is to-day ruled—ruled well and wisely I believe—by the British Crown is due, as much as to anything else, to the education, the status and the character of the men who belong to the Indian civil service and who have given just and equitable government to the people of that country.

In the speech which I made in Halifax on the 20th August last, I said that the Conservative party favoured a thorough and complete reformation of the laws relating to the civil service so that future appointments shall be made by an independent commission acting on the report of examiners. Some of the government organs say the government propose to bring in a measure on that line. I for one would be prepared to assist them in every way if they did, and I believe that the result would be a more enduring monument to their memory than anything they have accomplished during the twelve years they have been in power.

Let us consider one difference between the system which prevails in Great Britain and that which prevails in this country. In Great Britain the policy of every department is dominated by a political head, and its administration by a permanent head. Upon a change of government, the affairs of every department go on as before without any change except that which may be brought about by a change of policy, instituted by the political head of the department. That is a system which has not been so much in force in this country. In this country the political head of the department takes a greater or smaller share in the administration of the department itself. I believe that the British system is on the whole the best, although I am not insensible to some advantages which may be claimed for our system in a new country such as Canada, where the political head of the department may be very thoroughly in touch with the particular needs and aspirations of some interests under his special jurisdiction.

But even under the English system, what is the constitutional rule as to political responsibility? That rule is well known. I have quoted it many times in this House. Let me repeat it once again because it is very short. The rule will be found in Todd at volume 1, page 628, as follows :

As a necessary consequence of the division of the civil service into political and non-polit-

ical officers, and of the acknowledged supremacy of the members of the administration over all the subordinate employees, it is required by our parliamentary system that every branch of the public service should be represented, either directly or indirectly, in the houses of parliament. This duty is performed by the political heads, who are themselves solely responsible for every act of administration down to the minutest details of official routine. Having entire control over the public departments, they are bound to assume responsibility for every official act, and not to permit blame to be imputed to any subordinate for the manner in which the business of the country is transacted, except only in cases of personal misconduct, for which the political chiefs have the remedy in their own hands.

Surely no man can claim that in this country, where the political head takes a greater share in the administration than in Great Britain, there is any less responsibility upon the political head than in Great Britain.

I do not propose to deal at any length to-day with the subject of civil service reform by legislation. Let me, however, simply say that the requisites of civil service reform are that ability and industry must be recognized and must count, that there must be a sense of responsibility and that the civil service must not be a mere machine. Appointments upon merit and the recognition of merit in promotions must lead to a cultivation of individual initiative, which ought to tend very greatly towards raising the standard of the civil service in this country. This is recognized and expressed better than I have expressed it in the report itself, and I shall conclude my remarks upon this portion of the subject by expressing the hope that we shall bring about in Canada such legislative and administrative reform that Canada shall have not the worst, but the best system of civil service extant. Great corporations in Canada, dealing with this question upon common sense business lines and with honest and intelligent endeavour, have a splendid service where merit is recognized and receives promotion. If these great corporations can have such a service why cannot we have the same and why should we continue in the public service of Canada a system in which, according to this report, the evils of political patronage make themselves manifest at every step and upon every inspection?

Let us look for a moment at what the commissioners state in their report—and this is the report of gentlemen appointed by this government, gentlemen in whom they have confidence, and in whom they still say they have confidence—and see what these gentlemen say as to the working of the political pull, of the patronage system, under the present government. At page 13 of the report, from which I shall be obliged to quote very freely for the purpose of making my points, as I prefer to use its exact language instead of attempting to paraphrase it from memory, we read:

Your commissioners have so far dealt with the paragraph in the order of reference, stating that 'while the general principles of the Civil Service Act are regarded as satisfactory, &c., &c.' From the inquiries made by the commissioners and the evidence submitted to them they are constrained to declare that they are unable to agree with the expression of opinion contained in the order of reference, and they are of opinion that the repeal of the Act is really the best course to pursue in the public interest. What should be given in its place the commissioners will state when they come to that part of the report in which they make recommendations.

Let us now see some of the grounds at least upon which they put forward this statement respecting the present working of the Civil Service Act. On the same page they say:

The commissioners also find that in order to meet the pressure brought upon the several departments by influential politicians to take on assistants, officials who have not passed the examinations are employed temporarily and are called labourers. Patronage seems to run more or less through every department of the public service.

Again, on page 14, speaking of a particular branch of the post office, the commissioners state:

In that special branch of the public service politics was found, as a rule, to play an important part. The commissioners consider from the evidence submitted to them that on the part of responsible officials of the several departments, especially in the outside service, there is a dread of the politician, and every bit of strategy is resorted to to circumvent the carrying out of the patronage system.

On page 15 the commissioners say:

Your commissioners found in their rounds that a collector of customs, a city postmaster, a post office inspector and others were appointed politically. The recent appointment of a postmaster at Kingston was on the recommendation of the patronage committee; the last appointment to the postmastership at Montreal, the most important in the Dominion, was given to an aged member of parliament, 67 years old.

And further on:

It is the political element in the Act which, from time to time, has become more aggressive and which has steadily tended to deteriorate the public service. It would seem to the commissioners that the great prosperity of the country during the last fifteen years has been such that able men, who were formerly attracted to the service of the state have now ceased to look to the rewards of that service and have turned their attention to other avocations in which they see prospects of higher emoluments, with the result that inefficient and inferior men, unable to obtain better positions in the outside world, through political operations and other means, have been

brought into the service; whatever the cause the tendency is more and more to lower the standard of the civil service with the consequent detriment to the business of the state.

Again, at page 19, we find further evidence with respect to this :

In other instances of temporary employment people who have failed to pass the necessary examination, through political pressure or otherwise, have been unloaded on the departments when help is necessary, and to overcome the provisions of the Act are graded as labourers or some such designation.

These are sweeping statements, and if they are true—and they have not been denied up to the present—they are statements that show that the system of patronage carried on openly and avowedly by this government has seriously deteriorated the public service of this country during the twelve years they have been in power. But this is not all. On the same page of their report I find :

Your commissioners consider that in many cases promotions have been forced on the several departments owing to political influence; that the officials promoted do the same work as they performed in the lower grade, and, as has been mentioned before, promotions have taken place as a rule for other causes than the necessities of the service.

Can anything be more damaging, can anything be more of a condemnation of the government than a statement such as that ? How is the power of appointment to public office, or the power of promotion in public office to be regarded ? Is it not to be regarded as a public trust ; is it not a trust as sacred as the duty of the government to deal fairly and honestly and wisely with the revenues of this country? When we find three men, political friends of this government, able men, representative men, men whose ability and wisdom and honesty have not been doubted, deliberately stating in this report as they have done, that not the interests of the service but political pull has dominated the appointments to and promotions in the public service, surely we would be justified in expecting that before this date—because this report has been before the House for more than a month—the government or some member of the government would have given some explanation or contradiction of the statement I have just read.

But that is not all. On page 27 of the report the commissioners state :

As a rule your commissioners found in the outside service that politics enter into every appointment, and politicians on the spot interest themselves not only in the appointments but in subsequent promotions of officers. While at Ottawa the departments generally are administered with a good consideration for the public interest, yet in the outside service the politics of the party is of greater importance in making appointments and promotions than the public interests of the Dominion.

I invite the attention of the right hon. gentleman and of every member of the government to this portion of the commissioners' report. The statement there made calls for observation from the government, and cannot fail, under present conditions, to arouse very great distrust among the people of this country. Again on page 28 :

In the outside service those who have the 'political pull' use it for all it is worth; they pass by their superior officers and bring pressure to procure anything that may prove to their advantage.

On page 29 reference is made to the Department of Customs :

The chief positions in the outside service of this department are political appointments. Every collector of customs has been appointed from the ranks of the party in power at the moment.

Then on the same page, speaking of the same department :

Curious facts were brought to light in the inquiries into the outside service. At Montreal, for instance, there were found two landing waiters, one appointed in 1871 and the other in 1891, the one doing duty at the Bonaventure station and the other at the Dalhousie square station, both equally good men. The officer appointed in 1871, according to the last Civil Service list, after 36 years of service, obtained a salary of $750. The officer appointed in 1891, with 20 years less service, obtained a salary of $1,000; and when inquiry was made the collector informed the commissioners that a most prominent influential citizen of Canada who could not be refused had been approached by the friends of the officer who was appointed in 1891, and having inquired into the matter, insisted that his protégé should have an increase in salary.

So that not only does appointment to public office depend upon political pull and upon patronage, not only does promotion in office depend upon political pull and patronage, but the very salaries paid out of the public exchequer of this country are doled out to one or other civil service employee according to the amount of political pull he can summon to his aid. But that is not all.

Mr. PATERSON. May I ask if that was not a circumstance that took place under the old government and not under this?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, I always was under the impression that the hon. gentleman did not regard the old government as the exemplar of all the virtues; and I have always been under the impression that the hon. gentleman, when he paraded this country from 1878 to 1896, proclaimed loudly the reforms he would bring about. If the hon. gentleman, after a circumstance of that kind is brought to his attention, has

no better answer to give than to say that the Conservative party which he condemned from one end of the country to the other, did the same thing, then I think he ought to resign his office and get out of public life.

Mr. PATERSON. I am making no defence for anything I have done, I am asking the hon. gentleman a question. He says the public service has deteriorated under this administration. he cites this Act where political pull was exercised and I ask him whether the case occurred under my administration of the Customs Department or under the previous administration. I made no comments, I simply asked a question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not making these comments myself, I am reading the report of the commissioners appointed by the Minister of Customs and his colleagues. In order to make it perfectly plain I will read it again to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PATERSON. No, read the evidence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Am I not entitled to read the report of the commission appointed by this government? I do not know whether the commissioners have been paid by this government, but they were appointed by this government, and I presume they were paid for their services. They made this report——

Mr. PATERSON. The report is supposed to be founded on evidence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman intimate that the report is untrue or incorrect?

Mr. PATERSON. As I read the report, I was under the impression that this particular case they refer to took place under the previous government. If I am wrong, I would like to be set right.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, in the name of all that is sensible what would the hon. gentleman argue if the evidence discloses that ?

Mr. PATERSON. I looked to see, and I think so, but I may be mistaken.

Mr. FOSTER. You had better look again. You want to get your work done for you.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will read another paragraph :

In Toronto your commissioners found that the senior officer in point of service who was appointed in 1896 was the fourth in point of seniority. The collector, surveyor and cashier were all his juniors, although drawing larger salaries than he receives. There is no question of the integrity and ability of the officer in question. The only suggestion which the commissioners can make in regard to the outside service of the customs is to have the department absolutely divorced from political influence, and have all the appointments put upon the basis of merit.

Further on, on page 30 :

Of course, in the Inland Revenue Department, political appointments, as in other branches of the public service, prevail.

Further, on page 31 :

Every postmaster is appointed politically, and the number of what are called city post offices is small. Hundreds of post offices are used for the benefit of politicians rather than the benefit of the state. Only recently has it been pointed out in the public papers that the postmastership at Kemptville has been vacant for six months, and your commissioners are of opinion that until the political system in use in the outside service is entirely abolished, notwithstanding all the business methods adopted by the department, efficiency will not follow.

On page 37, after referring to some of the evils which had been demonstrated in the administration of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, the commissioners use this language :

The political pull has much to do with this; and no radical improvement need ever be expected until the political pull is completely eliminated from all branches of the service.

On page 42, speaking of the public works service, they say:

In certain cases there may be over-payments of wages such as the notorious instance which was brought to light about a year ago, when a clerk of works appointed by political influences was found to have sublet his work to another person at a much lower rate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have read from the report of the commissioners enough to indicate, not only the evil of the political pull and patronage system, but the fact that it has been in continuous activity since this government has been in power, and that through the active operation of that system much of the inefficiency, much of the extravagance, and much of the waste found by these commissioners in the administration of the public departments, are due. They further declare that the Civil Service Act which leaves full sway to the patronage system has often been evaded. They point out on page 13 that it is continually evaded by parliamentary votes:

That for the year ending March 31, 1906, during the last session of parliament, over 50 votes were passed with the saving clause 'notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act.'

And they declare :

It is known to the commissioners that many of the votes, not having that clause attached to them now, have had it in previous years.

They declare further:

It is the belief of the commissioners that hardly a vote to pay the several classes of the public service has been passed, during one sesion or another, without adding the limitation already noted.

The opposition have called attention to this evil on many occasions during recent years, and they have pointed out the constitutional difficulty, which is not noticed by the commissioners. That is very obvious to any one who considers it for a moment. Both Houses have passed a Civil Service Act, and a repeal pro tanto of that Act is annexed every year by this House to the appropriation Bill which cannot be amended, but which can only be rejected as a whole by the upper House, and as a result the House of Commons repeals pro tanto an enactment made with the sanction of both branches of the legislature, and it does that against all constitutional usage and custom. Then they point out, at page 13 and again at page 31, that the Act is evaded by improper classification. They say:

It would seem that in the four post offices examined into by the commission, letter carriers were employed to do high grade duty and duties of clerks, that they are still designated on the pay-list as letter carriers; that in consequence of a desire on the part of the officials not to bring these letter carriers in their uniforms to the public notice, they to their loss have been deprived of their uniforms as well as their street car fares

On page 31 they allude to the same subject:

Your commissioners found that in all the post office branches, officials were employed who had failed to pass the examination laid down by the Act, and who were designated as labourers although in many instances doing clerks' work. If the Civil Service Act is to be of effect your commissioners are of opinion that this incongruous state of affairs should be brought to an end as quickly as possible.

Then they found a further evasion by means of what is called 'temporary employment,' and their remarks in regard to that are on pages 18 and 19:

So-called temporary clerks are constantly admitted to the service and remain in the service until their death. There are temporary employees at Ottawa who have been there for thirty or forty years. In other instances of temporary employment people who have failed to pass the necessary examination, through political pressure or otherwise, have been unloaded on the departments when help is necessary and to overcome the provisions of the Act are graded as labourers or some such designation.

It goes back thirty or forty years. It is obvious that some of these men must have been taken on by administrations which preceded the present one, but the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) will remember that we have brought this matter up over and over again in this House, particularly upon his estimates and upon the estimates of other ministers as well, and have urged that there was every reason in the public interest why these men, if they are to be retained indefinitely, should be put on the permanent staff and brought thoroughly within the provisions of the Civil Service Act. Then, it is pointed out, at pages 14 and 42 of the report, that a very large number in the employment of the government are not under the Civil Service Act at all. I will not read that portion of the report as hon. gentlemen can consult it for themselves.

The commissioners deal with the question of suitable remuneration, and I agree entirely that it is a question of the utmost possible importance. The recommendations of the commission should be taken into consideration by the government at the very earliest possible moment. Although I have not had the opportunities of studying it that are possessed by hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches, my own opinion of the civil service, as we see it at Ottawa at the present time, is that it is over-manned and underpaid. I believe that men have been introduced into the departments of the government by means of political patronage and political pull who are not wanted there, and that if the officers of the government, the heads of the different branches in these departments, were consulted and their evidence taken fully and frankly many of them would state that men have been brought into their departments whom they did not want, and whom they found to be absolutely useless. As far as many officials are concerned I believe they are underpaid and that men doing the same amount of work in the service of the great corporations and institutions of this country are better paid than the average civil servant is at the present time. This, however, is a subject that I do not intend to dwell upon. It will no doubt come to the attention of the House later on in the session.

The commissioners deal also with the necessity of a pension system, and their observations in that regard are worthy of being quoted. At page 21 they use this language:

At the outset your commissioners consider it a subject of regret that the Superannuation Act, which had been in force for over twenty-seven years, should have been repealed, and the present Retirement Act put in its place. To the commissioners the repeal seems most illogical; when it is found that within a few years after its repeal Pension Acts have been placed on the statute-book providing for pensions to the members of the Northwest Mounted Police; the staff of the Intercolonial Railway, the members of the Permanent Corps and Headquarters Staff, and other employees under the Militia Department, as well as to their widows and families, it would seem that the

action in abolishing the Superannuation Act was not only illogical but hasty and inconsiderate.

So would think any person who has made a study at all of conditions as they prevail in this country at the present time. There is hardly a large corporation, such as a railway company or a banking company in Canada, that does not provide pensions for its employees after a certain age. Not only does it provide pensions for its employees, but it provides that there shall be an allowance under certain conditions to the widows and children of its officers after their death ; so that any man entering the service of one of these corporations has not only the assurance of a competence during his own old age, but he can feel absolutely certain that those who are dear to him and whom he may leave behind him will not suffer in want and poverty after he is gone. The government found a Superannuation Act upon the statute-book. No one pretends that it was perfect, but it might have been amended and brought up to the standard of the present day. Instead of moulding it in that way the government abolished it, and they provided a retiring allowance which these commissioners find to be absolutely inadequate and insufficient. They touch the subject further on in the report, at page 46. I will take the opportunity of quoting what they say there:

Your commissioners have in conclusion to point out that they are unanimously agreed that a comprehensive superannuation system should be placed on the statute-book; and that this system in the present state of the Dominion should include pensions to dependents of civil servants for there seems little doubt that with the exception of slight set backs the conditions of life in the Dominion are and are likely to be such that advances in prices of commodities will be the rule, and it will be almost impossible for the average civil servant to effect any savings from his salary. With that view your commissioners consider that the time has arrived when an efficient pension system should be put into force.

Now, I come, Mr. Speaker, to that portion of the report of the commissioners in regard to the administration of the different departments. Let me express my conviction that the government never intended that these commissioners should make any such examination of, or any such investigation into the several departments as that which they have attempted in the time at their disposal. In fact, we have heard rumours throughout the country, we have heard opinions freely expressed by certain stalwart Liberals, that the matter went wrong through the absence of the right hon. Prime Minister last May, and that if he had been here this order in council never would have passed in any such terms as would have permitted this investigation. But, if we had entertained any doubt as to the intentions of the government in that regard, my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) with his accustomed candour, has made the matter perfectly clear. He has pointed out that the government, never, for one moment, dreamed of the slightest investigation into the administration of any of the departments.

Well, Sir, we know from their record in this parliament that that statement of the Minister of Justice is absolutely true. When did they ever grant an investigation into any department? Two years ago when I moved for an investigation into the Department of the Interior with regard to the disposal of public lands, the Prime Minister declared that no investigation would be permitted; that if charges were made, they would be investigated, but in the meantime they would deny us such investigation and access as would permit us to make charges even if these charges were well founded. What was the attitude of the right hon. gentleman with regard to the Department of Marine and Fisheries ? After he himself had stated in this House that that department was not being well administered, he followed it up by bringing down a motion not to investigate the department but to find out whether or not the steamship 'Arctic' was physically capable of holding the stores which were said to have been placed in her. And when I moved in amendment that the whole Department of Marine and Fisheries should be investigated, the Prime Minister said that our words and our proposals were simply froth and wild talk. Does he now think the report of this Civil Service Commission froth and wild talk ? I venture to say that if he had permitted that investigation into the Department of Marine which we asked for two years ago in this House, all that is in this report and a good deal more would have been made known to the people of Canada long ago.

Let me bring to the attention of the House the charmingly candid words in which the Minister of Justice has made it plain that the Civil Service Commission took the government by surprise. In his speech on the 28th of April the Minister of Justice said :

I said on that occasion what I have no hesitation in saying again and what any hon.gentleman who reads the mandate to these commissioners can at one see for himeslf, namely: that they stepped altogether outside of that which was defined to them as their jurisdiction when they made a report at length which they have made with regard to the different departments of the governmental service. They were appointed to inquire into the operation of the Civil Service Act; they were not appointed to inquire into the administration of the general departments of the government service.

Further on he said :

I am simply pointing out, not in any way of attack or even of criticism upon their work,

that they did undoubtedly go beyond the commission of inquiry issued to them in what they have reported.

And further on :

They fell into an error, not unnaturally, but an error which they would not have fallen into if any one had known that they were travelling outside the purpose for which they were appointed or were engaged in an investigation which they intended to make the foundation of a report of this character—which simply illustrates the danger of acting upon or accepting the conclusions of gentlemen who have gone about a work which they were not appointed to undertake, and a work which nobody was aware they were engaged in at all.

Again he said :

And therefore, I say, I make no point whatever of the fact that they have travelled afield and outside and beyond their jurisdiction.

We are very much obliged to the Minister of Justice for making absolutely clear and beyond cavil that which every person must have believed, namely, that when the government appointed that commission they did not for one moment intend to permit the slightest investigation into any department of the government, even into this very Department of Marine which the Prime Minister himself was ready to admit had gone astray.

The Minister of Justice has used somewhat singular analogies with regard to the work of this commission. He has likened the commission especially in their work with regard to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, to a body of surveyors who by some accident have in the course of their journeyings come upon a corpse and suspect foul play. Then he proceeds to a further remarkable analogy by suggesting that the government, in the commission which they have issued to Mr. Justice Cassels are inviting him to play the part of a corner's jury. In some respects the analogy is not inappropriate. Let us look at the Department of Marine and Fisheries as it was in 1892. Mr. J. M. Courtney, a member of the present Civil Service Commission, was a member of the Civil Service Commission of 1892, and that commission made several comments upon the excellent condition, the efficiency and the economical management of the Department of Marine and Fisheries at that time. At page 27 they say:

Your commissioners observe that it has been found unnecessary to continue the division of the Department of Marine and Fisheries into two departments, and that it is thought the affairs of the department will be more economically administered by a single staff of officers, the minister and his deputy being assisted, in respect of those questions which relate more especially to the conservation of the valuable fisheries, by the study and experience of an expert.

At page 66 they say :

Ocean and river service, lighthouse and coast service, marine hospitals and steamboat inspection—

All under the control of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and involving an expenditure of $749,000. Your commissioners in looking over the outlay for some years back, are pleased to mention that they find a large measure of effectiveness has been introduced into these services, and expenditures that have been found of little advantage to the department have been dropped.

At page 68 :

SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS.

The outlay for these institutions covers the cost of meteorological service, including expenses for telegraphing weather warnings, for instruments, etc., and expenditure on account of the observations. The amount spent last year exceeded $60,000. The service is under the control of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and is well supervised.

At page 85 and 86 they report on important reforms made in the simplification of the accounts and book-keeping which were due to a particular officer mentioned, and they say :

This in an instance where it would be desirable to have such improvements made known and adopted by the departments generally.

At page 86 they say :

This department amongst other things has the charge of 710 lighthouses—more than there are on all the coasts of Great Britain and Ireland. We should judge that a very efficient outlook is kept on the very diversified service of this department and that supplies therefor are purchased with reference to economy.

That is the department as it was in 1892. I will contrast a little later on the department as it was found in 1907, and I think I may admit that the analogy of the Minister of Justice was a good one, and that the Civil Service Commissioners in 1907 found in that department the corpse of that honest, efficient, and economical administration which did prevail in 1892, but which has been assassinated and destroyed under this government. The Minister of Justice likens the functions of Mr. Justice Cassels to those of a corner, but in the present case the coroner has a very narrow scope of inquiry into matters which ought to be presented before him.

Coming to the report of the commissioners upon the several departments of the government, we find that it discloses deplorable extravagance, waste, inefficiency, confusion and lack of system in several of the departments which have been partially but only partially investigated by them. Let us look at some illustrations of this. On pages 23 and 24 of the report, the commissioners say :

Owing to the good times which have recently been prevalent and the large revenues re-

ceived from customs, the old-fashioned notions of frugality and living within one's means have to some extent been departed from, and instances have been found of departments giving orders for stores and other services to be delivered within a year in excess of the vote granted by parliament. Large amounts have been spent at several places in the Dominion for supplies bought from those enjoying political patronage at what may be called retail rates. Heavy expenditures have been incurred without necessary consideration or supervision, and while no doubt the several officers have thought themselves justified, owing to the expansion of the revenues, yet such conduct is contrary to the public interests and, in the opinion of the commissioners, ought to be restrained.

And let me say, in justice to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that these observations are not confined to his department, but are general observations, apparently applying to every department of the government which has come under the notice of the commissioners, except where they have otherwise stated in their report. Let us look at pages 26 and 27 :

By the evidence of several officials who are concerned in the purchase of stores, it has been conclusively shown that large amounts of money are paid over each year to merchants whose names are on the patronage lists in the several localities. It has been pointed out in the most simple way that this practice has been followed by everybody and it could not be altered. Your commissioners, however, consider that while the practice was always bad, yet through the great development of the country the extent was not so great as to become serious until of recent years. When one witness stated that his expenditure has increased threefold recently, and it is a well-known fact that the public expenditure has increased in the last twelve years about fifty per cent or more, in the opinion of the commissioners the time has come when this practice of paying retail prices to a few favoured merchants in each locality should be discontinued. Before suggesting a remedy your commissioners wish to point out how these expenditures are managed. In the first place there is the question of certificates. These certificates are in general terms, that the articles have been received, that the articles are necessary in the public interest, that the prices charged are according to contract, or that the prices are fair and just. In reference to the question of certificates, the Auditor General in his evidence pointed out that in one department he did not believe in the certificates received. This is a very serious affair. Generally speaking the commissioners are of the opinion that the certificates should be given in the first place by the officer who really receives the goods, or, to quote a witness of the commission of 1892, 'who is responsible for and cognizant of the services performed.'

Further on, at page 27, they say :

Your commissioners are of opinion that in many instances stores are ordered unnecessarily, and it may be doubtful that a good quality is always delivered. Mr. Pottinger states in his evidence that it is his opinion that the amount paid by the Intercolonial Railway for coal was higher than it ought to be. In instances which have been brought to the notice of the commissioners stores have been received which were not wanted and which it is difficult to get rid of.

That is a reference perhaps to the celebrated purchase of files of which there were supplied to one of the departments more than would be required for the next 40 or 50 years. Further on they say, on the same page :

Your commissioners have come to the conclusion that the time has now arrived when it would be desirable in the public interests that purchasing agents, probably three, should be appointed at good salaries to make all purchases of goods required for the public service, and that all purchases required by the several departments should be procured by this means.

Exactly the proposition which was put forward by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in a resolution which was opposed by the government, and especially by the Minister of Finance, who moved an amendment thereto. On page 34 we find further testimony :

A list of prices paid in Quebec was, in February last, submitted to the manager of the shipyard at Sorel, for comparison with the prices which he was paying there; and in his reply he stated that the prices were generally about 50 per cent higher than the prices being paid at Sorel. One item objected to was the purchase of a certain brand of flour at $6.95 a barrel. When this was inquired into at the instance of the Auditor General, the agent replied: 'These are ———'s prices, and the same prices are charged by every flour dealer in Quebec for the same brand of flour. These brands cannot be bought for less here. If as good flour can be bought in Halifax for $5.20 per barrel, it would pay the department to import it from there. There are other brands of flour that can be bought in this market from ——— and others at $6 upwards, but not less than $6, suitable for our purposes. Our people generally choose the best, for the reason that it is subject to changes of temperatures which might cause it to harden or sour, as has often occurred with ordinary flour.' And he adds later on 'referring to the matter of flour, there is but one flour dealer on the patronage list.'

And the remedy which he proposes is remarkable in its simplicity :

I beg respectfully to suggest that you place one or two more on the list of such dealers.

How exceedingly effective that would be ! Then the commissioners add their own comment as follows :

Your commissioners took the trouble to inquire of the makers of the particular brand of flour in question what price they were selling it at in Quebec at the time of the purchase referred to, and were informed that

the price was $4.50 per barrel, at which price they would only have been too glad to sell to the department. It should hardly be necessary to make any comment on this.

In other words, the government of this country, through this particular department, into which the Prime Minister refused any investigation two years ago, have been paying $6.95 a barrel year after year for flour which they could have bought in the very same city of Quebec for $4.50. Further on the commissioners say:

Your commissioners are informed on the best of authority that this state of things has been going on ever since pre-confederation times. As some evidence that the heads of the department have been quite aware of it, we find on one of the files a memorandum by one of the officers dated May 31, 1905, regarding expenditures in connection with lighthouses. 'I am of opinion that in the Quebec agency alone a saving of at least $25,000 per annum can be made by compelling the agent to obtain authority for his expenditures over ordinary supplies and maintenance. If this is not carried out, the department can look for an overdraft for the next fiscal year of from $50,000 to $100,000.'

The commissioners add a sarcastic comment on the extraordinary nature of the remedy proposed. The remedy would be, of course, either to purchase the goods by tender covering a certain length of time or to adopt the system of purchasing agents which has been advocated by my hon. friend from North Toronto. The commissioners add another memorandum from an officer of the Marine and Fisheries Department, in which he says:

I may also add that if you had a good storekeeper, articles which are often required could be purchased wholesale instead of retail, and thus a considerable saving could be effected—a saving of $8,000 or $10,000 a year could be made.

Further down on the same page the commissioners say:

These are comparatively small matters, but they are not small in the aggregate; and they are not small as symptoms of the disease the department is suffering from.

Dealing further with this diseased department, as the commissioners call it, on page 37 of their report, they say:

Money is wasted in small things as in great because no one seems to have any motive to do otherwise.

Then a little further on:

The political pull has much to do with this and no radical improvement need ever be expected until the political pull is completely eliminated from all branches of the service.

At the bottom of the same page, 37, dealing with the Department of Militia and Defence, the commissioners report as follows:

The expenditure in this department is going up by leaps and bounds. In 1903-4 the total expenditure, both in capital and consolidated fund was in the neighbourhood of three and a half million dollars. In the estimates lately submitted to parliament for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1909, appropriations are asked for aggregating $6,500,000 That is to say, in four years and three-quarters the expenditure will have increased, if the supply asked for is granted, to the extent of $3,000,000.

At page 41, after referring to the lack of necessity for an officer such as the inspector general and to the high salaries paid to a number of the officers in the Department of Militia and Defence, they say:

Your commissioners have noticed that it has been held to be of serious importance that the expenditure of the militia in Canada should increase with the growth of the revenue and that when once the revenue has arrived at $100,000,000 a year the expenditure should be in the same proportion to $13,000,000, as $13,000,000 is to $1,000,000, that rate being paid for conditions at the time of confederation. It would follow therefore that with a revenue of $100,000,000 a year, the expenditure should be at the rate of $8,000,000. How can this be adjusted with the various retardations which must occasionally happen through a bad harvest, stringency of the money market and other causes, the commissioners cannot understand. It would seem that the militia expenditure would have to be cut down in proportion to the revenue. The better method in the opinion of the commissioners, is that the expenditures should be increased according to the growth of the population and be put on a per capita basis.

If there is any virtue at all in the report of the commissioners, these hon. gentlemen opposite, who protested so vigorously against militia expenditures in 1906, will see that some brake is put upon the expenditure in the Militia Department. When we look at the comparative statement of expenditure given in the report of the department for the year ending 31st March, 1907, we find some rather startling conditions. Take for example the pay of the Headquarters' District Staff:

1897-8	$ 38,592
1905-6	143,880

And the pay of the permanent force:

1898	$ 249,457
1906	1,099,420

I presume that a portion of that is accounted for by our taking over the defence of Halifax and Esquimalt, but I do not know exactly the amount. Then take the other items:

	1897-8.	1905-6.
Allowances for care of arms, &c.	$ 77,876	$ 122,897
Annual drill, including supplies and transport	299,628	809,924
Military properties, construction	66,453	254,427
Warlike and other stores	46,868	174,980
Clothing and necessaries	87,344	429,727

	1897-8.	1905-6.
Provisions and supplies for permanent force	119,911	463,668
Dominion arsenal..	72,832	290,037
Arms and ammunition ..	173,740	1,092,128

The total expenditure for 1897-98 was $1,688,213, and for 1905-06 $5,594,009. And the estimates for the present year, as pointed out by the commissioners aggregate no less a sum than $6,500,000, of which, however, it is only fair to say, $1,250,000, as estimated by the Minister of Militia, is to be accounted for by our taking over the defence of Halifax and Esquimalt.

My hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder) has pointed out some rather significant considerations in connection with the expenditure upon militia and defence, as compared with our expenditure upon agriculture. He has shown the House that, after making fair deduction, there was expended in all about $500,000 in the interests of agriculture during the year ending 31st July, 1906, and that during the same year no less a sum than $5,594,009 was expended on our military force. Or, as he quaintly put it, for every $11 voted for war in Canada there is only $1 voted for peace. The question is whether or not for this enormous expenditure we have obtained any increased efficiency. As to that, I shall quote a little later on some remarks of the commissioners which seem to point to the conclusion that we have not got value in return. Our hon. friends opposite, including specially the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), tore their hair in 1896 in declaiming against the expenditure by the Conservative government of a sum of $1,000,000 for arms.

Mr. BERGERON. Three hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It may have been $300,000 at first, but eventually it was $1,000,000. My hon. friends on the other side were amazed that any such expenditure should be undertaken by any government in this country, and my hon. friends from Quebec on this side tell me that in the campaign of 1896 that expenditure was made a chief cry against the government. Well, what do these gentlemen think of an expenditure of $6,500,000 as compared with an expenditure of $1,700,000 by the late government? We have had no expression of opinion from them, but we have had an opinion from the commissioners, and to that I shall draw the attention of the House later on.

So far I have spoken of extravagances and waste. Let me read some extracts from the report of the commission regarding the disorganization, inefficiency and confusion which they found in certain departments. At page 34 their most striking condemnation is made, and it is in respect of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I should say that the time of the commission was very largely devoted to the inspection and investigation of this department, because for some reason of which I am not aware, they considered that the affairs of that department especially invited their attention. They say that they did not attempt to inspect or deal with the Department of Railways because they thought there were other departments on which their attention might better be bestowed. I would have liked, had there been an opportunity, to suggest to the commissioners, having regard to the operations of the Eastern Supply Company, to the Moncton land deal and other land deals carried out in the Department of Railways, that they would have found in that department quite as abundant a harvest of mal-administration, extravagance, and inefficiency as that which they did find in the Department of Marine. Let us read the conclusions of the commissioners with regard to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

There are officers enough in the department, both inside and outside, to do all the work efficiently, if they were properly trained and organized: but there is no efficient organization.

Who was responsible for the organization? The government of this country, especially the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; but every man who sits on the treasury benches is politically responsible for that lack of organization.

The only attempt at it is the appointment of men whose titles would seem to indicate what their duties are; but those duties have never been specifically defined. There is no record of anything of the kind, and there are no written or printed rules and regulations known in the service, which the commissioners think is lamentable.

Suppose that an investigation were made into the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway and that conditions such as those described in this report as existing in the Department of Marine and Fisheries were found, would it be proper for Mr. Hays or Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, as the head of the company to say: Oh, the responsibility is altogether with my subordinate officers and I will immediately institute an inquiry and take steps to have them punished?

It is practically impossible to fix responsibility on anybody. The deputy is supposed to shoulder responsibility for everything as his signature shows; but that means that he speaks for 'the department,' and 'the department,' like the King, can do no wrong. There seems to be a huge redundancy of work which proceeds in a lumbering, haphazard way, giving rise to constant blundering and confusion. There is no sign visible of a single directing head, or an intelligent purpose, unless it be that of spending as much money as possible.

Who is responsible for the expenditure in that department? The government of

this country are solely responsible and the minister at the head of that department is, of course, especially responsible.

Zeal for economy and good management or pride in the work, is not visible. Perfunctory and mechanical discharge of duties is the rule, with apparently no perception of any need for improvement.

How long has this department been in that state, and is it possible that those conditions can have prevailed in any department of the government without being brought to the attention of the head of the department and, indeed, to the attention of every member of the government?

The lack of organization and of organizing power in the department has recently been very conspicuously and painfully illustrated by the fact that the accountant's or bookkeeping branch had apparently fallen into such confusion that expert accountants had to be called in to put things to rights, and create some intelligible system. After months of work by these highly paid experts the result has been at least greatly improved books, as far as mechanical form is concerned, but probably little else; and this achievement has been accomplished at an almost fabulous expense.

There is not only a lack of efficient organization and method in the department. There would also seem to be a lack of conscience. In connection with the enormous expenditures which are deemed necessary the word 'discount' never appears. It is tacitly assumed that there is no such thing; but the whole commercial world knows otherwise. If no one gets any benefit from trade with the government except the trader, then it must be clear that in these great purchases made for the government, without discount, its officers must be assisting the trader to get better prices from the government than he can get anywhere else; for, everywhere else he has to give discount. In other words, some of the government's officers are serving two masters, and apparently succeeding with both—scripture notwithstanding.

The government of this country have taken that paragraph, minus the first sentence which deals with the inefficient organization, and have appointed Mr. Justice Cassels to act, as the Minister of Justice observes, as a coroner's jury with respect to the defunct body which is found in that portion of the report. Why did the government not add the following paragraph which I am about to read :

It seems amazing that this question has never been courageously faced and dealt with. There is evidently a power in the hands of responsible officers of some of the departments which they can exercise without the necessity of giving any account of it, and with the most demoralizing consequences all round. It is certain that under such a state of things it must be impossible to develop high character in the service, or rather to prevent the deterioration of what character there is.

These words are the words of independent men in respect of the utter lack of organization, the utter lack of system, the complete and thorough demoralization of one department of the government.

When that report comes down to parliament what takes place? The men who are responsible, the men who sit on the treasury benches and who therefore are responsible for this condition of affairs, calmly hand over to investigation by Mr. Justice Cassels, one paragraph, one small portion of this report and consider themselves before parliament and before the people of this country absolutely absolved from responsibility by taking that step.

Let us look at page 37 for further evidence :

Organization, discipline, zeal for the public service, and regard for economy are all conspicuous by their absence. Money is wasted in small things as in great because no one seems to have any motive to do otherwise. While there is no real punishment for the most outrageous blundering or the most incompetent service, there is at the same time absolutely no means for the discovery of merit and the promotion of talent.

Will my right hon. friend the Prime Minister and my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) declare in the face of this House and in the face of this country that they can successfully absolve themselves from the condition of affairs disclosed by these words:

On the same page the commissioners speak of the necessity of some effective means of inspection and continue as follows :

Your commissioners have to confess that the general conclusions which they have formed regarding the administration of the department are most unfavourable. It seems to have few redeeming features: although there are some, one of which is the presence in the department of some good men, chiefly, but not wholly, in the lower ranks. With a better organization and better methods these might form the nucleus of a good staff.

Mr. JOHNSTON. There is a very interesting sentence following that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to call attention to it when he speaks ? I have read every thing in this that is necessary. At page 42, in dealing with the efficiency of another department, the commissioners report as follows :

The number of militia trained in the annual camps is about 40,000 men; that according to the evidence of Major General Lake the men attached to the rural battalions have no drill except at the annual camps, and it is arguable whether the city corps are as efficient as they were some years ago, that while only 40,000 men come out for drill of ages from eighteen to fifty, yet compared with the population of over a million in Canada between the ages of twenty and forty, the proportion seems small.

Further on :

If, with all the consideration of the Public Accounts Committee and the War Office, the expenditure in Great Britain is such that the Public Accounts Committee consider it their duty to draw attention to expensive ideas, particularly amongst military men, and that grave irregularities are punished by reprimand, the system in Canada where the control is not as effective as in the mother land, would seem to be more disadvantageous to the Dominion.

In this the commissioners are dealing with the Department of Militia. Further on, dealing with Public Works:

Your commissioners are led to believe that in many cases works have been undertaken by the Department of Public Works at the instance of the municipalities or bodies of people locally interested, in which the opinion of the outside officers of the department as to the desirability of the proposed works was not asked for. The only information sought for related to the feasibility of the works in question.

Then on the same page, 43, they point out that at least three different departments of government are charged with duties of inspection of various characters, and they suggest that all these inspection duties, and all officers engaged in the duties of inspection, should be assembled under one minister, and that the system adopted by the board of trade in Great Britain should be adopted in the country.

Then on page 40, returning again to the Department of Militia, the commissioners point out that in 1892, a recommendation from the commissioners who reported in that year, led to the abolition of the system of paymasters, and add:

In consequence of this evidence the old system of paymasters was abolished, but again, with all its defects, the system is being reintroduced.

Further, on the same page, they allude to the fact that desertions during the year 1905 from the permanent force, amounted to about one in three, and in the following year the desertions in six months were about one in six. They declare that they have not seen any report since the 30th of June, 1906, and are unable to give subsequent figures. But taking the figures of that report they declare they show a grave state of affairs with such a large number of desertions, and they use this language :

Your commissioners have come to the conclusion that the large percentage of desertions is to a great extent caused by the want of sympathy between the officers of the permanent corps and the men.

If that statement is well founded, it is one which certainly invites the earnest and immediate consideration of the government. We are paying pretty heavily for this permanent force, and it is extremely undesirable that any such condition should exist for a moment. Our headquarters staff costs within about $25,000 as much as the headquarters staff in Switzerland. The difference between the military force of this country and that of Switzerland is that in Canada, with 3,000 or 4,000 men in the permanent force, we have 40,000 men drilled for a certain number of days; whereas in Switzerland there is a pretty thoroughly organized army, as I understand, of 250,000 fighting men of the first line, ready to take the field at any moment. The difference in the results of expenditure between this country and Switzerland seems to be very marked indeed.

Now, I am sorry to have worried the House by so many quotations, which have rendered my remarks more lengthy than I could desire. But I must next come to the point that this report upon its face declares that the inquiry was partial and incomplete. If hon. gentleman turn to page 7 of the report they will find there the order in council upon which the inquiry proceeded, one paragraph of which is in the following words:

That the commissioners be requested to proceed with the inquiry as rapidly as possible, with a view to the presentation of their report at the next session of parliament.

So apparently the commissioners considered it their duty to make some report at the present session, and therefore their inquiry was not as thorough as it otherwise would have been. At page 9, in commencing their report, the commissioners use the following language :

The commissioners report that in the short and possibly inadequate time at their disposal it has become very evident that in the present state of the development of Canada important changes are required to maintain the civil service as an efficient, contented and useful part of the machinery of administrative government.

On page 20, in dealing with the efficiency and sufficiency of the departmental staff, the commissioners use the following language:

In dealing with this subject, your commissioners have to submit that in the vast service such as exists at Ottawa, in the limited time at their disposal, it has been absolutely impossible for them to inquire fully into the efficiency of the officials in the several departments. There are probably including labourers, some 3,000 employees at Ottawa. In the Department of the Interior alone there are 500 employees.

And further on :

It would take many months to examine the work of the Department of the Interior alone, and when so many officials are engaged in these several branches it would be hard to gauge with accuracy the extent or character or style of the work turned out by each.

Further, on page 27, in dealing with the outside service, the commissioners use this language :

Acting on this suggestion, as previously stated, your commissioners visited three places, and they only regret that the time at their disposal prevented them from pursuing their inquiries at other points. The information procured was most interesting and instructive, and even the chairman, who had spent nearly forty years in the public service at Ottawa, had no idea of what constituted the outside service until he visited the several localities.

On page 32, referring to the Department of Railways and Canals, they say:

Your commissioners have not visited this department, believing that other departments required more immediate inspection.

And speaking of the Department of the Interior, on the same page, they say:

With its large staff of five hundred employees at Ottawa, it would require months to thoroughly inspect the work and see that the several officials are properly employed. The commissioners regret extremely that with the short time at their disposal they were unable to visit the Northwest, much as they desired to see how the land, and more especially, the timber sales are effected.

I am sure that all good Canadians who are interested in public affairs must sincerely regret also that the time at the disposal of the commissioners did not enable them to perform that good work. At page 37 I observe that the commissioners regret that they have been unable to investigate the condition of things in some of the other departments:

But to do the work with any pretensions to thoroughness would take much more time than would probably be agreeable to the government.

I do not think there can be a doubt in the minds of any hon. gentleman in this House as to the correctness of that surmise. This quotation continues as follows:

They have been able to go over only a very small section of even the Marine and Fisheries Department. If they had had time it would have been most desirable to have inspected the work of the department at the agencies—Quebec, Sorel, Halifax, St. John and Prescott—particularly Quebec and Halifax.

At page 42 they also declare that :

There is no means by which they could appreciate whether the amounts payable for sub-target guns or for Ross rifles are proper and just, but according to the evidence the contract for the Ross rifle was prepared by the counsel employed by the company, and no security was exacted.

Now, I do not think, after these extracts from the report of the commissioners, that there can be any doubt whatever in the mind of any hon. gentleman in this House that the inquiry was partial and incomplete, that the commissioners desired to make it much more thorough and absolutely complete, and that they did not find themselves at liberty to do so simply because they felt themselves constrained by the terms of the order in council and considered themselves obliged to make a report at the present session of parliament.

The government have, according to their own views, proceeded to supplement the inquiry of the commissioners by a further investigation before Mr. Justice Cassels. The proposed investigation relates to only one portion of the administration of one department, and the order in council cuts one of the paragraphs of this report in two, disregards all the inefficiency all the extravagance, all the waste and all the mal-administration outside of that particular paragraph, and asks Mr. Justice Cassels to consider the matters referred to in this paragraph and these matters alone. What about the next paragraph which I quoted a moment ago? My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) says that the functions of a corner's jury are to be exercised by Mr. Justice Cassels and he most stoutly defends the appointment of Mr. Watson and Mr. Perron as the gentlemen who are to assist Mr. Justice Cassels in that regard. Now, I have not one single word to say in criticism of the professional status of either of these gentlemen. As far as I understand, one of them was not long ago chairman of a Liberal organization in the province of Ontario. The other was in partnership with the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the management of the department under his administration will, no doubt, come under review by Mr. Justice Cassels. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice declares that he is absolutely satisfied with the appointment of Mr. Watson and Mr. Perron and I thoroughly believe it. I do not doubt it for one moment. But that is not the question. The question is whether or not the country will be satisfied, and I do not think the country will be satisfied. Mr. Watson's inquisitorial powers in the West Elgin commission did not seem to be very far-reaching or very effective. I am not going over the story again. Sufficient it is to say that what Mr. Watson could not discover Mr. Aylesworth forced his client to confess, and I suppose that he did not force his client to confess anything which was not absolutely correct and according to fact. We may have some good reason to believe that in so far as these two gentlemen are able to control and conduct the proceedings somewhat the same result might follow. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice has likened the function of Mr. Justice Cassels to that of a coroner's jury. Well, if you find the corpse of honest, efficient, economical ad-

ministration in any of the departments of he government, would you consider that the coroner's jury should be guided by men in the pay and in the employment of the assassins? That is exactly the position which the Minister of Justice is so stoutly defending. The men on the treasury benches today are responsible for the slaying of efficient, economical and honest administration in the departments. The report of 1892 shows honest, efficient and economical administration at that time. When the coroner's jury is to sit upon that which was once living, but which is now a corpse, we are to have the confidential friends and agents of the assassins guiding the efforts to probe into and investigate the cause of the decease. I think the proposition need only be stated in order to convince every hon. member of this House that the course which should have been taken was to select independent men, to go outside of the ranks of the political party which is responsible for this condition of affairs and to pursue the course which was pursued by Sir John Macdonald and Sir John Thompson in 1891 when they selected Mr. B. B. Osler and Mr. C. A. Geoffrion to probe into the Department of Public Works.

Now, Mr. Speaker, under these circumstances I think it my duty to place on record the views of the opposition in regard to the report of this commission. Let it not be forgotten that although this report was presented to the department on the 17th March, 1908, up to the present time we have not had from the government any statement of their intention to redress any of the grievances or abuses disclosed by this report, except that which was vouchsafed by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) on the day when the report was presented to the House. Although entirely apart and outside of the particular paragraph to which he directed attention on that day, the most outrageous extravagance, waste, lack of economy and efficiency have been disclosed by this report, not one word has been proffered by the government to parliament or to the country in explanation or in promise of redress. I have omitted to metion one or two portions of the report which refer to waste. I have already referred at very great length to extravagance. At page 36 of the report I find this language :

There can be very little question that the lighthouse board has been the means of greatly increasing the expenditure of the department and that much of the increase has been wasted.

Under these circumstances it is the duty of the opposition to place itself upon record as to the necessity of reform and redress, as to the necessity of further investigation. In the first place, the resolution which I am about to move declares that the proposed inquiry before Mr. Justice Cassels is absolutely too narrow and restricted in its character. Can there be any doubt about that when it picks out one paragraph of that portion of the report which relates to only one department and when it deals with only certain incidents in that administration and not with the whole administration which has been so vigorously attacked. The next point I desire to emphasize by the resolution is that the investigation conducted by the Civil Service Commission was confessedly partial and incomplete. There can be no doubt about that after the extracts which I have read from the report. The next point which is emphasized by the motion is : That this extravagance, waste, inefficiency, and maladministration are deplorable and that immediate steps should be taken to reform and redress the same. And these being the premises laid down in the resolution, the conclusion is : That the public interest imperatively demands the appointment of a commission with full powers to make a thorough and searching investigation which would carry on to a conclusion the work already accomplished by the Civil Service Commission. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move :

That all the words after the word 'that' be left out and the following substituted therefor:—

The investigation conducted by the Civil Service Commission was confessedly partial and incomplete.

That the proposed inquiry before Mr. Justice Cassels is unsatisfactory and insufficient inasmuch at is relates to only one paragraph of the report of that commission and touches but a portion of the administration of one department.

That this House regrets the deplorable, extravagance, waste, inefficiency and maladministration revealed by that report and declares that immediate steps should be taken to reform and redress the same.

That the public interest imperatively demands the appointment of an independent commission with full powers to make a thorough and searching investigation into the several departments of the public service.

I may add in conclusion, that I have not mentioned the commissioners who have already acted simply for the reason that I do not know whether or not they would be willing to act again. If I named these gentlemen I might be met by the statement from the government that they had declined to prosecute their inquiry further, that their health, or the time at their disposal would not permit them to conclude the work they had begun. I have therefore left the words of the resolution general in their character in that respect, but I have no hesitation in saying that so far as I am concerned and so far as gentlemen on this side of the House are concerned we have absolute confidence in the thoroughness, ability and integrity of these three gentlemen and we would be glad indeed to see them appointed to carry

on to a conclusion the work in which they have been engaged.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I do not believe it will be difficult for the House, even after the very lengthy speech we have heard, to come to a conclusion as to how this motion should be disposed of and to decide that we should pass to the order of the day. I followed the observations of my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) with very keen interest for I was anxious to know what arguments he would present in support of this motion. The question is not new ; we have had it under debate three or four times already and I must say that I have not observed a very unanimous consensus of opinion amongst gentlemen on the other side as to how the question should be treated. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) is of opinion that the inquiry with which we have entrusted Mr. Justice Cassels is too narrow and too limited in its scope and that it should be very much enlarged, while my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) is on the contrary of opinion that this investigation of Mr. Justice Cassels is altogether useless and that we have already enough information on which to come to a conclusion. I do not hope it will be possible for me to reconcile the different opinions of gentlemen on the other side. I am satisfied that whatever the government may do or not do it will not be possible for us to have their approbation. However that may be, we will be satisfied if we have the approbation of all conscientious men in this country who are honest and unbiased in their opinions. Let me call the attention of the House to the object of the motion presented by my hon. friend. He wants to have a commission with full powers to make a thorough and searching investigation into the several departments of the public service, and the reason upon which the hon. gentleman bases this new demand for investigation is stated in the first paragraph of the motion to be :

That the investigation conducted by the Civil Service Commission was confessedly partial and incomplete.

If by that word 'partial' my hon. friend means its ordinary acceptation and that the commission showed undue favour to somebody I do not know that the reproach should come from his side of the House, but the hon. gentleman went further and in his opening remarks he stated in so many words that when he opened the report of the commission he thought he was opening a campaign document. In view of the copious extracts he has read from this report I do not know how far it was proper for him to thus at the outset belittle the report of the commission, but that is a question on which I have no comment to make.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My right hon. friend evidently misunderstood me. I made that observation simply with regard to the extract I read from Mr. Fyshe's statement respecting protection.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not fail to observe that, and neither did I fail to observe that the other commissioners rather have a slap at Mr. Fyshe and state they do not share his views. If we are to take the report of the majority and not of the minority I do not think the observations come at all under the description which my hon. friend gave them. But, Sir, this is of no consequence ; the commission was appointed in order to give information to the government upon the efficiency of the civil service and in the course of their investigation they found that in one department there had been not only inefficiency as they charged, but also something akin to dishonesty. That was no part of the investigation they had to make. Still, I find no fault with their findings. On the contrary, if they saw that the attention of the government should be called to a particular condition of things, it was most necessary that the government should be apprised of the fact, so that the proper course could be taken. Therefore, since we had the report of the commissioners charging something akin to dishonesty in a certain department, we thought it our duty not to let the matter rest where it was, but to have the investigation pressed, whatever the consequences, and the whole matter probed to the bottom; and this is the reason why we have appointed Mr. Justice Cassels to continue the investigation which has been left undone by the commissioners. It is to be observed on this point, as my hon. friend the Minister of Finance remarked on a former occasion, that the report of the commissioners states either too much or too little. It would have been better, if they found dishonesty, to have completed the investigation, and to have put their finger on the guilty parties, and reported them to the government so that the government could deal with them. They having failed to do so, we thought it our duty to complete the investigation, and, as I have said, we have entrusted the work to Mr. Justice Cassels. I am glad to say, so far as the selection of the commissioner is concerned, that no fault has been found with it. On the contrary, everybody agrees that no better selection could have been made than Mr. Justice Cassels. Everybody acknowledges his eminent judicial spirit, his honesty, and his impartiality. But, Sir, much fault has been found with the counsel who have been selected. It has been stated that the choice of the counsel was unfortunate, in this respect, that Mr. Watson was at one time the chairman of the Liberal organization in Ontario, and that Mr. Perron was at one time a partner of Mr. Préfontaine. So far as Mr. Watson

is concerned, for my part I never knew that he had been so prominently associated with a political organization, though I knew that he generally voted the Liberal ticket. So far as Mr. Perron is concerned, I must admit in all candour that I had forgotten that at one time he had been associated with Mr. Préfontaine. Nor do I believe that this is a matter of much consequence. But, Sir, we have to view the matter in another light. Is it to be said on the floor of the Canadian parliament by gentlemen of the eminence of my hon. friend in the profession, or by other gentlemen who occupy very high rank in the profession, that when you select counsel you have to look to their political opinions? I belong to the legal profession, and I know something of its ethics; and I am sure I shall not be contradicted by the hon. leader of the opposition, nor by other hon. gentlemen eminent in the profession, when I say that it is not to be supposed that a man who is worthy of belonging to the bar ever carried his political opinions into court. It is the pride and the honour and a very elementary rule of the profession that the man who accepts a brief from anybody leaves his political opinions at the door of the court room. Who does not remember that in the many trials which George Brown had to undergo in his province, he was always defended by John Hilliard Cameron, who sat in this House opposed to him, and was one of the most eminent members of the Conservative party at that time? Did Mr. Cameron, though engaged in political trials and in defending the most eminent man in the party to which he was opposed, carry his political opinions into court? Or is it to be supposed that he did not do full justice to his client because he happened to be opposed to his political party? Nay, more, is it not within the knowledge of everybody that my hon. friend and colleague the Minister of Justice, when in active practice, was often retained in election trials on the Conservative side? And is it not a fact that he always did justice to his client, whether he was a Conservative or a Liberal, without any regard to the consequences? Sir, I would be ashamed of the profession if it were to be supposed that a man who had the honour of belonging to that profession would be influenced in the discharge of his duty by his political proclivities. If a man belonging to the bar thinks that he cannot do justice to his client or to the cause with which he is associated, it is his duty to refuse the brief; but the moment he has accepted a brief, it is his duty to be true to the cause which he has accepted without any regard to the consequences. Sir, this is the ethics and the pride of the profession. Will any man in this House who belongs to the bar of Ontario or to the bar of any other province in this country take any other position than this? Why, Sir, because Mr. Watson happens to be a Liberal, or because Mr. Perron happens to belong to the same political party, though I am not aware that Mr. Perron ever took a very active part in politics, is it to be supposed that these men will be recreant to their duty or untrue to the cause that they have to defend, because forsooth it might happen that the political party with which they have been associated would suffer? Why did we appoint this commission? We appointed this commission in order to have the truth and the whole truth brought out in this matter; that is the purpose Mr. Watson and Mr. Perron have to serve. The order in council providing for the commission says:

> The minister observes that some statements are made in that report which affect the honour and integrity of the officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.
>
> On page 61 of the report the following paragraph appears:
>
> There would also seem to be a lack of conscience. In connection with the enormous expenditures which are deemed necessary, the word 'discount' never appears. It is tacitly assumed there is no such thing; but the whole commercial world knows otherwise. If no one gets any benefit from trade with the government, except the trader, then it must be clear that in these great purchases made for the government, without discount, its officers must be assisting the trader to get better prices from the government than he can get anywhere else; for everywhere else he has to give a discount. In other words, some of the government officers are serving two masters and apparently succeeding with both—Scripture notwithstanding.
>
> The minister further observes that it is assumed by that statement that commissions are received improperly, or enhanced prices paid through dishonesty on the part of officials of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. But, unfortunately, the report does not mention any names which would enable him to take definite action concerning these officials. It is, however, in the interests of the Department of Marine and Fisheries and of the country that immediate steps should be taken in order to determine what officials (if any) deserve condemnation and to give to all an opportunity to meet the charges implied.
>
> The minister therefore recommends that he be authorized to appoint the Hon. Walter Cassels a commissioner under part 2, chapter 104 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, to investigate and report upon the foregoing statements contained in said report of the Civil Service Commission reflecting upon the integrity of the officials of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or of any of them.

This is the task for which Messrs. Watson and Perron have been appointed—to assist Mr. Justice Cassels; and this is the task which, if they are true to the profession to which they belong, they will discharge faithfully, without fear or favour towards anybody. The strange suggestion has been made in the press that not only should Mr. Cassels be assisted with counsel but

that counsel should be appointed to represent the Civil Service Commission. I have not heard that suggestion made by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, but I have heard it made in this House and I have seen it in the press. Could anything be more preposterous ? The retiring commissioners are not on trial. Mr. Justice Cassels is not appointed to take issue with them, and there is nothing to indicate that his appointment is in any way contradictory to their report. On the contrary the object of his appointment is to continue and complete the investigation made by the commission, and therefore it is absurd to pretend that the commissioners should be represented by counsel.

The commissioners were appointed to inquire into the efficiency of the service and they have made a report. The gist of that report is that the service is inefficient and that its inefficiency is due to the fact that the service is recruited by political patronage. There is nothing very new in this. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition says we should have a third investigation. Why, this will be the fourth investigation. We had a commission appointed in 1881 which reported. We had a commission appointed in 1892 which reported also. We had one appointed in 1907, which has just submitted its report, and the hon. gentleman wants another appointed. Well, I have this to say that as regards the inefficiency of the service, it is the duty of the minister and the government to look into that matter and of no one else. We do not admit any necessity for an investigation into that subject. We are responsible to parliament, and if there be inefficiency it is for us to devise a remedy.

The charge made by the commissioners that the civil service is recruited upon political considerations and none other is not a new one. The same complaint was made in the report of 1892. My hon. friend, who has made copious quotations, did not quote this part of the commission report which will be found on page 15 :

> In the previous remarks your commissioners have pointed out that in their opinion the principles underlying the Civil Service Act are not in the public interest. In the report of the Royal Commission of 1892, the commissioners observe that: It is possible that public sentiment in Canada may not as yet be ripe for open competition generally, and it may not be possible as yet to eliminate altogether the power of politics in making appointments; but if the recommendations of your commissioners be accepted and strictly adhered to, the public service at Ottawa will, they are convinced, in the course of a few years be better for the change.
>
> The commissioners at that time only took into account the public service at Ottawa. They left in their draft Bill in the report the provisions of a former Act relating to the outside service. Your commissioners regret to state that in their opinion the hopes of the members of the former commission have not been realized. The provisions of the Civil Service Act and its amendment have not made the service any better. In fact the Act has been so amended, re-amended and whittled down that the public service, the commissioners believe, not only at Ottawa but elsewhere throughout the Dominion, has fallen back during the last fifteen years.

Well, if the service has fallen back during the last fifteen years, the party in office are not alone responsible because we have not been here all of these fifteen years. If the evil goes back so far, we all may be held to an equal share of the blame. If the service has been rendered inefficient by political patronage, who is it who will cast the first stone? Can it come from the other side? Why, the service to-day is these gentlemen's own service. It is their service very largely as regards the personnel, and it is altogether theirs as regards the law. We have inherited the condition of things which now prevails and it ill becomes hon. gentlemen opposite to say that we are to blame.

While I am disposed to take the report of the commissioners as a basis of action, I am not disposed to grant that everything in this report should be taken as incontrovertible. In their disposition to blame the system that prevails, they have gone very far to find fault with some of the appointments. They have criticised the appointment of Mr. Harwood as postmaster of the city of Montreal, on the ground that he was an old gentleman seventy years of age and had been in active politics. That is true. But it is also true that the post office at Montreal has never been as ably managed as it has been by Mr. Harwood. For the last six or seven years, during which it has been managed by him, its administration has been perfect. No complaints have come to us and the public appear thoroughly satisfied.

It must not be forgotten that there are several aspects to be looked at before coming to any kind of a conclusion. We appointed a commission because the public were of the opinion that the time had come to have civil service reform. And what could we do better than appoint a commission to investigate and report and lay down a basis of reform ? There are in the report some things in which I am not disposed to agree altogether. There are some statements which I regret exceedingly and which I do not think reflect any honour on the commissioners. What they have said with regard to the Militia Department seems to me altogether uncalled for. And I am not disposed to congratulate my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, on the remark he made a moment ago concerning the speech by the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) who, I regret, is not in his seat at pre-

sent. Some time ago, in a speech to a meeting of farmers, the hon. member for Dundas said that the government spent $6,000,000 on militia and only half a million dollars on agriculture. Now, there is no man in this House for whom I have greater respect than my hon. friend from Dundas. He is a strong partisan, and for that I do not blame him because I am one myself. But though he is a strong partisan, he is generally very fair in discussion. When, however, before a meeting of farmers, he pointed out that the Canadian government was spending $6,000,000 on militia and only half a million dollars on agriculture, he was guilty of appealing to the worst prejudices that lie in the human heart.

I am sorry my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) should have been guilty of the same offence. Sir, the civilized nation does not live to-day that has not to spend more on militia than it can spend on agriculture and arts and many other useful things . That is our position. We are not in the condition yet, I am glad to say, and I hope we never shall be, of those nations of Europe, England, France, Germany, which spend no less than 50 per cent of their income upon war and preparations for war. But, Sir, we are in this position, though we are happily far from the condition of these nations, that we cannot ignore our duty to provide for the defence of this country. It is a part of the duty we owe to ourselves, it is a part of the duty we owe to our nation, and when an hon. gentleman in this House, like my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) stoops—stoops, I say, to try to create political capital out of such a question he plays a part, I believe, altogether unworthy of himself and unworthy of the position which he occupies in this House. We have to spend far more on militia than I would like; I wish we could spend far less, I wish we could spend $6,000,000 on agriculture and only half a million on militia, but unfortunately, if the time should come when my hon. friend occupies this seat to which he aspires, instead of heaping condemnation as he does to-day on our conduct, he will not be able to modify at all the policy which we have introduced. It is a part of our system of existence as a nation and cavilling against it is setting a bad example on the eve of what may turn out to be important events.

Mr. FOSTER. What does that mean, signs of war?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, I see signs of war. That is not only the petty war my friend is engaged in—if that was all I would not mind it—but Canada has a population of 6,000,000 of souls, it has a very large extent of territory, it faces on two oceans, and my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) himself remembers that when he was in office, he had to provide for the preparation of war, which I hope is very far distant, although it may come at any moment. It is not probable but, Sir, if my hon. friend is ready to say that, situated as we are, we had better disperse the militia and abandon the preparation we have made, I will be prepared to say we have made a mistake —but he never can say that.

Mr. FOSTER. No, he will leave that to the Minister of Marine.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Sir R. L. Borden) wants to have another investigation. I repeat what I said that so far as the charge of dishonesty in the service is concerned, we have committed that charge to the investigation of Mr. Justice Cassels. So far as the efficiency of the service is concerned, we can keep that in our own hands, it is for us to deal with that, it is for the minister to look into that and provide for a remedy. We have no intention of shirking our duty, we have no intention of placing in the hands of a commission the responsibility which rests upon us. It is for us to administer the affairs of the country. So long as we have the confidence of the people and responsibility to the people we have no intention of shirking our responsibility and placing in other hands the duty that properly rests on us. If the service has deteriorated, it is for us to put it in a better position; if it has to be improved, it is for us to do it. But how is that to be done? First, by amending the law. The commission tell us that the law is deficient. Look at the report of the commission and what is their very first conclusion? The law is deficient and you must change the law. They regret that this was not done before. They call attention to the fact that in 1892 a similar commission reported in exactly the same way and nothing had been done up to the present time. If nothing was done I am not disposed, for my part, to be very severe with the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who at that time was a prominent member of the administration, nor am I disposed to quarrel with the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Haggart) who was also a member of the government at that time; they had before them the report which advised them to reform the civil service, to change the law, I am not disposed to be very severe upon them, because the reform of the civil service is a very difficult task and I do not know whether at that time public opinion was prepared for it. But, Sir, we have come to the conclusion that the time has come to tackle this reform. This was why we appointed the commission. We have now the report of the commission which was placed in our hands on the 17th of March last. The first thing we did was to look at the report, to study it, to investigate it. The next thing was to appoint a com-

mission which has been provided for by the appointment of Mr. Justice Cassels. The third thing was to commence the work of looking into the departments to see what improvements could be made, and the fourth thing was to prepare a Bill, which is now under consideration, to be brought before the House. When we lay that Bill before the House we may resume this discussion, but for the moment I have only to say that we do not intend to depart at all from the position we took at first. The duty is ours and we must face it. There is no reason to have another investigation. We have now had three investigations, one in 1881, one in 1892, one in 1908 and with these we have information enough to do our duty. At all events this is what we propose to do, and I have to say simply this in conclusion that with the responsibility which is upon us we have certain things to do and we intend to do them ourselves; they will be done not through a commission, not through others, but by the party now in office, the government responsible to the people. These are the observations I have to offer to the House on this occasion and I have to say that in my humble judgment, the best thing the House can do is to proceed with the orders of the day and to leave this matter in the hands of the government.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, whatever else the independent onlooker, if such there be, will have to remark with reference to the observations of my right hon. friend this afternoon in reply to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, I am quite sure he would come to the conclusion that the Prime Minister did not make an adequate answer to the case which was presented by the mover of the resolution. If he will permit a criticism from me I would say that his reply seemed to show, either a lack of appreciation of the condition of things as they now exist, or else so great an appreciation of them that he was not able to meet them, and so went off on what I consider to be simply a side issue. He undertook to divert the attention of the House by conjuring up a difference of opinion between the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) and my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, saying that the leader of the opposition wanted more investigation whilst the member for Beauharnois thought there was investigation enough, and quite as much information as was necessary. Well, this was an interesting piece of by-play; but I could not help thinking that my right hon. friend would have been better employed in addressing himself to meet the arguments in the case, rather than in giving us what was at best a figment of his own imagination.

I said that I did not think the right hon. gentleman showed an appreciation of the condition of things as they are to-day. I do not think I would be making too strong an observation if I said that of late years I know of nothing that has produced wider comment and aroused deeper interest than the report of the Civil Service Commission. I do not say that such a report coming simply by itself would have had such effect, but coming as it does at this particular time, it certainly had an effect upon the country at large which is remarkable. and, whether my right hon. friend thinks so or not, has taken a very deep hold of the people of Canada. It follows a number of other incidents and transactions which year by year, for the last five or six years, have been gradually unfolded, and of which the people have taken due cognizance. The right hon. gentleman does not seem to feel that owing to laches, sins of omission and sins of commission by himself and his party since 1896, he has already lost and is still losing in the respect and confidence of a great body of the electorate of Canada. After he came into power and for some years subsequently, he rejoiced in an almost complete adhesion of the provincial legislatures to his party and his cause. Year by year they have been slipping away from him, and have assumed a position of political antagonism. First he lost control by his party friends of the province of Manitoba; then he lost control by his party friends of the right arm of his party, the great province of Ontario; later still, he lost control, against a most determined campaign put up by himself and his colleagues and supporters, of the great province of British Columbia; later still the province of New Brunswick, which for eighteen years had stood behind him and his party, and during the last twelve years without shadow of question. the province of New Brunswick, although the fight on his behalf was engineered by his latest and one of his ablest ministers, has administered a well merited defeat to his Minister of Public Works, and to the federal party after all their intervention in that election. And only yesterday, in the good old city of Halifax, to which two of his party supporters left their places in this House and went down to conduct the fight on party lines for the Dominion and in view of the next federal contest, the city of Halifax has, by an overwhelming majority, changed its political belief as shown in a civic election, and has defeated the Liberal candidates and elected the Conservative candidates for civic office.

My right hon. friend thinks there is nothing in all these signs. He has a compact majority behind him, for various reasons; does he believe that the country is just as

compact behind him? And now, after all these signs of the times, after all the work that has been done by His Majesty's loyal opposition against great odds and great difficulties, after all the glimpses which they have been able to let into the departmental work and the methods of the government of my right hon. friend, comes this Civil Service Commission report. A commission of his own friends, appointed by himself, after a more or less exhaustive examination, has given to the government a report which has aroused more interest than any document that has been presented to this House of Commons for many a long year. Yet my right hon. friend seems to think that all is at peace in Zion, that so long as he can turn around and get ready applause from a large proportion of this House that sit behind him and support him he is safe in vouchsafing no answer, safe in taking any trifling position that he pleases on what is really a very large and very important question.

Some one in the newspapers, probably in the independent press, has remarked as a singular thing that this session at least the Prime Minister, who had a reputation for being politically astute, has been so unfortunate as to take the wrong side on almost every important question that has come up. I believe that will be found to be true. From the fight for the original documents on which my right hon. friend took the wrong side, and from which he afterwards had to retreat, down through a series of positions which he had to face in this House, my right hon. friend has been, for some reason or other, I do not know what particularly, forced to take, or has chosen to take, the wrong, the unconstitutional and the unpopular side.

In the matter of the purchase of supplies for the different departments of this government the right hon. gentleman generally agreed with the principle of the resolution which I had the honour to introduce, but when it came to the practical part of it, in the end, he finished by what? Voting, himself and his whole party, for the continuance of the middleman's operations in the purchase of supplies. And so in reference to question after question. It has been remarked, and I think the observation is very true, that the right hon. gentleman appears to have been forced, for some reason or other, to take the wrong side on a great many of the important questions which have come before us. In the same manner I do not think he has appreciated the gravity of the question which is before the country to-day and I do not think, as I have said before, that he has appreciated the whole situation or met it adequately. In the first place my right hon. friend joins the procession of repudiators—shall I call them? These gentlemen selected their own commission—Mr. Courtney, Mr. Fyshe and Mr. Bazin. They were their own appointees. They declared them to be able men, they had their confidence, they set them to work, they gave them certain powers and these gentlemen acted under these powers and the spectacle is afforded to this House and the country of one minister after another, followed in the end by the right hon. gentleman himself, rising in his place in the House and repudiating his own commission. Why?—because it had a surprise for them. It often does happen that a man has a certain thing in his head and he thinks that is the only thing there is in the universe, but he is surprised some day to find out that there are other things. The main thing in the head of the Prime Minister and of the government was that the commission should simply confine itself to the dry bones of the Civil Service and nothing else. But these gentlemen had certain powers under which they conceived they acted. They acted under them and besides having something to do with the dry bones of the Civil Service system they went further and inquired into certain things with reference to the efficiency of the Civil Service and the methods by which the business of the government, by this Civil Service, was carried on. That is the thing that the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues did not expect would happen. And so, first, the Minister of Marine, secondly, the Minister of Finance, and, thirdly, the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth), and, fourthly, but I am sure not lastly, the Prime Minister himself rise in their places in this House and confess to their annoyance. The right hon. gentleman joins in the caustic criticism of these gentlemen, sneers at them, in fact, for going beyond their duty. Why this surprise? Because it really happens to have operated as a flank movement which was not expected. The right hon. gentleman and his colleauges were devoting themselves to the frontal attack and as poor strategists they forgot that the rear and the flanks should also have been defended. Whilst they can, by their majority in the Public Accounts Committee, prevent investigation into public matters, whilst they can by their majority in this House, prevent information from coming down to members, whilst they can, by their majority in this House, deny any investigation and all investigation into alleged malpractices they forgot to fortify themselves upon the flank and the rear. And whilst they were successful by means of their majority in warding off frontal attack, their own friends, in the spirit of duty and of honesty and of thoroughness lifted the lid upon these governmental transactions and gave the people a glance at the inside. Hence this procession of caustic repudiators who, one after another, get up and flagellate the commission that they themselves appointed and sneer at the men that they themselves made their

own Royal Commission. Well, we will let that go to the country. The exhibition is one of bad taste, it is one, I think, of very poor policy, the average man in the country will easily see through it and it will not count to the advantage of the government.

The right hon. First Minister said that it was the duty of this commission simply to inquire into the efficiency of the Civil Service Act and that it was no part of their duty to investigate into transactions. But they did investigate some transactions in one part of one department and they came upon appearances of dishonesty and now the second commission has been appointed, as the right hon. gentleman with an odd failure to appreciate the meaning of language, declared to continue and complete the work of the first commission. If Mr. Justice Cassels had been appointed to continue and complete the work of the first commission, as they themselves conceived their work was to be, this side of the House would have no objection to Mr. Justice Cassels being appointed to continue the work of the first commission, but let the right hon. gentleman as well as this House clearly see what this commission means and the purpose for which it has been appointed. It was not appointed for the purpose of continuing and completing the work of the first commission. What was the work of the first commission as under authority given to them and as understood by themselves ? It was to look into the Civil Service system certainly, to inquire as to its efficiency, and, as well, to make recommendations as to how it could be made more efficient, but when you come to No. 8 and No. 10 of the subjects mentioned in the order in council you see that there are other powers that are given them. No. 8 reads 'Efficiency and sufficiency of the departmental staffs.' How could that commission come to a conclusion as to the efficiency and sufficiency of the departmental staffs unless they followed the work of these departmental staffs and found out how it was done, not only if it was efficiently done. Is efficiently the only characteristic of the civil service ? It was also important to inquire whether it was honestly done because honesty must be a characteristic of the Civil Service ; whether it was done in a businesslike way, whether it was extravagantly done, whether it was wastefully done, in fine, whether it was properly or improperly done. How were the Civil Service Commission, as appointed, to come to a conclusion as to the efficiency and sufficiency of the departmental staffs unless they followed their business from A to Z ? And in following out that business what did they find ? They found what they have embodied in the report, that instead of there being efficiency there was inefficiency, instead of there being any sign of a directive head in the Department of Marine and Fisheries there was no sign of it, instead of there being any conscience in that department, not in the individuals in the department—that is not what the commission says—but in the department itself, they found that there was a lack of conscience, they found waste, they found extravagance, they found mal-administration. In the very duty that they had to carry out to determine whether the staffs were efficient and sufficient they were bound to go into that kind of an examination. They went into one-half of the Department of the Marine and Fisheries, namely, the Marine part of it, and they did not get half through with that, but they found what has angered the government, what has somewhat astonished the country and what has proved up to the hilt the charges that His Majesty's loyal opposition have been making for the last five years.

But, Sir, they had another power given to them. They were to look into 'any other matter relative to the service which in the opinion of the commissioners requires consideration, that was a wide power; that power led them into questions as to the purchases and as to whether retail or wholesale prices were paid, and as to whether there was prudence, economy or honesty or not in these purchases, and it led them to some most astonishing results and to some very cogent conclusions which to-day are reverberating through this country and having their influence on public opinion. I tell the right hon. gentleman that he must take back his words or else he must make Judge Cassels commission just as broad as was the commission of the three gentlemen who were first appointed. On 'Hansard' he will find his statement: that Judge Cassels has been appointed a commission to complete and continue the inquiry begun by the first commission—not to continue and complete the inquiry that the government supposed these commissioners were going to make but that they actually have been making for the last six months. But is Judge Cassels's commission as wide as has been stated ? Not at all. It is absolutely whittled down to the fine end of nothing in comparison. Judge Cassels is not to prosecute the inquiry which was committed to these gentlemen. These gentlemen if they had been given full time and full power would have lifted the lid from the Fisheries part of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and in lifting that lid I can imagine the caustic conclusions they would come to and the biting notes they would jot down on the margin, when they came to look for instance at the system of lighthouse and buoy service on the St. Lawrence and on the great lakes; and for instance the parcelling out of the great future fishing resources of this country at $10 a year to favourites and supporters and friends of the government, and the giving over to

them for twenty-one years, the absolute exclusive right to fish commercially in the great fishing areas of the Northwest, and to sell the products.

Mr. SPROULE. And renewable for another term.

Mr. FOSTER. And renewable in some cases for another term. But, Sir, if this gentleman were to do what the other commissioners had sarted out to do and had partly done. Judge Cassels in continuing and completing that work would have knocked at the door of the Interior Department at which we have been knocking for four or five years and which we have had banged in our face; and if Judge Cassels had got entrance to that department as the first Civil Service Commission did to a portion of the Marine and Fisheries Department, I can imagine what would have been the caustic conclusions and the biting margin notes that would be penned. I can imagine what the conclusions would be with reference to the land deals, with reference to the timber leases, with reference to the giving away to favourites of vast tracts of grass and agricultural lands, of the letting down of the bars this day, the driving in of a number of favourites to-morrow, the putting up of the bars the next day thus giving to the half dozen that had been herded in twenty-one years' grazing lease, irrevocable, which they could sell in the markets of the world and make into fortunes for themselves. I could imagine with what caustic notes these gentlemen would have followed the case of the romantic Brown who was hunted for with such extreme diligence for three and a half years and who turned up at last in the pockets of Mr. Adamson, M.P., sitting behind the government and always supporting them. I imagine with what caustic notes they would have treated the giving over to Hitchcock and McGregor, two heelers and supporters of the Minister of the Interior, nearly 100,000 acres of irrevocable grazing leases with power to buy 9,500 acres selected out of the whole of it at a dollar an acre, which they did. and sold directly afterwards for $12 an acre. And, Sir, in connection with the Robbin's irrigation scheme what gems of thought would have been developed by Mr. Fyshe and by Mr. Courtney as they followed the still more romantic career of the young man Robbins, a penniless Englishman, without capital and without friends, cheeky to the point of stepping up to the Minister of the Interior and asking him to sell him 380,000 acres of land at $3 an acre with the proviso that $2 should be paid back to him when he should have irrigated one quarter of the land and a further proviso that no payments should be made until 1910. How beautifully they would have followed out the rippling course of that young man from England as he passed like a whirlwind through the Interior Department and in thirty days and less carried off his grant of 380,000 acres and deposited it in the lap of Hitchcock and McGregor, so that these two privileges put together could be marketed on the English market at a profit of $800,000 and over. Oh, how they would have lifted the lid on the fake homesteading in the Northwest; how they would have lifted the lid on the devious dealings of men in the employ and pay of this government in the Northwest who are lining their own pockets by carrying on land speculations and the sale of lands with the information they get from their governmental positions. Oh, with what caustic beauty—if such an expression may be allowed—Mr. Fyshe would have set out these things if he once got inside the Interior Department. And then Sir, what unheard stories he would have to tell if he gained entrance to the Department of Public Works, than which there is none other to be compared in its conscienceless system of dredging, in its equally conscienceless system of building public works without any regard to fitness or to the price or to the manner in which they are built; with its beautiful supervision of tailor clerks and absentee supervisors; men who take charge of scows and who never look at the scows and allow them to be loaded and the prices paid without check. All this, if followed out by the first commissioners—or by the second commissioners in the spirit of the first commissioners—would have made beautiful reading for the electorate of Canada. Now, my right hon. friend may I ask you: Is not that exactly what your first commission did in so far as it had time. It got at half of one department that of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and if it had had time and had been allowed to do so it would have gone to the inside of every one of these departments. That is what the first commission would have done. Now, I put it to my right hon. friend: Take back your words that the second commission is constiuted to continue and complete what the first commission was doing, or else come up in a manly way and tell the country just exactly why you appointed the second commission and what you propose to get by it. The right hon. gentleman will not answer, and therefore I will try to devise an answer for him. The second commission was appointed for several purposes. One was to absolve the minister put within the danger zone—to absolve him from any responsibility in connection with the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

I am old-fashioned enough to think that it is the duty of a minister, when he takes hold of a department, and takes his oath as an administrator, and accepts the salary, to make himself reasonably quickly and reasonably well-informed with reference to

the business of the department over which he is to preside. My hon. friend does not lack in intelligence; he had two years in that department; he had years before that side by side with his colleague who preceded him in that department, and men in one department know a good deal of what goes on in another when they sit together in council and foregather as they do from day to day. My hon. friend visited the city of Quebec, visited Sorel, visited Montreal, visited Brockville, went to St. John, I believe, and to Halifax; and his own star witness, Mr. Richards, who had but casual acquaintance with these places, testified on oath before the Public Accounts Committee that any intelligent man could have walked into any of these places and seen exactly what he saw, though perhaps they could not state as well as he what would be the best way to go about a revision of the evils most quickly and most thoroughly. Now, what was my hon. friend doing during those two years? May I answer? He was too busy thinking of the party and of the political side of the administration; too busy parcelling out offices; too busy lying awake nights thinking what he would give here and what he would give there to strengthen his influence against his colleagues and to strengthen the influence of his party against the opposing party. That is what took up his time. But, Sir, he is guilty before this House and this country for allowing a state of things which was spread on the files of his office, and which he himself, by the merest walking through the domain of this department, could easily have known. He was guilty of allowing that department, which was pretty thoroughly demoralized by his predecessor, to sink lower and lower until it arrived at the stage where it had no directive power, no loyalty, no head directing it, and no conscience within.

Well, let us see about this doctrine of ministerial responsibility. There have been other days and other expounders of that doctrine. I believe the Hon. David Mills was a pretty thoroughly informed man on constitutional law; he prided himself on that; he was the champion of his party on that line when in opposition; he was made Minister of Justice; he was afterwards translated to the bench. He has all the qualifications which render an opinion valuable. Now, what did Mr. Mills say in 1893?

> We do not want to interpose between the responsibility of ministers to this House in the discharge of their duties as ministers, any one deputy or otherwise, who apparently limit the power that a minister should possess, but who really carry out the minister's behests. Why should we say that a deputy should make such a recommendation? It is the minister's business to know the work of the office. The minister, if he does his duty, knows as well as the deputy; it is impossible that it can be otherwise. The theory of our government is not that the deputy minister is responsible, but that the minister is responsible, and if the minister is responsible, we ought not to impose limitations upon the discretionary authority of the minister. Let the hon. gentleman look at the English organization as set out by Mr. Todd; does he find any such limitation there upon the authorities of ministers? There is but one limitation, and that it is with regard to appointments to office.

This expression from Mr. Mills is particular and definite, and besides, it is a true statement of the case. Well, one object of this commission was to contract the Minister of Marine and Fisheries out of his responsibility in that department. I put it to the Prime Minister whether I am within the facts of the case or not. All that Mr. Cassels is by that commission empowered to look into and report upon is as to whether certain subordinates of that department have dishonestly or inefficiently sacrificed the money of the country in the matter of supplies and of payments. It was stated by the commissioners that from the outlook of the business, as they had gone into it, it would seem that there were officers in the department who were making it easy for the trader to get more than he ought to get. Now, the officer of the department might have had a good reason for making it easy for the seller of goods to get more than he should have got, and for thinking that in doing so he was doing exactly what the minister would have liked him to do, or what the minister absolutely ordered him to do. Does my hon. friend deny that? One of the Tory 'goats,' as the elegant and somewhat imprudent Minister of Justice declared in his own county a few weeks ago—one of them is Mr. Gregory, it is said, of the city of Quebec. He was brought to book by the commission, and it is spread upon the report that Mr. Gregory paid more than was proper for certain things. Mr. Gregory was the agent of the government in the city of Quebec. Here is a letter on page 76, dated May 3rd, 1905:

> Dear Mr. Gregory,—Young Willie Walsh, who represents McColl Brothers & Company, Montreal agents for Vesta boiler compound, has asked me to say a good word to you for him; and if the material is as good as represented, I hope you will place some orders in his way.

That is fairly modest. That is signed by a minister of the cabinet.

> May 6, 1905.—Mr. Leo C. Walsh——

Not Willie Walsh this time, though it is the same man——

> Mr. Leo C. Walsh, representing McColl Brothers & Company, will call on you, probably Tuesday, in reference to some oil. If you can give him an order I will feel obliged. —R. P.

Which means Raymond Préfontaine. There is a minister of the department pratically odering his subordinate, who is supposed to be doing the government service but who, under the interpretation made by this government, is doing the party service —practically ordering his subordinate—for it amounts to that—to give Willie Walsh a good contract. if he wants to be grateful to his minister, R. P. That is one of the little things left on record ; but where that is left on record, how much is done by word of mouth, how much is done by letter, and the letters not kept on file. Let us go a little further. They raised Cain with Mr. Gregory because of certain fire extinguishers. But it afterwards comes out that the minister himself had ordered $9,000 worth of these extinguishers. It turns out that another man, who had some extinguishers and the proper influence, Mr. P. E. Perreault, 312 St. John street, Quebec, was advised to call upon Mr. Gregory, and sell him a lot of fire extinguishers. Mr. Perreault was afterwards an employee of the agency and he had a lot of fire extinguishers on hand which he would like to sell the department. So the department was advised of this, and in the end it was considered best to take them off the employee's hands, although the department had $9,000 of them bought just before, besides a large quantity in stock.

With reference to this oil called Kantslip, it turns out that they had more Kantslip down there than they knew what to do with. Mr. Gregory says :

An opportunity some time after occurred when I saw the late minister here and spoke to him, as it seemed to me that the firm had taken advantage of his kindness about the matter. He told me to keep the goods and try to get rid of them to the best advantage, which I did by distributing them around where I understood the Kanslip could be used on belts, &c. If any has been sent where it was not really required, I shall see that it is removed where it can be used to advantage.

Does that not abundantly carry out what I was explaning. that you may have men in the autocratic employ of ministers, who are interested in having their favourites given contracts, and who order their subordinates to give an advantage to their favourites under the penalty of disobedience to orders and thus displeasing their official head. So it may be that there are officials in that department who have really given a contractor a chance to make the most but have given it, not because they were personally dishonest, but because they felt the pressure from above and felt bound to see that the party friends got the best of the transaction.

So when Judge Cassels sits on the bench performing these coroner's duties, as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) so expressively explained to the House last night, he will sit in the position—if I understand anything of the value of English words—where, the very moment any question comes up of connecting wrong business methods with the minister, he will be told by the counsel that this is outside of his commission and that he has no power at all. That is what I mean when I say that instead of appointing a royal commission to look into these matters in the public interest, the minister himself has appointed a commission to simply look into the deeds of subordinates and find out whether or not any of them have taken commissions or unduly obtained public money in the purchase of supplies or the payment therefor. That is the duty of Judge Cassels and his duty only ; but even that duty is circumscribed by the fact, according to the Minister of Justice that he is not expected to look into this whole matter himself. There are files to be gone through ad infinitum, years to be gone over, 1904, 5, 6, 7, 8—why it would take Judge Cassels years and years to make the whole investigation himself ; and that is why the Minister of Justice said he took the responsibility of appointing counsel. It is the counsel who are to look into these things. They will see what papers are to be scanned. They are to look over the files judicially and carefully. They are to designate the cases that are to be brought to light—and they alone. They are to steer the whole investigation, and they are to put the facts and cases before the judge who occupies a judicial position. So says the Minister of Justice. This commission is intended to have the effect of relieving the minister entirely of responsibility. And it is intended to have this other effect. Just as in the case of that deceptive and partial investigation into the transactions connected withe the 'Arctic', so in this case my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) stands before the people and exclaims : I have appointed a new commission to continue and complete the work which was begun by the first commission. That is a fine song for the people. That will make elegant headlines in the Toronto 'Globe', which is so zealous for the truth. That will be used ad infinitum by the party papers all through. See how our Premier meets the situation. When the first commission after seven months' examination made a partial report, our Premier appointed Judge Cassels to continue what the first commission had undertaken but had not finished. That goes to the people, that is read by the newspapers to the faithful, that is headlined and that is relied upon ; but when it comes down to the naked fact, he has estopped Judge Cassels from looking into a single transaction in any department outside of the Department of Marine and Fisheries and has estopped him from looking into any transaction there unless it involves the dishonesty of a subordinate in the Marine branch. That is what

the commission does. If it were to continue and complete the work undertaken by the last commission, Judge Cassels, on Friday or whenever he starts in, would find every door of every department at Ottawa open to him to look into its transactions and judge by the results as to the efficiency and the sufficiency of the departmental staff; and any other subject that he thought was necessary to be inquired into for the same purpose. What this commission does, is simply setting aside by a rather bold but at the same time transparent fiction, the real issue, trying to blind the people's minds while at the same time giving a semblance of a commission to get out what my right hon. friend so valiantly declared over and over again, he wanted, the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. The last thing that my hon. friend wants in this matter is the whole truth. I am anxious that the country shall know exactly what this second commission is to do, what it can do and what it cannot do. What it does I have declared, what it does not do but what the first commission did is to enter any other department, to look into any single transaction anywhere, to look into any dishonesty of action anywhere except in the cases that are brought to its attention in that report as to one department. I ask my right hon. friend what the inferences are? Is it possible that the only lame duck you have in that government is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries? Can it be possible that such a state of thing exists in one department and nothing like it in any other department? Can it be that the people will not argue in that way? People will say: There sits Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Mr. Fielding, Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Paterson, they are conducting this government, because they are the dominant members of the cabinet. In one branch of their work see what has happened—what in the world is taking place in the other branches? Will you open the lid and let the country see? No, Sir, you clamp it down and use Judge Cassels and a fiction commission in order to clamp it down and by making a show to the people that you are doing something to continue and complete the work done by the first commission.

My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) flies to the rescue of Judge Cassels. It is not necessary. Judge Cassels, by his reputation and his action in this matter, has pretty well taken care of himself. What a surprise it must have been to the Minister of Justice, lord of all the judges, as I believe he once described himself, to get a polite note from Judge Cassels saying: 'I had no intimation of my appointment until I read it in the newspapers.' These gentlemen have gone on so long that they think every judge is tarred with the same stick. Having had to do with Judge MacTavish and that ilk they think that Judge Cassels and the others are the same and so, without consultation, they appointed him to do the work and had already agreed on the sum in addition to his own salary which they would offer him for doing that extra work. They have found that Judge Cassels is made of different stuff from Judge MacTavish. He immediately administered a reproof to these gentlemen, saying: I think you might have consulted me before you asked me to leave my pressing duties in the Exchequer Court and undertake this investigation; I will not take any salary or emolument other than what I get as judge of the Exchequer Court and I want to be appointed by parliament and not by a simple minister. Certain of these things Judge Cassels has got; certain others he has not. But it was not necessary for my right hon. friend to fly to the defence of Judge Cassels who has shown that in these particulars he is well able to take care of himself. But the right hon. gentleman flew with terrible alacrity —with lightning wings he cleft the air in order to go to the rescue of those two bright particular stars, the counsel who have been appointed in the case. In that he was more ready than the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice talked for an hour or so, but in all his talk he never mentioned Mr. Perron once. Mr. Watson he knew, Mr. Watson he would vouch for, Mr. Watson was a crony of his own, Mr. Watson was a lawyer of the highest repute—I take the responsibility of his appointment. Thank you, Mr. Minister of Justice, but whether you take that responsibility or not does not make a bit of difference, it is the government that shoulders the responsibility for the appointment of counsel, the Minister of Justice is only the machine through which it is made, that is all. But was it not a little odd I ask you, Mr. Minister of Marine, that your own colleague, the Minister of Justice, never put in a single word for Mr. Perron who is the counsel appointed from the province of Quebec? Was it an oversight or was Mr. Perron not so much a crony of the Minister of Justice as was Mr. Watson? There it stands, but the right hon. gentleman came to the defence of both and what a model defence and what a novel defence it was! My right hon. friend in this year of his political life and after all his political and partisan acts in his government, assumes a face filled with indignation and overflowing with wisdom and enunciates the doctrine that it does not make to him a pin's difference what the political affiliations of a counsel are, these are never taken into consideration and should not be taken in consideration. Very good. Will my right hon. friend take his pencil and note down all the commis-

sions he has appointed, all the special committees he had appointed. all the counsel he has appointed for grave and other matters of public necessity, and point out one single instance wherein he forgot what was the political affiliation of the counsel? But it just happened that in a moment of somnolence or of weakness, to quote a phrase sometimes quoted by my hon. friend, in a moment of weakness he appointed one Shepley to undertake a very important piece of work and utterly forgot at the time what his political affiliations were. He likewise appointed Judge McTavish as a high court, in a way, and utterly forgot that Judge McTavish had political proclivities and affiliations nearly allied to his own. He appointed Judge Britton, that grand old independent hero without any political affiliations. Whenever a departmental commission is to be appointed he forgets that there are any political affiliations, but he always wins out by having all Grits on that commission or a majority of Grits on any parliamentary committee so as to keep things taut. What a splendidly novel and bold defence that was that the Prime Minister made this afternoon. Certainly it must have its effect on the country.

But, says he, George Brown was defended by Hilliard Cameron; a lawyer's honour binds him to his client. So it does. Who is the client of these gentlemen? Who creates them? Who pays them? Who instructs them, verbally or otherwise? Somebody else who has no political affiliation at all. And here I want to protest once more against the action of the Minister of Justice in giving his verbal instructions to Mr. Perron and verbal instructions to Mr. Watson, though he said in his speech that they had been supplemented by written instructions in the case of Mr. Watson. Is the same old game to be played? Political cronies, vitally interested in the success of their party and government, of which one is a member and the other is a partisan supporter, sitting down together and talking over the whole situation, and one of these, the member of the government, giving his verbal instructions to the other! Will he follow them, as he followed the others, by written instructions designed to guide them, pointing out just the course they should take and the precise time when the bomb should be exploded? Did he, in this case as in the other? Never a more bigoted political partisan occupied the seat of the Minister of Justice than the man who occupies it to-day. What about Mr. Watson? A good lawyer. Who says he is not ? He would not have been chosen by this partisan government for this purpose unless he had been a good lawyer. Mr. Watson may not have the very strongest and best inquisitorial powers, but he has shown that he has great repressive powers. He showed these repressive powers in the West Elgin election. Older now, more experienced, growing somewhat heavier may be with age, who doubts that his repressive powers are stronger than ever they were ten years ago? And if they are brought to bear with equal success on the files of the department, on the cases to be tried, on the particular complexion of the officer who is to be remodelled, why it may have an effect similar to that it had in the West Elgin case. And how beautifully it fits in for the Minister of Justice, the unpartisan Minister of Justice, who appoints Judge Cassels to find out who is guilty, if anybody, of the subordinates, then to walk up into his own constituency and pass judgment on the delinquents before any inquiry was made by the judge, and declared them to be Tory officials. Here is what he said, I have it from the Globe:

> Mr. Brodeur was going to investigate for himself, the sheep will be weeded out from the goats.

He was not a gardener at that time, was not a shepherd either, but a sort of hybrid between a gardener and a shepherd, and so he got the metaphor somewhat mixed. However, what he meant is clear:

> The sheep will be weeded out from the goats, the Tory goats who deserve dismissal and they will have fit punishment meted out to them which they have gained for themselves.

There is your Minister of Justice, delightfully unpartisan. Will not the Prime Minister lecture him a little in the doctrine of non-political sentiments and feelings when he approaches a great state question? There is this gentleman who has prejudged the whole thing, creating counsel and sitting down and giving him verbal instructions. And yet we are asked to think that it will be carried out on the square? I do not believe it for a moment, neither will the country.

Now, I come to another branch of the subject. We are not alone at fault, said the First Minister, and he made a dramatic gesture, and asked some one to get up and throw a stone. Who will cast the first stone? says the Prime Minister. Well, that was statesmanlike, I must say. May I ask my right hon. friend where any reform in the wide world could ever take place if that answer was supposed to be sufficient? Here is a man who is brought up before a judge, accused of a crime, the evidence is getting pretty close and pretty hot, and he says: Your honour, John Smith did the same thing ten years ago and he was not punished. According to the doctrine of the Prime Minister, the judge will have to say: Go about your business and sin no more. Exactly on the same plane. What ineffable foolishness it is for the Prime Minister, of all men in the world, to meet a demand for revision and betterment in the great civil service of Canada, to say: We are not worse than you were; get up and

cast the first stone if you can. It is not a question of casting a stone. People are getting wiser, systems are getting to be better understood, new ideas supervene, the experience of the world is constantly growing, and one age will endure what another age will not endure. So it is with reference to the civil service; and if my opinion is worth anything, Canada to-day is waking up to the importance of an improved civil service. Just here I beg to say that if my right hon. friend will bring in a Civil Service Act, prohibiting the features of influence, partisanship, and political appointments, he will have my most hearty support; and if he will press that to the very end of eliminating patronage from every purchase and every appointment by the government, he will have my support as well.

But my right hon. friend was not quite right. He says there was a commission in 1880. So there was, and after the commission of 1880 what was done? The Civil Service Act of 1882 was brought in and passed, and has been on the books ever since, adopting the principle of a civil service examining board, of a qualification and a promotion examination, and of a classification test. In 1892 another commission was appointed, I have the report of that commission in my desk. The report of that commission is worth studying by my right hon. friend, and especially by his Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance the other night tried to lead us to suppose that the report of the commission of 1892 was just as strong as the report of the commission of 1908. Any one who will read it will see the absolute difference. On the question of the operation of a civil service system, it was equally strong in 1892 as it is in 1908. In 1892 Mr. Barbeau and Mr. Hague, two members of that commission, went round the offices in Ottawa, looked them all through, made their comments on them, and with reference to this Department of Marine and Fisheries put in their report a statement which was read by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition to-day. That, Sir, was in 1891 and 1892. Then they said that with the exception of some obsolete methods of bookkeeping here and there through the departments, the departments were fairly well run, but in reference to that special department, they commended it because of its rigid oversight of its business and because of the fact that the supplies were economically bought. On that part of the report contrast 1892 with 1908 which has to do with the efficiency and sufficiency of the departmental staffs and methods of business; this commission's report is absolutely new and is absolutely clear on that point. In both you have the patronage system declared and execrated, but in this one it is ten, yes twenty times as strongly declared as it was in 1892.

But, may I call my right hon. friend's attention to one thing? He and the Finance Minister declared that nothing was done. Nothing done? In 1893 we introduced, on the top of that commission, three Bills. The commission reported in favour of a civil service board to consist of a permanent chairman and four deputy heads, appointment by competitive examination, clerks to be selected from the roster as established by competitive examination by the board, the superannuation system to be continued and an insurance system if it could be applied properly. In 1893 our government introduced an insurance Bill for the civil service, placed it on the statute-book and it remains there yet. We introduced a Bill strengthening the superannuation system by propounding and establishing fund No. 2 on a more equitable basis to the employees with six per cent interest allowed by the government and that was largely taken advantage of. And we introduced on February 3, 1893, a civil service Bill providing for a civil service board and for the strict supervision of the appointments to office and of the methods of conducting the business of the civil service in all the departments. Where was my right hon. friend? He rose and objected to it. Mr. Mills rose and objected to it. Both of them objected to it on principle and my right hon. friend moved the six months' hoist. Yet the Minister of Finance declared that we did nothing and my right hon. friend declared that we were quits as bad as they were. Well, we will see now what they do. I just leave that as a corrective of something which has been stated in the House and which is not quite correct.

One thing that amused me—and that expresses it exactly because it did not frighten me—was the forced denunciation of my hon. friend (Mr. Broder) by the First Minter. It was really a fine dramatic act. I and others sitting here and facing the chief actor could not help but admire the way in which enthusiasm and indignation were worked up and the splendid denunciatory tone in which the invective was launched against Andrew Broder. What was it that my right hon. friend found fault with Mr. Broder for? Mr. Broder, he said, went before a meeting of farmers—tinder, you know! Farmers and farming questions are something like tinder; you are apt to get a great, quick, and mighty prejudice aroused amongst a lot of farmers on a farming question! Mr. Broder actually went before the farmers and ventured to tell the farmers that the present government was extravagant in its expenditures for the militia and parsimonious in its expenditures for agriculture! That was the whole thing. He did it of course, by an object lesson—so many millions for the militia and only half a million for pure agriculture, so many dollars for war and so many dollars for peace. It was the object lesson method of present-

ing the fact to the irascible and excitable farming audience that he had before him and he actually worked upon their prejudice to the detriment of the defence of this country, and my right hon friend blossomed out into a full grown champion of war and all the trappings of war. Why ? The one distinction that crowns the brow of the First Minister in Europe as well as in America is that he is a peace-at-any-price man. He hates militarism. He has vehemently denounced the militarism of the old country and fought against its being introduced into this country. He swept aside all the inducements for the colonies and Great Britain to get closer together because the spectre of militarism was above him day and night and frightened him. To-day he rather insinuates that some big thing is going to burst upon us in the shape of an unknown and contingent war and that Mr. Broder has been exciting the prejudices of the farmers against the proper defence of Canada. But, oh, Mr. Speaker, I did believe that it was a very fine play when I saw a portion of the audience that listened to him, said portion being the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries, for, in 1896, when I, as Minister of Finance proposed a vote of $1,000,000 in order to get some large artillery for this Dominion, absolutely defenceless, in so far as that arm was concerned at that time, the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries denounced the project in this House, went down to the province of Quebec, toured through that province, got together audiences of his fellow-countrymen, wept tears and made them weep tears as he portrayed to them the foul iniquity of the Tories at Ottawa in putting up a vote of a million dollars for war in this country, the ultimate result of which would be that the French woman's sons would be torn from their arms and sent out to defend distant portions of the empire. Did my right hon. friend administer any rebuke to his friend and supporter, the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries when he appealed to the prejudice of race against the defence of Canada and against proper arming as regards large artillery at some of the ports ? Not at all. He gloried in it and he thanked God for every vote he got by that kind of mechanism. Oh, these strange metamorphisms that at the last moment even gentlemen like my right hon. friend will be led to exhibit before the House and the country ! But my right hon. friend ended up by saying : We do not want any more investigations. That was one thing that I believed if I believed nothing else that he said during that speech. He and his party have shown that they do not want investigation. They have shown it in the Public Accounts Committee, shown it in this House, shown it in refusing us information before we voted supplies, shown it in refusing to us investigation as to how supplies were expended after they had been voted and, time after time, has called his followers here to stand up against any beginnings of an adequate investigation into any department. Two years ago my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) moved for an investigation into the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Then they all said : It is a pure and honest and efficient department, you shall not have any investigation. We trotted out the Merwins, we trotted in the Strubbes, we trotted in all the Brookes and the others, and we showed how they were fleecing right and left the Marine and Fisheries Department, and yet they would not allow us an investigation. My right hon. friend does not want any more investigations, but I venture to say that the people of this country do, and that they are bound to have more investigations. And so it is that the motion of the leader of the opposition, asking for what the Prime Minister says he has provided for, but which he has in reality estopped a continuation and completion of the work commenced by the first commission, is a motion which this side of the House can support and one which I believe he country will endorse. But, Sir, the man who wants the truth and the whole truth appoints a gentleman like Mr. Perron from the city of Montreal—I am saying nothing as to Mr. Perron's ability as a lawyer ; what I am saying is that for nine long years Mr. Perron was the partner of the minister whose subordinates are to be brought up before Judge Cassels in this investigation ; that he was not only a business-in-law partner with him but that he was a partner in Mr. Préfontaine's private and other concerns, and it is stated upon the streets of Montreal that he had a great many dealings with parties who had dealings with the minister and the departments. That is the kind of man —outside of his legal abilities entirely—a man who was the partner of the incriminated one for nine years, of the same political belief, engaged in the same schemes, profiting from the same enterprises ; that is the man that my right hon. friend has had the grace to interpose between truth and the public of this country in the investigation to be held by Judge Cassels. I miss my guess if the people of this country do not condemn that kind of thing. They like to see the game played fairly and they would have some idea that it was being played fairly if my right hon. friend had forgotten for a moment political bias and had placed a strong independent lawyer, or if he wanted two lawyers, a strong Conservative lawyer on that investigation and allowed the people some chance. The government by theory represents the people—this government by practice if not by theory represents its own selfish party interests and

looks after those interests. And, to qualify these two gentlemen as being counsel for the people of Canada is a misnomer. They are created by and paid by and they will be rewarded by the party who has called them to thus interpose between a certain investigation and the people who demand it.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I rather regret and I am a litle surprised at the course of the speeches of the hon. leader of the opposition and the hon. member for North Toronto. I had supposed when we were going to have a discussion on the report of the Civil Service Commission that we would have a discussion on the best way to improve the civil service of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. We will have that later.

Mr. FISHER. I am glad to hear that. I remember that a little while ago the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) had a motion on the paper for that purpose. He dropped it.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman knows why I dropped it.

Mr. FISHER. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman might state that.

Mr. FISHER. I intend to. My hon. friend need not be so impatient.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to keep you from falling into difficulties.

Mr. FISHER. You need not be alarmed; it is not my habit.

Mr. FOSTER. What about that letter—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FISHER. Will my hon. friend have patience ?

Mr. FOSTER. What about that letter the hon. gentleman got from Japan that he never got, and that he told this House he had when he never had it ?

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend dropped that motion for the purpose of discussing civil service reform. I had hoped he was going to discuss that question to-night, but instead of following his better bent he has taken up the role of a partisan and indulged in one of his usual speeches of that character. The leader of the opposition in his opening remarks said that when he read the report of the Civil Service Commission he thought, from a certain phrase in it, that it was a campaign document.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of the Liberal party.

Mr. FISHER. Of the Liberal party. I suppose my hon. friend had his mind so occupied with the idea that he intended to make a campaign document of this for the Conservative party, that he thought it was intended for that purpose.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It spoke for itself.

Mr. FISHER. It speaks for itself and if my hon. friend tries to he can find a great deal of good in it. But he prefers to try to make a campaign document of it and to turn it to his party political purposes rather than to draw from it anything for the benefit of the Civil Service of Canada. The hon. gentleman mentioned the fact that in a speech at Halifax last summer he laid down civil service reform as one of the planks of the Conservative platform. I believe he did on that occasion, but while I followed with some interest his tour throughout Canada I saw but little, after he left Halifax, of many things he had in the Halifax platform and I do not remember—subject to correction—that he dealt very insistently in other parts of the Dominion on that plank of his platform.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On 90 per cent at least of the occasions on which I spoke I addressed myself to that subject.

Mr. FISHER. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement, but judging from the press reports of his various speeches I fear that part of them did not make so great an impression on the public or on the newspaper reporters who heard him as other parts of his speeches did. At all events, to-day the hon. gentleman is attempting to make a campaign document out of the report of the Civil Service Commission. I regret that. I spoke from the heart when I said that I would have hoped that we might discuss civil service reform and not party politics. However, my hon. friend is free to take whatever course he pleases. Now, the civil service reports which have been before the public of Canada from that of 1881 to that of 1908, are all full of strictures upon the political aspects of the civil service and of remarks about the evil effects of politics upon the Civil Service of Canada. I have no doubt whatever—speaking for myself and I think speaking for the inmost thoughts of everybody in the sound of my voice—that political influences are a serious detriment to the civil service, and that the result of political influence in this country is the same as it has been in England and in the United States in years past before civil service reform had been forced upon the people.

My hon. friend quotes these strictures in the report of the commission of 1908 with the evident intent of trying to hurt the present government, as though those strictures were only and entirely levelled at the civil service under the administration of the present government. I have here the report of 1881, which says this:

While there exists in the public mind a very general belief that the civil service is

defective and inefficient and that the true remedy is the abolition of political patronage and personal favouritism in making appointments to public offices, there is on the other hand an impression that it is difficult and almost impracticable to apply the remedy.

I find later on, under the subject of appointment to office, the following:

The present mode of nomination by political influence and appointment, without examination as to qualification, which prevails so very generally in the service, seems to us, and is frankly confessed by the majority of the witnesses we have examined, to be defective in the highest degree.

There are many other statements of the same character. But the report contains recommendations, which seem at that time to have fallen upon deaf ears. In reference to the Act of 1868, which was then in force, that the commission said this:

The Act contained certain provisions under which departure could be made from what appear to have been intended as the fixed rules of the statute; and thus departure became in time the rule rather than the exception, so much so that the means which the Act proposed to provide for the admission of properly qualified persons to the public service became practically obsolete. It also established a civil service board, to which certain duties were assigned, but owing to the absence of any power or authority therein to enforce the recommendations of the board this provision of the Act became inoperative.

In 1875 a Bill was introduced by the government which, however, did not become law.

In 1877 a committee of the House of Commons was appointed to inquire into the condition of the civil service. This committee examined many witnesses, and we desire to state our sense of the value of its proceedings and of the evidence taken which has been of considerable use to us in the course of our investigations. It presented a report containing various comments on the evidence and suggestions for the government of the departments. No legislation resulted, however, and the public service continued to be administered under the provisions of the Act of 1868, and such interpretation of those provisions as were made from time to time by orders in council and departmental regulations.

They go on to say:

We did not conceal from ourselves that there may be doubts as to whether the public opinion of the Dominion is even now fully alive to the importance of a thoroughly efficient civil service, or, on the other hand, has recognized rights on the part of the service, such as have long since been conceded in other countries.

Here is another extract:

Apart from any specific statements made in the evidence, we find in its general tenor and in what we have ourselves observed, abundant reasons for the conclusions that the service requires reform, and that it has not been sufficiently guarded against the evil effects of political patronage.

They wind up with this statement.

Political patronage is responsible for other evils, and we do not hesitate to express the conviction that many unnecessary civil offices have been retained, and that new places have been created, for no better purpose than to provide for the followers of influential politicians.

The recommendations in that report were directly in the line of competitive examinations under an independent civil service board. A law was passed in 1882, based largely on this report, but the essentials of the report were not carried out in that law, inasmuch as no independent board of civil service commissioners were appointed, and no competitive examinations were inaugurated. The result was that the civil service went on from 1881 very much in the same way as it did before. But we come to the report of 1892, made when the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was a member of the government, and what do we find in that report? We find the same condition of affairs described exactly as it was in the report of 1881. Referring to the report of 1881, the report of 1892 says:

Following this report a new Civil Service Act was passed in 1882, which provided for examinations to test the qualifications of candidates for positions in the public service, and also for the examination of candidates for promotion. This Act, although not going so far in its provisions as was recommended by the commission, has been amended year by year, with one exception, from the time of its being first placed on the statute-book until the year 1889, and so far as the commissioners have been able to observe, the amendments in general have tended in the direction of the relaxation of the provisions of the original Act, and the consequent prevention of its intention from being carried out.

They say further:

The principal recommendations contained in the Bill are (1) the appointment of a Civil Service Commission, and (2) the adoption of the principle of appointment by open competition.

They wind up thus:

It is possible that public sentiment in Canada may not as yet be ripe for open competition generally, and it may not be possible as yet to eliminate altogether the power of politics in making appointments; but if the recommendations of your commissioners be accepted and strictly adhered to, the public service at Ottawa will, they are convinced, in the course of a few years, be better for the change. Intelligence and capacity will meet with their due reward, politics and favouritism will cease to dominate, the service will soon become attractive to many persons who now seek other avenues of employment, and in general the title of public servant will be an honour to be coveted. The

doors to appointments and promotions in the service will open only to capacity and honesty, and no man or woman who aspires, as all have a right to aspire, to any such position, will have occasion to seek or use any influence less honourable than his or her own merit and fitness for office.

That was their recommendation. My hon. friend from North Toronto has stated to what extent his government carried out that recommendation. He says that they passed a Bill for insurance of civil servants. That was not a reform of the civil service; it did not embody in any way the removal of political patronage. On the contrary, it simply aided to a certain extent those civil servants who were already in office. He says that they approved of the Superannuation Act. I dare say that is true, but that does not in any sense imply a reform of the Civil Service Act or the carrying out of the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission regarding political influences. But my hon. friend says that they introduced a Bill and that the right hon. the First Minister moved the six months' hoist of that Bill. But why did he do so? Because the Bill was inadequate and inefficient, and did not carry out the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission. I have here the 'Hansard' of that day. Mr. Costigan, in moving the second reading, said that the Bill perhaps did not contain all they intended to put into it. Mr. Laurier then went on to say that the Bill had been introduced without a word of explanation, but we now had its provisions and he added:

If I understand the Bill rightly, what the hon. gentleman proposes, under the name of civil service board, is simply a detective agency to look after the civil service. Look at section 4 of the Bill, and see what are the duties it is proposed to place upon the supervisors of civil servants. . . . At all events his duty is to see whether or not the clerks are properly discharging their work. I submit, in all conscience, that the minister under whom the department may be, or the deputy minister, or the chief clerk of the department, are quite competent to do that.

That is the doctrine of the ministerial responsibility which this government have always advocated and endorsed, and it was because of that reason the leader of the opposition at that time moved the six months hoist. He said :

The Bill did not introduce an independent board of commissioners and did not carry out any of the recommendations of the commission of 1892.

Mr. Casey then made a speech. Mr. Casey was one of the first who advocated civil service reform in this parliament. In 1880 or 1881 he introduced a civil service Bill, and it was largely in consequence of the speech he made on that occasion that the government appointed the commission of 1881 and that the statute of 1882 was placed on our statute-book. In this debate Mr. Casey aslo spoke. He said :

As to the official proposed to be created, to be called the supervisor of the civil servants, my leader has apparently expressed all the objections to such an appointment, and I will not add anything to what he has said. As to the creation of a civil service board to examine candidates for admission, promotion and so on, so far I can go with the government. But I intend, at a later stage, to propose an amendment carrying out more efficiently what one would understand to be implied by the appointment of an impartial and non-partisan board to manage the affairs of the civil service. I believe that the conduct of the civil service should not be on partisan lines but that appointments and promotions and other proceedings should be dictated by a board appointed as judges are appointed and as the civil service board in England are appointed, during good behaviour, and not responsible to any political minister of the day. I believe the service should be conducted on business principles, that appointments, promotions and all other matters connected with the service should be carried on as in a bank or insurance company or any other institution of that kind.

The result was, not that a vote was taken and the Bill defeated, but that, after the discussion, Mr. Costigan said :

If the House will allow me. I will withdraw the motion for its second reading.

Mr. LAURIER. Certainly.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I can move the second reading another time when the amendments are prepared.

Mr. LAURIER. When you choose to do so.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I move that the Bill be read the second time to-morrow.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will to-morrow ever come?

To-morrow never did come. The Bill died a natural death. It was an abortion when introduced, and it never came into being.

I wish to say a few words with regard to the report of 1892. I have alluded to some of the recommendations of the commission of that day and to some of their statements regarding what they found in the service. I find here an interesting letter from Mr. Le Sueur, one of the best known and oldest civil servants in Ottawa who has since left the service. In this these words he characterizes the service at that time :

Politics I need not define. We have it with us always, and we know what it means. The present question is, how does the intrusion of politics affect the public service? It affects it in many ways:

1. By crowding it with unnecessary hands.
2. By introducing into it, at times, inefficient or other unsuitable persons.
3. By interfering with the due course of promotion.
4. By interfering with the exercise of necessary discipline.

5. By interfering with the due course of departmental procedure.

These are the primar evils of some of them. The secondary (in the sense of derivative) evils are to be found in the moral effects upon the service at large of these attacks, if I may so call them, upon the integrity of its organization and methods. How can industry be enforced in an overcrowded office? How can a proper standard of work be maintained where some are markedly inefficient? How can the moral of the service be kept at a high point if justice is trifled with? How can an officer who is not supposed to be a political partisan enjoy the highest measure of self-respect if he is compelled, or thinks himself compelled, to act as a partisan?

That was dated January 2, 1892. Mr. Le Sueur was then secretary of the Post Office Department and well qualified by his experience and honesty to pronounce upon it.

My hon. friends have quoted a lot from the present civil service report. But there is a word or two in it which they were careful not to quote and to which I would refer them. Referring to the commission of 1892, the commissioners say:

Your commissioners regret to state that in their opinion the hopes of the members of the former commission have not been realized. The provisions of the Civil Service Act and its amendments have not made the service any better. In fact the Act has been so amended, re-amended and whittled down, that the public service, the commissioners believe, not only at Ottawa but elsewhere throughout the Dominion, has fallen back during the last fifteen years.

Fifteen years took them back to the report of 1892; and it is curious to relate that since 1896, when this government came into power, we have not made any amendments to the Civil Service Act. It is the same Act, whittled down and made so poor and useless by the party opposite that it was ineffective.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The expression 'whittled down' probably referred to the repeal, in individual cases, of the Act from session to session.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think so. Coming immediately after the quotation from the report of 1892, I took it to be an endorsement and corroboration of what was said in that report.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was there any Act between 1892 and 1896 whittling or cutting down the Civil Service Act?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know that there was, but there was nothing to improve it, and the late government had the opportunity of improving it.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) and his colleague (Mr. Foster) talked a great deal about the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the strictures thereupon. I shall not go into that matter except to point out that in the report of 1892, while the language is not so extreme or violent, the same thing is actually referred to. In my opinion violence of words and extreme language do not add force to strictures or make them any more applicable or true. Tre report of 1892 contains this remark about the purchases:

This is fully treated of in the separate report on revenue and expenditure, but generally it may be stated that there has been a tendency in some cases to purchase in such a manner that the government pays retail prices for wholesale quantities.

In another part of the report it goes into that much more fully and deals with it almost as extensively as the report of 1908, but not in such extreme or violent language. I wish to deal with some of the things my hon. friend from North Toronto has said tonight. But first, let me say that I will try to keep to the question of the civil service and the Civil Service Commission. I do not think it is profitable in this or any other debate to drag in and dilate upon and picture in glowing words questions that have been discussed and threshed out and disposed of in this House years ago. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) talked about the Department of the Interior. He said that no doubt certain things would have been discovered if the commissioners had gone on and devoted their attention to that department. He instanced certain questions in regard to the disposal of public lands and timber limits in the Northwest. He knows, no one better, that these very questions have been discussed here one or two or three years ago, have been disposed of by votes of this House that all his accusations and insinuations and those of his colleagues in the opposition have been completely answered and disposed of, and that since that time, in by-election after by-election in the country, these same questions have been paraded before the electors; the electors have been appealed to on these questions to defeat the government candidate and the series of government victories has been almost unbroken. What is and what can be the object of the hon. gentleman bringing up and resuscitating these things? Is it simply to give himself the pleasure of the glowing word-painting he so often indulges in? Is it simply to give himself the pleasure of gloating over imaginary scandals which he thinks may affect the country and that by constant repetition he thinks these things will come to be believed and so affect public opinion? There is no fair or decent politics in such a course, but the hon. gentleman returns to these matters over and over again and deals with them in a way which I am disposed to characterize in words that would hardly be decent or proper to use in parliament.

Mr. JOHNSTON. It was properly characterized in the Public Accounts Committee and declared to be a lie.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member for North Toronto reproached the First Minister because he had spoken briefly in answer to the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Borden). It is not always by any means the length of the speech that proves its effectiveness, in fact it may be said in general terms that the effectiveness of a speech is in inverse ratio to its length and that instead of quoting details of all kinds, instead of repeating over and over again, it is better to go to the heart of a question, to put the salient points before the House and the country and to deal with it on broad, statesmanlike lines, and I venture to think that the half hour of the right hon. the leader of the governmet (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was quite sufficient to reply and effectively reply to the two and a half hours of the leader of the opposition. I believe, too, that a reply can be as effectively made to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in a much less time than that hon. gentleman spoke. He said the leader of the government had been on the wrong side. We have heard that for 12 years, we heard it when we first came into power, it was blazoned by the Tory speakers in the House and in the country that the Liberals had not the instinct of government and that it was impossible for us to have more than one term in power. The results of 1900 clearly showed the error of that argument. We had the same thing for the succeeding four years from 1900 to 1904, and again we went before the people, and again these hon. gentleman's lucubrations, again their aspersions were declared to be absolutely without foundation. Since 1904 the same kind of thing has been going on and there is absolutely no indication that my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has in any way lost his cunning, or lost that keen, comprehensive power of seizing the essentials in great public questions and being on the right side, the side which the people will endorse and support every time.

The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) then began to criticise and discuss the remarks of my right hon. friend. He caught him up on the statement that Mr. Justice Cassels was appointed to complete the inquiry. He knows perfectly well, every one knows perfectly well that it was not the general inquiry that it was suggested Judge Cassels will complete ; it is simply the question of the dishonesty of officials in the Marine Department which he is to complete. The commissioners made their report in general terms, they did not even make a direct accusation, but they indicated and showed they believed there was dishonesty on the part of certain officials there. It was to complete that part of the investigation, to finish up that question of dishonesty, to either acquit these officers of the aspersions upon them or to prove that they were guilty and enable the government to punish them in accordance with their guilt. In that sense and in that way Judge Cassels is to complete and round out that portion of the work of the Civil Service Commission ; but upon the other question it is not intended and nobody suggests that he should supplement the other parts of the report either in regard to the investigations in the department or recommendations as to civil service reform. In respect to these matters the Civil Service Commissioners completed their report. The hon. member for North Toronto said that the appointment of Judge Cassels was for the purpose of contracting the Minister of Marine and Fisheries out of his responsibility. If Judge Cassels was to undertake to investigate the management and the efficiency of the organization of the Department of Marine and Fisheries it might be said that he was appointed for the purpose of contracting the minister out of his responsibility. But he was not so appointed and it is not his business to do any work at all in connection with that part of the administration of the Department of Marine. The Minister of Marine, assuming his full responsibility as a minister, is quite prepared to do that, is doing that and is quite competent and able to do that, and I have no doubt whatever that with the help of the information which may be supplied him in regard to the dishonesty of officials and with the details as to the organization of the department which have been to a certain extent supplied him by the report, the Minister of Marine will be the better able to carry out his reorganization of that department and will succeed in doing it at no distant time.

The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) spoke of the government having discussed what we were to pay Judge Cassels for his work. I can say to the hon. member absolutely that there was no discussion as to what Mr. Cassels was to be paid or whether he should be paid at all. He was simply appointed because we believed him to be the proper and right kind of man to carry on the work for which he was appointed. It was not a question of payment. If he had wanted pay there is no doubt that the government would have been ready as the country would have been ready to pay him a fair amount for the work. He undertook to say he would not do it unless it was done without reward. All honour to him for that. All honour to him for it, I am glad he has done so. But the government have never proposed or suggested to Judge Cassels what reward he should get, or whether he should get any reward at all. Sir, in the appointment of Judge Cassels the government did

not discuss the matter with him, because we did not wish him to think for a moment that we were making any bargain with him. Judge Cassels was selected by the government because he was thought to be a suitable man and competent for the work, and I have no doubt he will carry it out in the way intended by the government and the way it ought to be carried out. But the hon. member for North Toronto, without any evidence on which to base his opinion, without even having had the decency to ask the government a question on the subject, coolly jumps to the conclusion that the government have discussed and agreed upon the reward they should give Judge Cassels, when as a matter of fact nothing of the kind was discussed or even thought of. Sir, that is the way in which the hon. member for North Toronto builds up a fabric out of his own imagination, and by his word painting makes it seem almost real; then it goes out to the country, as it will be reported tomorrow, that the government have arranged to bribe Judge Cassels by appointing him to this work and giving him a large reward when, as a matter of fact, nothing of the kind was thought of. But it is the habit of the member for North Toronto, followed unfortunately by many hon. members opposite, to make baseless charges, and for the Conservative press to state them as facts, even though they are immediately denied afterwards.

Sir, the hon. member for North Toronto and the leader of the opposition have spoken of their desire to help us carry into effect amendments to the Civil Service Act. I am glad to hear it, I hope they will loyally fulfil their promise when the opportunity arises. But when they choose, in a discussion of so important a subject, to mix up the question of civil service reform, which ought to be discussed without partisanship, with a political attack upon the government in a formal motion of want of confidence, I can hardly believe in their sincerity or in their desire for civil service reform. I hope they are sincere, and when the government brings down a Bill to amend the Civil Service Act so as to make the service more efficient, I will be glad of the cooperation and endorsement of hon. gentlemen opposite. Sir, I do not intend to go into the question of civil service reform tonight beyond saying this, that I hope before the end of this session the government will be in a position to introduce a Bill to amend the Civil Service Act. I hope and trust that that Bill will make the Act more workable, and will improve the public service, and I believe that can be done on the lines of the reports and recommendations of the three Civil Service Commissions who have made reports to the government of Canada. I would be glad indeed if the present government were able to do what former governments did not do, although they had before them the reports and recommendations of commissions of their own appointing. But they never acted upon them, and the result is that today the civil service of Canada is no better than it was 25 or 30 years ago when the Act of 1868 was in force. I hope that before long this government will be able to carry out a great reform of this kind, and thus justify its name as a reform government.

Mr. A. BRODER (Dundas). I would not have risen to speak on this occasion were it not for some remarks that the leader of the House saw fit to direct against myself when I was unfortunately absent from the House. I have taken the trouble to find out what he said, and I desire to make some reply. He referred to me as having made certain statements before a farmers' meeting. I want to say to the right hon. gentleman that the statements he refers to I made, not before a farmers' meeting, but in this House, and in his own presence. I made those statements here, and I will take the liberty of repeating them again to-night, as I shall repeat them again in the country. I was very careful to quote the figures from the government blue books to prove my statement. I have yet to learn whether it is appealing to the lowest sentiments of any class of people when you ask them to compare the expenditure of one department of government with that of another department. That is the position I took, and if the right hon. gentleman sees fit to accuse me of using indiscreet language, perhaps I could remind him of an occasion, even in this parliament, when the most indiscreet language ever used in this parliament was used by the right hon. gentleman himself, and in my presence. If I may be allowed to refer to a past debate—the right hon. gentleman himself has referred to it—I allude to the statement he made in the discussion of the Japanese treaty, when he drew on his imagination to picture the combined fleets of England and Japan facing a common enemy in the Pacific ocean. Now, Sir, that speech was adversely criticised in the English press. Everybody knows that at that particular time there was a good deal of friction between the United States and Japan. If my statement was indiscreet, what are we to think of the statement of the right hon. gentleman who is at the head of the government, and with whom your humble servant cannot be compared? Now, when I referred to the expenditure in the Militia Department, I made no criticism whatever of that department further than to say that this government was spending $11 on that department to $1 that they were spending on the great avocation of agriculture. I say that is true, and I will give the figures. I quoted from the government blue books of 1906, because that was the last full year of which we had any record. Turning to page 34 of the Public Accounts,

you will find this statement: Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, $603,500.34. Now, I have deducted from those figures the items which have no reference whatever to agriculture. For instance, Archives; would the right hon. gentleman tell me what these have to do with agriculture or produce of any kind that is raised on the farm ? The 'Patent Record'—what has that to do with the farming interests of the country? Census and Statistics—does that belong to the Agriculture Department any more than to any other? Criminal Statistics—does the hon. gentleman want to say that the criminal class are found among the farmers of this country? That is what his book says, the criminal statistics are charged up to the farmer. Here is the Year Book. I do not know that any man can say in whose interest that book is issued. It is not in the farmer's interest. For general statistics there was an expenditure of $14,-111.85. Is that in the interest of the farmer any more than in the interest of any other class of people? Then, we find 'historical data re Acadian families.' Is that in the interest of agriculture? 'Quinquennial census, Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan' called for an expenditure of $4,-980. Is that in the interest of agriculture? After deducting these items I find that we have spent, in 1906. $518,976.56 in the interest of agriculture. As against that you take Militia and Defence and you find that there was an expenditure for that service of $4,294,124.62 chargeable to income and of $1,299,875.65 chargeable to capital account. Taking these figures it is within a few cents of $11 for war to $1 for agriculture. I say that should not be so. The right hon. Prime Minister said that he hoped we would never have the conditions of Germany, France and other European countries which have such heavy expenditures for war. Well, let us see. I hope we will never be in that position and the fact that we are not in that position and are never going to be in that position is a justification for my statement. Now, we will take France and these other European countries which have to be on a war footing all the time. The peace of the world is in the balance and it would be jeopardized if these nations did not keep upon a war footing. Nothwithstanding that France is kept on a war footing, what is her expenditure for agriculture ? I am taking the figures which were given in a report to the president and Senate of the United States and which are thoroughly authenticated. Nothwithstanding the statement I make about these countries, France spends on agriculture yearly $9,200,000, as against an expenditure in Canada of $518,-000 ; Austria spends $9,270,000 ; Hungary, $9,400,000 and Russia, which has had a most strenuous war, spends $25,280,000. Russia is our future rival in the sale of agricultural products. Japan spends $3,-750,000 a year, the United States, $10,000,-000, and Canada. I repeat, $518,976.56. While the expenditure of other departments has been increased from one to threefold, the expenditure in the interest of agriculture has stood still. The commission, whose report is under discussion this afternoon, have criticised more severely than anything else the Department of Militia and Defence. What do they say ?

The expenditure in this department is going up by leaps and bounds.

I want to ask this House if the militia of this country is any more effective than it was ten years ago? You have machinery enough for an army of 125,000, but you have only 38,000 men. You say that this is the framework of an army but there is no permanency in the rank and file because you drill them once a year instead of for three years which is a mistake. You have done away with the three year rule.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, that has not been done. The term of service has never been changed from three years to one.

Mr. BRODER. I stand corrected. The commission proceed to say that :

In the estimates lately submitted to parliament for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1909, appropriations are asked for aggregating $6,500,000.

Is there a justification for that? With an expenditure of $518,000 for agriculture I say that my criticism is a fair and just criticism and it is a criticism that ought to be made. So much for that.

I want to say before I sit down that I am pretty careful in the statements which I make and that I do not make statements without taking the trouble to verify them. I propose to give the expenditures for a few years in the Militia Department. I am quoting from the annual report of the Militia Council published last year and what do they say? If you take the men in the field, as detailed in this report for 1906, you will find a large preponderance of officers—an officer for every two and a half or three men. That is the bones of an army with a vengence. The statement of the expenditure by the Department of Militia and Defence since 1896, is as follows:

Year.	Expenditure.
1896-7	$2,413,651
1897-8	1,688,213
1898-9	2,500,635
1899-1900	3,624,654
1905-6	5,594,009

My figures are taken from the public documents and I am usually pretty careful to see that they are verified before I state them. The right hon. First Minister has expressed his regret that I should have stated these facts but all I can do is to tell

the truth. I am not going to say anything I should not say even to please the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAIN. Will you speak before the farmers any more?

Mr. BRODER. I will if they want me. I never force myself on any meeting and I do not intend to. I wish to say that I am not going to be responsible for what the press say about me. I see that one paper says that I said there were less people in this country than there were in 1896. I am not accountable for that and I never made such a statement. I am simply accountable for what I say in this House and elsewhere. With regard to civil service reform, we hear a lot about the sinner who used to live in this country ten or fifteen years ago. It does not make any difference about who that sinner is or where that sinner is now. It is the sinners we have here that we have to deal with. That there are sinners the report of the commission has made plain. In 1891, when there was trouble in one of the departments, several civil servants were expelled, a minister of the Crown was sent into private life and some prominent party men were prosecuted in the court. Now, will these hon. gentlemen go that far and deal with those who are guilty? If they say they will we will see a very curious condition of things in this country. It will not strike one department only. Irregularities may grow up under any administration and with the large business of this country there may be an incentive to men to go wrong, but the men who are at the head of affairs are chargeable with the responsibility of keeping things right side up and if they do not do it they are guilty and not the other people. They are the men who are responsible. If everything were in a flourishing condition in these departments you would hear hon. gentlemen opposite taking a lot of credit to themselves. Now, since things have gone, these gentlemen say: These things do not belong to us; this is an heirloom that we got from the old Tory party; we have inherited this trouble. You have inherited it but the child has grown on your hands and when you talk about rascality—shall I use that word?—it is pretty severe—the Conservative party may have sinned, but, as compared with hon. gentlemen opposite, they were in the primer when these gentlemen were in the fifth book. That is the plain English of it. The interests of the country and the interests of public life demand that a thorough scrutiny and investigation should be held under the control of these gentlemen who have the right to see that the public departments are cleansed of what is not proper, and that the public service of the country should have that honest deal which it is entitled to from any government no matter what its party stripe may be. I have not criticised anybody very much in this House, and perhaps that is a good thing for myself as well as for the opposite side, but there may a time come when I shall consider it my duty to discuss certain men and certain measures, and then I shall say what I have to say fearlessly and above board. I have never yet taken undue advantage of my opponent no matter who he may be, and I shall not do so in future, but I am going to have fair-play even if I have to fight for it.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Before I discuss the motion before the House I should like to say a few words in reply to certain statements made by my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder). It has been stated in certain sections of the country that the expenditures on our military system are excessive, but if the hon. gentleman looks at the report of the last Imperial Conference of 1907, he will find that among the most important autonomous states forming the British Empire, Canada spends least for military purposes. The hon. gentleman will see in that report that England spends per head of its population for military purposes £1. 9 shillings 3 pence; that Australia spends per head of its population 5 shillings ; that New Zealand spends 5 shillings and a farthing ; that the Cape of Good Hope spends 5 shillings and a farthing ; and that Canada spends 4 shillings and 6½d. The hon. gentleman will therefore find, that instead of Canada being extravagant in its military expenditure, this report of the Imperial Conference proclaims that Canada is not doing as much as some other parts of the empire for its defence. I do not agree with the view of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Broder) in this respect and I may avail myself of this opportunity to state that the attack which has been directed against me to-night by the hon. member for North Toronto as to my having at one time made certain appeals with regard to the defence of Canada or of the empire, is entirely uncalled for. The hon. gentleman from North Toronto seems to have taken much delight in directing attacks against me for some time past. He has made insinuation after insinuation, but he has never dared to make any charge against me because he knows very well that I can repel any charge he can make either in this parliament or before the people of the country. If he thinks he has any case let him stand up in his place one of these days ; let him put his seat in jeopardy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, he will never dare to do that. He will make insinuations but he will not have the courage to make charges and to expose himself to the consequences. Let him make charges against

me; we will have an investigation and we will find out which of us shall retain his seat in parliament; we will find who will be branded as a slanderer, and who will stand before this country a man who did his duty.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Did or did not the hon. gentleman in 1896 pursue the same policy which I regret to-day is pursued by certain gentlemen now, of endeavouring to make capital out of the expenditures of the Militia Department? Did or did not he appeal to the fanaticism of the people of his province by stating that Canada was spending money for the purchase of arms for the defence of the empire?

Mr. BRODEUR. Let me at once say that when the hon. gentleman speaks of the fanaticism of the people of my province he speaks of something which does not exist. There is no fanaticism in my province, and I believe the hon. gentleman knows it. We are broadminded in the province of Quebec. We are not ruled by prejudice, we are working for our country and for the advancement of our country. We are glad to serve under the British Crown to which we are devoted. And, Sir, when at different times in our history British connection was in danger it was the French Canadian who were there to defend it. Who in 1775 stood up in defence of the British Crown if not the French Canadians? Who in 1812 fought the battle of Chateauguay and repulsed the American troops, if not the French Canadians? And, Sir, in 1849 when, because of the repeal of the corn laws in England certain Canadians signed a document in favour of annexation to the United States, who were the signers? Let the hon. member (Mr. Sam Hughes) look at the signatories to that document and he will not find five French Canadians among the number. I tell the hon. member that there is no fanaticism among the French Canadians. The French Canadians are devoted to their country. I resent the insult flung at them to-night by the member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) and I regret to say that such insults have become a habit with certain members on the opposite side.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the minister be good enough to answer my question, and I will substitute the word 'prejudices' for the word fanaticism. He has given us a nice little speech now, but let him answer the question.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have never appealed also to the prejudices of my countrymen. I know that my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) is probably living upon such appeals which he makes against the French Canadians. I know that he has been in the habit of insulting my fellow countrymen.

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is that, again?

Mr. BRODEUR. I say that the hon. gentleman is in the habit of insulting my fellow countrymen.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman cannot show an instance in my whole history where I insulted the French Canadian people. However, I shall reply to the hon. gentleman later.

Mr. BRODEUR. Let me for a moment discuss the question before the chair.

Mr. LENNOX. That is a good idea.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is certainly a good idea, and had I not been interrupted, I would not have digressed. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the motion before the chair? Let us read the first paragraph of it, and we will see that hon. gentlemen opposite do not want an investigation made; they do not want that the truth should be known; they do not want that Judge Cassels should be called on to make an investigation. Here is the way the motion reads:

> That the investigation conducted by the Civil Service Commission was confessedly partial and incomplete.
>
> That the proposed inquiry before Mr. Justice Cassels is unsatisfactory and insufficient, inasmuch as it relates to only one paragraph of the report of that commission and touches but a portion of the administration of one department.

So I understand that hon. gentlemen opposite are going to record their votes in favour of the declaration that we should not investigate the charge that is made in the report of the Civil Service Commission that there are men who have no conscience in the Marine and Fisheries Department. Let them read this motion. They do not seem to have read it, because they are laughing now. What does the report of the Civil Service Commission state? It states that there is a lack of conscience amongst the officers of the Marine and Fisheries Department. I proposed to my colleagues to have an investigation made as to whether that statement was true or not, and I think it was the proper step to take; I think that the country will commend the action that we have taken. But now we find hon. gentlemen opposite saying: No, don't make an investigation; we do not want an investigation made. That is the position which they are going to take. Well, I expect that the House will not agree to such a motion; I expect that the House will stand by the government in declaring that an investigation must be made, and that we must find out whether there is a lack of conscience amongst the officers of the Marine and Fisheries Department or not.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us take from the Civil Service list the names of the officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries appointed by hon. friends opposite. Is it because they are appointments of the late government—recommended by some members who are now sitting in this House—that the hon. gentlemen do not want an investigation? I think so, Mr. Speaker. Let us take the names. The deputy minister was appointed in 1896 by hon. gentlemen opposite. Take the three chief clerks in the Marine Correspondence Branch; they were all appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite—one in 1879, one in 1873, the other in 1882. Take the Fisheries Correspondence Branch; the two principal officers there were appointed by the Conservative government—one in 1892, the other in 1869. Take the Accountant's Branch; the chief accountant was appointed in 1881, the next in 1879, and the assistant accountant was appointed in 1904 under this government. Take the Chief Engineer's Branch; Colonel Anderson, the head of this branch, was appointed on October 23, 1874, by a Liberal government, and he is a man against whom there is absolutely nothing in the report of this commission. Mr. B. H. Fraser was appointed in 1889, Mr. W. Bell Dawson in 1894. Take the Hydrographic Survey Branch; the chief was appointed in 1884. Take the Commissioner of Lights' Branch; the commissioner was appointed in 1893, the assistant in 1883. Take the agents, of whom we have five—one in St. John, one in Halifax, one in Charlottetown, one in Montreal, and one in British Columbia; of these five officers four have been appointed by the late government. Well, I am sure that our hon. friends opposite are not asked by the officers of the department, to oppose an investigation, as they do by their motion. No; they want the truth to be known; they are anxious that the truth be known, and it is only hon. gentlemen opposite who do not want the truth to be known. Are they afraid of something? But hon. gentlemen opposite say: Oh, but the minister is entirely responsible; if there has been some stealing in the department, the minister is responsible for it, whether it took place some time ago or many years ago. While the administration of the department may not have been all that it should have been, I repeat that the system in existence there is the system which has existed not only since the Liberals have been in power, but even when the Conservatives were in power, and I am going to prove it immediately.

The hon. leader of the opposition has quoted a great deal from the report of the Civil Service Commission, but he has failed to quote some paragraphs which are very interesting. He was very anxious to condemn me; he was very anxious to prove that the existing Minister of Marine and Fisheries was responsible for everything that was found in that department. He did not quote page 37—oh, yes, he made a quotation, but stopped short. I quote it again, and this time I will complete the sentence which the hon. leader of the opposition commenced but left uncompleted:

> Your commissioners have to confess that the general conclusions which they have formed regarding the administration of the department are most unfavourable. It seems to have a few redeeming features, although there are some, one of which is the presence in the department of some good men, chiefly but not wholly in the lower ranks. With a better organization and better methods these might form the nucleus of a good staff.

I think my hon. friend stopped there; but there is another phrase which it might be interesting to know, and here it is:

> The trouble is not of recent origin but has been long continued and is the result of evil methods and practices persisted in for many years.

Was the hon. leader of the opposition afraid to quote this part? The hon. member sitting beside him (Mr. Foster) has been Minister of Marine and Fisheries; he was perhaps one of those responsible for these evil practices; what did he do to stop them? I might quote something to my hon. friend on the subject of arrears of payment. I need not go very far; I will take the last report of the Auditor General during the time the Conservatives were in power, and what do I find there? I find that there have been in those last years some arrears of payments. But if hon. gentlemen opposite want to do me justice, let them read the evidence given by Colonel Gourdeau. If they will read that evidence, they will find that there has been a great change made in the administration of the department. Let them read at page 649 of the evidence, vol. 1, and they will find the following evidence given by Colonel Gourdeau, the deputy minister:

> Q. When you have a supply granted by parliament, do your officers try to live within that supply?—A. Yes, under the present minister. There is an order which has been adhered to. First of all, an account is received. That has to go to the clerk who looks after the estimates. If it corresponds with the estimates, he attaches his initials to it. Then it goes to the accountant who checks it. If it is an expenditure for a new boat or lighthouse, it has to stand until next year.
>
> Q. You are trying to keep within the estimates of the year?—A. Yes. The present minister said he would hold the accountant responsible if anything was paid for that was not estimated for, he would take strict measures to prevent recurrence of that.
>
> Q. The present minister has taken steps to keep the expenditure of the department within the appropriations?—A. Absolutely, and is particular in exacting a monthly statement showing how the appropriations stand.

I would like to know if the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) exacted that monthly statement when he saw how the affairs of the department were administered.

Q. There was a certain amount of laxity previous to his assumption of office?—A. It was a continuation of what had been the practice under every government. When they had to spend money, they spent it.

There is the best answer to the insinuations of hon. gentlemen opposite. Here is the evidence of a man who has been connected with the service under all the governments since 1867, and who states under oath that the present minister is the one who has made such an important change in the administration of the department. Even under the administration of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), this man says that the old system was existing and there were accounts which were not paid. But I have got here in the Auditor General's Report for 1895-6 letters showing that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster)—who, I regret, is not in his seat now—was in the habit of making payments for one appropriation out of another appropriation, without any legitimate excuse. Here is the correspondence interchanged between the department and the Auditor General. It will be found on page 115 Part T of the Auditor General's Report for 1895-6. Mr. McDougall called the attention of the department to the fact that they were taking money—were I to follow the example set by some hon. gentlemen opposite, I should use the word 'stealing'—from one vote and applying it to another. I shall not, however, use the word; I am not the kind of man to use expressions and insinuations absolutely uncalled for. But what are the facts? Here is Mr. McDougall complaining of the action of the department in taking money from one vote and applying it to another. And I may observe that these irregularities were sanctioned by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). Would any one believe it? It was this great administrator. It was not that crazy man, as he described me the other day. That is the language which the hon. gentleman uses with regard to myself, but here is what Mr. McDougall says. The deputy minister thought, of course, that when he could tell the Auditor General that it was the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), then Finance Minister, who had sanctioned these payments, no further difficulty would be made, but here is what the then Auditor General, Mr. McDougall, said:

Now if it were proper to charge these cheques to maintenance, it would have been equally so to charge them to any other vote covered by your credit; so that you see if such transactions are allowed to pass unnoticed, the subdivision of the annual supplies into separate and distinct appropriations would be a farce, and, so far as keeping expenditure under its proper vote is concerned, parliament might as well vote the whole supplies in one lump sum.

And the deputy minister replies by sending to the Auditor General a letter of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in which he said that this way of making payments was a proper thing to do. There is ample evidence to show that the practice of spending under one vote the moneys belonging to another vote was quite common under the administration of this paragon, the Ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster). Now, let me quote the evidence of another person. Let me quote the letter of Mr. Gregory, on page 78, in which, writing about the Auditor General's inquiry regarding prices, he says:

I beg respectfully to state that the prices charged by J. J. Murphy, Samson & Filion, Terreau & Racine, are all fixed and agreed upon in advance. If lower rates are expected, I have no idea how you can obtain them. There has been no other system in the service before or since confederation, and it remains with the department to establish means of effecting a change.

I am trying to make a change, and if my hon. friends who, since the two years I have been in that department, have kept on criticising it day in and day out and making insinuations, will give me enough time to make those changes, I will see that the mistakes of administration which were made, even when the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, will be corrected. It appears that I am to be responsible for everything set down in this respect, even for things which happened when this government was not in power. And we are told that we should not have an investigation made by a judge but by an independent commission. Here are officers of the department, charged with being derelict in their duties, charged with having lack of conscience, and who are asking for an investigation. Well, we have appointed Judge Cassels to investigate. But hon. gentlemen do not want a judge to make the investigation. What is it they want? I know what it is. If they were in power they would probably do what they did in 1892, and perhaps my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, who was not then a member of this House, will find extraordinary the procedure which was then adopted by his political friends. Would he believe me when I say—but he would not, I will quote the order in council.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I always believe you.

Mr. BRODEUR. Charges similar to these were made against officers of one of the departments in 1891 and what happened? Were they referred to an inde-

pendent commission as this motion states ? Were they referred to a commission absolutely independent ? Yes. The independent commission was composed of, do you know whom ? It was composed of the minister whose officials had been found derelict in their duty, together with two other members of the government of that day. I am glad to say that my hon. friend the member for Lanark was one of those independent members called upon to investigate the actions of the Conservatives. Let us suppose for one moment that I had passed an order in council providing that I should myself make this investigation. You would see these hon. gentlemen rising in their seats and saying : Look at the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the guilty one, the culprit ! he is investigating his own actions ! Here is the order in council passed in 1893, appointing Mr. Dewdney, the minister whose officials were found stealing money. The member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) was also responsible as a Minister of the Crown for the actions of the officials, yet he assisted in investigating them ; and last but not least, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was also on that commission. Here is an independent commission ; that is doubtless the one quoted by the hon. the leader of the opposition in his motion when he speaks of independent commissions.

Mr. HAGGART. Would the minister tell us what the finding of the commission was ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, I shall read the order in council, although it was rather long.

Mr. HAGGART. What was the finding ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The point I wish to make is that the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has been complaining that the minister is responsible for the actions of his officers. The hon. member for Lanark claims that too, I suppose ?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. BRODEUR. Then does the hon. gentleman think it was a fair thing for the men who were responsible for the actions of those officers to themselves investigate those actions ? Does he think it was a fair thing to do ?

Mr. HAGGART. It was our duty to investigate and we dismissed every one of them.

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh, no, the hon. gentleman goes too far.

Mr. HAGGART. Every one against whom any charge was proved.

Mr. BRODEUR. He did not dismiss them all. I think it is not fair. The hon. the leader of the opposition claims that the minister is responsible. Then the hon. gentleman should have dismissed himself, he should have resigned. But no, they cut the heads off the others, the small fry, but they kept their seats in the cabinet. However, the people dismissed them at the next election.

I did not think it would be proper for a minister or members of the cabinet to investigate the actions of the officers. These officers were not appointed by us, none of those whose conduct will come before Mr. Justice Cassels were appointed by this government ; and I thought it was fair and just that the investigation should be carried on by an independent commission, not an independent commission such as my hon. friends opposite, but a judge, a commissioner in whom the country would have confidence in order that justice might be rendered to all parties. It is interesting thus to read what has been done in the past and then to see the indignation of my hon. friends opposite. We have seen something of this to-day. We know that the hon. gentlemen had before them the report of the other Civil Service Commission, urging the appointment of an independent Civil Service Commission. They have done nothing, but to-day they are urging strongly such a change in system. When they were in power they never found it advisable to make the change which was recommended in that report.

Much has been said with regard to the expenditure of the Department of Marine. It is true that our department has spent money and we have been obliged to spend money. Why ? Because when the hon. gentlemen were in power they did not do their duty to the country. Take the case of Aids to Navigation. Will anybody deny the importance of having aids to navigation in order to help our shipping, in order to improve our trade, in order to add to the wealth of our country. Will hon. gentlemen opposite deny that ? We must judge them by their policy in the past ; they were letting everything go to decay ; no aids to navigation were provided, no proper facilities were given and what was the result ? I shall quote some very eloquent figures which will show to this country that this government has done its duty with regard to transportation, with regard to aids to navigation, in such a way that we have reduced materially the rate of insurance on goods going to or from Canada. I have here the figures which will show the rates of insurance from Montreal direct to ports in the United Kingdom on provisions and merchandise and on grain, under the Conservative government and under this government :

Time.	Rate on Provisions and Merchandise. Cents.	Rate on Grain. Cents.
Under Conservative government.	84½	99
Under Liberal government, 1901	63½	78
Under Liberal government, 1902	55½	78
Under Liberal government, 1903	49	56
Under Liberal government, 1904	43	50
Under Liberal government, 1905	37	41
Under Liberal government, 1906	45	45

Thus there was a reduction on provisions and merchandise of 39½ and on grain of 54 cents. How much does that represent to the country? I contend that it represents to our consuming classes and our exporters millions of money each year; it represents more money than we have spent.

Perhaps it will not be sufficient for me just to state those figures, hon. gentlemen may say that they are not correct. I have in my hand resolutions passed by the Board of Trade of Montreal, the most important Board of Trade in Canada, approving of the action of the government, approving of my own actions with regard to aids to navigation. I shall read these resolutions and also the resolution of the shipping federation:

The Montreal Board of Trade,
Montreal, November 15, 1906.

Hon. Mr. Brodeur,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Ottawa.

Sir,—I have the honour to communicate the following resolution adopted yesterday by the council of this board after hearing the eulogistic reports of our president and the representative of the shipping interests upon the work of your department in improving the navigation of the St. Lawrence route,—

Resolved, that having received from the president and the representative of the shipping interests on the council their reports on the annual departmental inspection of the channel, which inspection, by the courtesy of the Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, they attended, the council of the Montreal Board of Trade hereby expresses its appreciation of the manner in which the Dominion Government has met the desire of the country that a generous expenditure should be made for the purpose of improving our national waterways from Montreal to the ocean, and the council further expresses its gratitude to the hon. the minister and to the engineers of his department for having so readily and promptly met the various specific requests for channel and lighting improvements made by this board and the shipping federation.

Here is also the resolution of the shipping federation:

Resolution unanimously adopted at a general meeting of the members of the Shipping Federation of Canada, held in their board room in the city of Montreal, on Wednesay, November 21, 1906, of which the following is a true copy of the entry duly minuted.

Be it resolved that the Shipping Federation of Canada, duly record a vote of thanks to the Hon. L. P. Brodeur, K.C., LLB, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, for the opportunity giving the members to inspect the St. Lawrence ship channel and the works connected with the aids to navigation.

That this federation is extremely gratified with the permanent and substantial manner in which the many undertakings are being carried through, and consider that great credit is due to the government and to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, for the way in which this national work is being done. The beneficial effects have already been felt in the lowering of insurance rates by the St. Lawrence route, which not alone benefits the ship but also the producer in the west.

That the members of this Federation are pleased to note the able manner in which the minister has mastered the many details in the short period which he has held office.

Similar resolutions were passed last year also. I appreciate highly what is contained in these resolutions of the Montreal Board of Trade and of the Shipping Federation, I care far more for them than I do for all the criticisms which hon. gentlemen opposite have directed against me. I will quote also the last report made by the president of the Shipping Federation, Mr. Hugh Allan, not a man who is connected with this party; he has never been a Liberal, he belongs to a Conservative family, and I think has always been a Conservative. Here is what he says:

The lighting of the river and gulf has not only been very much improved, but the attention to lights has left nothing to be desired. The attention of the department when a defect has been brought to its notice has been prompt and the service generally first class. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is to be congratulated on the vast improvements he has made in this department, which no doubt has been brought about largely by the formation of the lighthouse board.

I suppose there is not a man on the other side of the House who would dare to say that Mr. Hugh Allan is not qualified to speak on these questions with intelligence and impartiality. I think I am able to say that since I have been in this department I have done my best to remedy any evils which may have existed in it. I have done something since I have been there. When my hon. friends opposite were in power they had in charge the administration of the Montreal harbour, and what a condition it was in! Ask any man who was connected with the shipping interests in Montreal, and he will tell you that they could get nothing done by the government; the government would not move because the hon. member for North Toronto did not want any money to be expended. Well, Sir, we do not belong to that class of men.

We do want money to be expended, but expended only in such a way as will expand and develop the country, and make of Canada a great and magnificent nation. The hon. gentlemen say that I have done nothing for the Montreal harbour since I have been in office. Well, I had been there only a few months when I introduced a Bill changing the system under which the harbour works had got into a muddle. That new system has been in operation for about a year, and I am sure that every man in this House who is acquainted with the facts would be obliged to commend the work which has been done by the new board. This is something which I have done. What did my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) do when he was minister, for the purpose of improving the Montreal harbour? Absolutely nothing. It is this government who are building up the harbour of Montreal, and we intend to give to Montreal a harbour which will be a credit to this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I came into the department in the month of February, 1906, immediately after the opening of the session. Since that time I have been employed in that department at least fifteen hours a day. It seems to me that a minister who has devoted so much time to his department as that, should receive some commendation from the country, if not from the members of the opposition. I do not shrink from the labour. I have health and I have strength, and as long as I am at the head of this department I am willing to sacrifice my health and strength in order to make the department a credit to this country, and in order to remedy the evils and mistakes which were committed by hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in power. Eleven ministers have passed through that department, of these seven belonged to the Conservative party and four to the Liberal party. Is it right that the responsibility for all the mistakes which were made in that department during all those years should fall entirely upon the shoulders of the present minister? I do not seek to evade any responsibility for which I am chargeable, but I refuse to be responsible for any acts committed by my predecessors. I will not stand responsible for the mistakes made by hon. gentlemen opposite, the accumulated mistakes they made while in charge of that department. I am going to change all that, and I believe the work will be done in such a way as to satisfy the country.

Some reference has been made to several statements made in the report of the Civil Service Commission. The hon. member for North Toronto quoted their reference to flour, and I think the leader of the opposition also alluded to it. I think he also referred to the question of coal. We had a coal contract with a man in Prescott. That coal contract was given after public tenders had been caleld for. I gave it to the lowest tenderer as I usually do. I found out that when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power they did not always give contracts to the lowest tenderer. They had some particular friend and I am going to present a report to the House on this subject from which a good many illustrations of this fact will be derived. Hon. members of this House will be edified by the knowledge of how hon. gentlemen opposite were carrying on affairs of the country and by the evidence which will be afforded of the mistakes, extravagance and maladministration of hon. gentlemen opposite. That coal contract, as I have said, I gave to the lowest tenderer. The price quoted was a very low one at the time but the tenderer found it possible to quote the price. I gave him the contract and I took the precaution to state in the contract that we could extend it for two years if he so desired. It was a very hard clause but it was a clause which was put in the contract and when the year expired, although the coal was very cheap at the price, I thought of extending the contract for two years. The contractor came later on and asked to be relieved of that clause in the contract. An officer of the department in whom I had reason to have confidence and who was also appointed by the old government, made a report to the minister, or to the deputy minister, which was as follows :—

> Mr. James Buckley, of Prescott, who furnished anthracite coal to this department at $5.75 per ton, states that this coal was furnished at a considerable loss to him. The coal cost him $6.25 and he is now willing to continue the furnishing of the anthracite coal at cost price, viz., $6.25 per ton. I recommend that Mr. Buckley's offer be accepted; and as he has furnished coal at a loss in the past, that 5 per cent profit be allowed him for coal in the future. Anthracite coal in Ottawa costs from $7.25 to $7.75, and the regular price at Prescott is $7 per ton.
>
> (Sgd.) W. W. S.

That means W. W. Stumbles. Mr. Fyshe, in his report, quotes that memorandum and adds the following, which will be found at page 35 :—

> This was agreed to.

Meaning that the department, or the minister, had accepted the recommendation which was made to increase the price of the contract. I do not want to find fault with Mr. Fyshe, but I thought before charging the department or the minister with having agreed to that he should have taken the precaution to go and see the minister and ask him what had really taken place. I have never seen him to discuss this question with him, but if he had come to me I would have been very glad to have shown him that in spite of the recommendation which was made I wrote across the document, on

the 17th March, 1907, the following: 'Carry out the contract. Sgd. L. P. Brodeur,' I cannot understand how Mr. Fyshe came to declare in his report that this was agreed to when the contrary had been done and when I had given instructions that the contract should be carried out. More than that, I have gone over all the payments which have been made before and since this document has been on file and Mr. Buckley has been obliged since that time to deliver the coal and was paid for it at the price formerly agreed to and consequently that part of the report which deals with this question is absolutely incorrect.

In another case which is quoted I find the same mistake. It will be found at page 34. The statement is somewhat long but I suppose it is better that all the facts should be known and therefore I am going to quote it all:

A list of prices paid in Quebec——

I call your attention to that expression.

—was, in February last, submitted to the manager of the shipyard at Sorel, for comparison with the prices which he was paying there; and in his reply he stated that the prices generally were about 50 per cent higher than the prices being paid at Sorel. One item objected to was the purchase of a certain brand of flour at $6.95 a barrel. When this was inquired into at the instance of the Auditor General the agent replied: 'These are ——'s prices, and the same prices are charged by every flour dealer in Quebec for the same brand of flour. These brands cannot be bought for less here. If as good flour can be bought in Halifax for $5.20 per barrel it would pay the department to import it from there. There are other brands of flour that can be bought in this market from —— and others at $6 upwards, but not less than $6, suitable for our purposes. Our people generally choose the best, for the reason that it is subject to changes of temperature which might cause it to harden or sour, as has often occurred with ordinary flour.' And he adds later on: 'Referring to the matter of flour, there is but one flour dealer on the patronage list. I beg respectfully to suggest that you place one or two more on the list of such dealers.'

The last part of this letter has been quoted by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. I will come to that in a minute. But the commissioners, in their report, state that the list of prices paid in Quebec was submitted to the manager of the shipyard at Sorel. I must take exception to that. It is true that an account certified to by Mr. Gregory was sent to the department and the department refused to pay that account; so, the account was not paid. Now, Mr. Fyshe goes on and states that this was inquired into at the instance of the Auditor General. I must take exception also to that; this account was never referred to the Auditor General. This account, as I have already explained, came to the department and was, under my instructions, sent to Mr. Desbarats, at Sorel, who knew exactly the price which should be paid and the Auditor General, up to the time that his report was brought before this House, did not know of this account and the account had not then been paid. I am sorry that these mistakes have happened. My hon. friends are going to take this document and spread it all over the country. I suppose they will not take the trouble to publish as extensively the remarks I am now making and they will no doubt go to the people of the country and say: Look at the Department of Marine and Fisheries, how corrupt it is; they paid $6.95 for a barrel of flour.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the minister will tell us how much was paid.

Mr. BRODEUR. I could not say offhand how much was paid, but we did not pay that amount. I will, on a future day, give the information. Reference has been made also by the hon. leader of the opposition to the fact that there was only one person on the patronage list at Quebec from a statement made by Mr. Gregory. Mr. Gregory makes that statement, but if the hon. gentleman had read the whole letter of Mr. Gregory he would have found that Mr. Gregory states formally that he had gone over to see not only the Liberal flour dealers but the Conservative flour dealers of Quebec and that the price which he puts in his account and which he certifies was the price which was asked in all of the houses there.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What page is that?

Mr. BRODEUR. Page 92. I quote from this letter:

Now before writing this answer to your letter, I beg to state that I have made inquiries among the dealers in flour, pork and all the other articles mentioned, not only among the friends of the administration but outsiders also, and the prices quoted are Quebec prices, and these prices, by tender as far as possible were obtained from dealers in Quebec, friends of the administration, and submitted for your approval by my letter of the 18th March, 1907.

I think that disposes of the charge made by the leader of the opposition that there was only one flour dealer on the patronage list and that the prices paid were so high on account of that. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has referred to Mr. Willie Walsh, and to Mr. W. Leo C. Walsh, who, he says is the same man. The hon. gentleman led us to believe that the agent at Quebec had received positive instructions from the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine), and from the then Minister of Justice, and that the agent had no discretion but to purchase from Mr. Walsh. But let us see what

the evidence is. Mr. Gregory in a letter of March 16, 1905 (it should be 1906) is thus quoted in the report:

Gregory replies that stuff was purchased on direction of the Hon. R. P. on the wharf at Quebec who directed me then and there to give a good order to the agent of McColl Brothers & Company, Mr. Leo C. Walsh, who stood beside him at the time. That was over a year ago. I gave an order to Mr. Walsh as requested.

I may say that after coming to the department I ordered an inquiry into this matter and it is the reply of Mr. Gregory that is here referred to:

I gave an order to Mr. Walsh as requested, and when the goods arrived I was somewhat surprised at the size of the package, and I refused to take them and a lengthy correspondence took place between McColl Brothers & Company and myself on the subject—in fact I declined to give them any more orders. Subsequently I received a letter from the late minister as well as another from the Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick, copies of which I herewith inclose. An opportunity some time after occurred when I saw the late minister here and spoke to him as it seemed to me that that firm had taken advantage of his kindness about the matter. He told me to keep the goods and try to get rid of them to the best advantage, which I did by distributing them round where I understood the Kantslip could be used on belts, &c. If any has been sent where it was not really required I shall see that it is removed where it can be used to advantage.

In order to understand the sentence which follows, I may refer to what was done by me when I came into the department. There were constant statements that certain things had been ordered by the minister verbally and I gave positive instructions that in future no excuse should be offered that the minister had given instructions unless reports were made right away by the officer who was receiving the orders. I do not want to charge anybody particularly but I found there was a tendency to charge the minister with having given verbal instructions. In the letter above quoted the agent says it was done on the instructions of Mr. Préfontaine. But there is a letter of May 6, 1905, bearing on that, and which I may read:

Mr. W. Leo C. Walsh, representing McColl Brothers & Company, will call on you probably Tuesday in reference to some oil. If you can give him an order I will feel obliged —R. P.

It was, therefore, left absolutely in the discretion of the officer and he could give the order or not give it as he pleased. Now, the letter from the then Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Fitzpatrick) is quoted as follows:

May 3, 1905. Dear Mr. Gregory,—Young Willie Walsh, who represents McColl Brothers & Company, Montreal agents for Vesta boiler compound, has asked me to say a good word to you for him, and if the material is as good as represented, I hope you will place some orders in his way.—C. Fitzpatrick.

Now, what harm is there in those letters; what deduction can be drawn from them that they are not proper letters to write. Fortunately we have the correspondence bearing on this matter and we see from it that the officer was simply told that if he needed any oil he might purchase it from this young man. Mr. Gregory concludes his letter of March 6. 1905. by stating:

The new system now established of informing you immediately of any order I may receive from the minister or deputy minister verbally will avoid for the future any misunderstanding.

That is perfectly true. When I saw that representations were made that verbal orders had been given by the late minister, I ordered that in future the verbal orders of the minister would not be sufficient and that written orders would be required. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was Minister of Marine and Fisheries for many years and if he ever should become minister again this rule of mine will probably assist him so that he may not be responsible for acts which he never intended to commit. Now, there is another little thing in this report which though not very important in itself may be magnified in certain quarters, and I think perhaps I should avail myself of this first opportunity to make a reference to it. There is a rather peculiar insinuation to be found at page 226 of the report and a most uncalled for insinuation it is. The Department of Marine and Fisheries had for years been purchasing buoys from German firms. I may say en passant, and it may perhaps surprise the House to know, that when the hon. member for North Toronto was minister he also bought some buoys, but strange to say he paid a higher price for them than we are paying now. It will be a surprise to many gentlemen to know that the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries who is said to be so extravagant is paying less for these buoys than did the member for North Toronto when he was minister. Well, at page 226 an order in council with reference to the purchase of buoys is quoted as follows:

The undersigned observes that the Willson low pressure gas buoys are manufactured in Canada, while the welded compression buoys heretofore used were manufactured in foreign countries (G. B.?).

Now, it would seem that the comment 'G. B.' is an insinuation that I consider Great Britain to be a foreign country. Of course that is absurd, but I have a doubt that the hon. member for Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) in reading that over to his electors would take great unction from this

insinuation made by Mr. Fyshe and say: Look at these French Canadians, look at this man referring to Great Britain as being a foreign country.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If the hon. minister will permit me, I would not take him for a second to be typical of the honest French Canadian.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, Mr. Speaker, I may say that this remark—not the remark made by my hon. friend, but the remark at page 226—tending to show that I declared that Great Britain was a foreign country is absolutely incorrect; because we did not buy the buoys from Great Britain. We bought them from Germany, which certainly is a foreign country; and I think I was right in suggesting that it would be better for Canada to purchase her buoys in Canada than in Germany. I thought I should take this opportunity to put the facts of this matter before the country.

I have spoken longer than I had intended; but I thought it was my duty to say a few words to-night in regard to the insinuations which have been made for some time, not only against myself, but also against the Department of Marine and Fisheries. A few months after I took charge of the department, I saw that the system of accounting there was bad, and I thought that I should get somebody to make a thorough investigation, to find out whether the system of book-keeping we had there was good or not. Because I have done that; because I have tried to bring about some reform in my department; because I tried to provide the means of ascertaining every day what the expenditures in my department were, and of making comparisons every day and every hour to see whether the expenditures were too high or not, and whether they compared favourably or unfavourably with those of former years; because I took these means of saving thousands and thousands of dollars to the department, I stand charged before the country by hon. gentlemen opposite as having been extravagant in providing that system of accounting. No, Mr. Speaker; it is the best thing I have done, because now we can ascertain whether the affairs of the department are properly administered or not. During the time my hon. friend from North Toronto was Minister of Marine and Fisheries—a man of such great administrative ability that he declared the other day that the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries was a fool or something of the kind—he did not do himself the credit of establishing a system in the department by which the books would show every day a trial balance. I thought it was absolutely necessary in such a department to have books which would show every day how the affairs of the department were going. We have that reform, and I have hoped that it would bring other reforms. But I repeat what I stated a few minutes ago, that I have had no time since I have been in the department. As I have explained immediately after I came into the department, in February, 1906, the session came on. After the session I ordered the investigation, and left for the maritime provinces. I thought it was necessary for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to go and see those provinces. I have not yet had time to visit British Columbia, though it is important that a Minister of Marine and Fisheries should visit that fine section of our country. In November, 1907, this session began. I have attended all meetings of council; I have worked with my colleagues preparing for the work of the session. As I said a few minutes ago, I have worked not less than 15 hours a day in the administration of the department, devoting all the strength I have to placing it on a proper footing. In the month of February, 1907, I was called on by the Prime Minister to go to the Colonial Conference. In June, 1907, the Prime Minister asked me to accompany the Minister of Finance to Paris to negotiate the French treaty, a treaty which I claim is a credit to this country, but which meant for me a great deal of labour. But, Mr. Speaker, I came back here in the month of October last just before the session began, and this House has been in session almost ever since. And so, Mr. Speaker, since February, 1906, I have been engaged constantly in my parliamentary and departmental duties, and this session I have been spending a good deal of time in answering the base insinuations made by hon. gentlemen opposite. Mr. Speaker, I think I have done my duty; I think I have done my share of work; but I do not object to work, In spite of all the insinuations which have been made against me, I will continue to do for my country the work that may be expected of me, and I will continue to reform the department with the view of placing it on a proper basis.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria). Mr. Speaker, I will not attempt to follow the hon. gentleman in his peregrinations in regard to the administration of affairs in his office or in regard to the alleged insincerity of hon. gentlemen now in opposition with reference to their conduct when they were in power. His whole speech has very little relation to the motion made by the hon. leader of the opposition. I would not have spoken at all on this subject had the hon. minister not undertaken to read the member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) a lecture on his conduct in speaking in general terms on the expenditure in the Militia Department for political purposes. At the time it struck me as an apt illustration of the old adage about Satan reproving sin. When I asked the minister if he had not in 1896 used his position as a prominent member of his party, throughout the length and breadth

of the province of Quebec, to appeal to the fanaticism—I use the term advisedly, for all people have more or less fanaticism—of his fellow countrymen in regard to the expenditure for the purchase of rifles for the volunteers of the Dominion of Canada, he played the old game and said that it was an insult to the people of Quebec. I want to tell him that the insult comes from himself when he so belittles the intelligence of the people of Quebec as to resort to such tactics. No man should ever remain in public life who would seek to mislead the people directely or indirectly. Let the hon. gentleman stand up and deny that on that occasion, as on others, he appealed to the prejudices of the people, even going so far as to appeal to the mothers: Are you going to vote for a Tory government in order that they may take your money to buy rifles with which to arm your sons and compel them to go and fight the battles of Britain the world over? That is the line of policy which was followed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and yet he has the nerve to get up and reprove the opposition for their strictures on the conduct of the government in connection with the civil service report commission.

If there is anything wrong in the expenditure of the Militia Department, the proper place to take that up is when the Militia estimates are before us. In the commission report there is no charge of improper expenditure against that department, but of extravaagnt expenditure, and when the estimates are under discussion, I shall be prepared to criticise them to the fullest extent. But, no doubt the newspapers supporting the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will be placarded to-morrow with big head lines describing the insult offered the people of the province of Quebec because I have pointed out the misconduct of the minister in following the line of policy he did when he attacked the late government for its purchase of rifles for our militia.

Mr. TALBOT. We do not give you so much notice as that in the province of Quebec.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman should confine himself to the study of entomology for that is his specialty. In the year 1885, when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was appealing to the fanaticism of the people of Quebec and opposing law and order in the Dominion, I had the honour of endeavouring to assist in maintaining law and order and of defending my French Canadian fellow countrymen. I took the opportunity of defending the 65th French Canadian regiment in the Northwest and of pointing out the splendid service they had done, but the hon. minister was wasting all his sympathies on the rebels and condemning the government for calling on the French Canadian regiments to go to the front. I stood for law and order, regardless of race or nationality, and my sympathies were with all his felow countrymen who stood with me. I have faith in the progressive spirit, in the honour and in that love of liberty which is characteristic of the French race, and I believe that as soon as our French Canadian fellow countrymen learn—and they are learning rapidly—that many of their leaders on the other side have for years deliberately gone from hustings to hustings and misled them, and then have turned around in their clubs and association rooms afterwards and told stories about them and laughed at and mocked them, they will administer swift vengeance on those men who have so long deceived them. I would not at all regard the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as one of the class to which I have referred as honourable and progressive and lovers of freedom and of law and order. The hon. minister referred to the work done by the people of Quebec in 1775 and I am quite ready to commend them for what they did. But our good countrymen of that province at that time sold their wares to the United States troops as well as the British troops. In 1812 they did splendid service for the old flag of Britain, but their own writings at that time and their own appeals show it was rather the dread of being under the republic than love of Great Britain which caused them to do such splendid service. The reference of the hon. minister to the annexation manifesto is entirely erroneous.

Mr. TALBOT. I rise to a point of order. I would like to know what these references of the hon. gentleman have to do with the question before us.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. He is merely giving a personal explanation and must keep within reasonable limits, and is only giving that personal explanation in the course of his reply on the amendment before the chair.

Mr. TALBOT. If the hon. gentleman stands as an interrogation point, I can understand what he means.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The issue at that time was not Cobdenism but 'no pay to rebels.' That was the reason which brought about the annexation movement at that time. The hon. minister referred to the remark of the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) with regard to the expenditure on militia. Let me point out what the minister himself said on April 22, 1896. Speaking on the vote of $1,000,000 for arms and ammunition for our militia, he said :

There is one feature in connection with this which puzzles me. We have over and again been told that in the event of a war taking place in Canada, of Canada being invaded we could rely on Great Britain's protection, and that the only ground for not severing the colonial tie was that should international difficulties arise, we

might rely on England's strong arm. Now, Sir, I am sorry to hear under the circumstances that the government, for the purpose of arming Canadian militia, have made their purchases not from private contractors but from the war office in Great Britain and that we are asked now to foot the bill. Is that the protection we have been promised by Great Britain? Is that the position in which we stand as a colony? I think we are entitled to an altogether different treatment at the hands of Great Britain. On the other hand, I do not think the war department is in such a hurry to get their money that we should be asked for a vote of money now.

Other members in sympathy with the minister took similar lines. I merely rose to make this explanation and to express my intention of supporting the resolution of my hon. leader. While with regard to some of the departments general criticisms are made by the Civil Service Commission, with regard to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, specific charges are preferred. Those charges should be probed to the bottom and a commission appointed to follow out in the other departments all those questions which have been raised.

Mr. BRODEUR. Reference has been made to the expenditure on the militia and it is charged that that expenditure is too large in comparison with the expenditure made on agriculture. Does the hon. gentleman agree in that?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have one rule in public life, quite unlike the practice and policy of the hon. minister and his administration of his department, and that is to let in the broad light of truth and justice. Let the broad light of truth be shed on every transaction and every department. But as regards military expenditure, I want to point out that the United States are expending between $5 and $6 a head this year on their army and navy and Canada is spending about 75 cents per head. Providing the money is properly expended and not too much goes in fuss and feathers, I shall not cavil at this expenditure, and I have no hesitation in saying that the militia expenditure of the Dominion is far below what it should be.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I must first congratulate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on his speech as to what he has done for the country and what he proposes to do. I have heard it so often this session that I have come to admire it more and more every time I hear it, and I have no doubt that, surfeited as the hon. gentlemen are with the laudations he showers on himself, some one will rise and say something on behalf of the minister, for God knows he needs it, as no one has said anything in his behalf this session. The minister is trying to attract the attention of every one in the country to himself and it has been on him every year since he came to this House.

He happened to be Speaker of this House and immortalized himself by being the most profligate spender of money ever in that office. He talks about juggling with accounts; the accounts of the Speaker for that year were so enormous that he had actually to juggle them to the amount of over $3,000 into the account of the Minister of Public Works.

Who is the minister and what has been his past conduct? He was Minister of Inland Revenue and was then transferred to the Department of Marine. He sat in this House and in committees and heard the Department of Marine assailed. He saw that in that garden of the grafter and that paradise of the plunderer they had been permitted to roam at large, that the department was approaching to the notoriety of the Public Works Department, he heard of its waste and saw it and on coming into power in that department he was the first man to extend the right hand of fellowship to the grafters who had been in that department for years before he entered it. He cannot deny that. Merwin and Brooks were the only men with whom he wanted to deal. These grafters who had pilfered, pillaged and plundered the money of the country were the first he dealt with. I do not wonder he does not wish their affairs to be inquired into. Does any same man believe that these grafters who plundered that department for years did not share up with somebody? And it was not with the subordinate understrappers of the department either that they were suspected of dividing up.

When he came in as a new minister to the department it was to be expected that he would have kept Brooks, Merwin and the rest of the grafters out of it, but they were the first men who introduced themselves to the minister. They knew, that of all the ministers they could best deal with him, and they have been doing very nicely too. Look at their accounts for a couple of years. In 1907, Merwin's account was over $50,000, and Brooks was over $60,000; actually when Merwin had not the money to float himself along the Minister of Marine and Fisheries took that grafter by the hand and helped him to the bank. One would imagine the minister would not dare to stand in the House and ask for consideration when the records of the grafters proved that again and again he took them in hand. A man who desired to have every stigma of disgrace removed from the department, would have told them to stand beyond its doors. But you do not get the Minister of Marine and Fisheries doing that. He knew, his deputy told him that a man in his employ named Roy had been padding the pay-lists. Did the minister at once dismiss Roy? Was he suspended? No, the minister gave him a better position,

simply transferred him from the scene of one operation to another. Here is Roy actually charged by the minister himself with padding the lists to the tune of thousands of dollars, it is currently reported, and actually, instead of suspending him, the minister retains him in his office, he is in his employ to-day and the minister cannot deny it. The minister got on a virtuous spasm, and said: I will have this man's conduct inquired into—and two years ago a good political friend of his from Montreal, Mr. Gaudet, was appointed to investigate what he has not yet reported, and, as my friend behind me says: The minister will see he never does. It is current on the streets of Montreal and in Ottawa to-day that the stealings of Roy ran into thousands of dollars but the minister kept him in his employ.

The minister has been trying to mislead the House by mis-quoting from the report. Half a dozen times he has said that the report stated there would seem to be a lack of conscience in officers of the department and that that is what he wants to have an inquiry into. The minister was misreading it and knew it. There is not a word about lack of conscience in the officers in the department. At page 34 the report says:

There would also seem to be a lack of conscience.

Then there is a period, not a reference at all to the officers. Let us see what he does with men who are honest in that department. At page 80 we find a letter written by the accountant of the department:

(Memo. for deputy minister.)

I have an account of Samson & Filion, Quebec, for packing for the steamer 'Champlain,' amounting to the sum of $562.18. It appears to me that the quantity and the price charged for this packing is very excessive. There is a charge also for 50 pounds of tallow at 15 cents a pound. I just found out from Matthews & Company by telephone that they can supply any quantity of tallow at 9 cents a pound. In that case Messrs. Samson & Filion are making a good profit on the tallow. The prices charged and certified to by the agent, Quebec, are so excessive that I do not feel like issuing a cheque without receiving further instructions. This tallow is based on the price of beefsteak.

A. W. OWEN,
Accountant.

Ottawa, August 21, 1907.

What is the end of this? Why an honest man is turned out by this minister, but a thief, Roy, is kept on and promoted. Yet this minister talks about the way he is conducting that department. No one on that side of the House will take up the cudgels on his behalf. Let us see another case showing his treatment of men who are anxious to get honesty and decency in this department. At page 81, I find a memorandum for the deputy minister from A. W. Owen:

I attach an account received from the agent at Quebec, dated October 6, for five large Morris chairs covered in plush at $18 for the 'Montcalm.' I do not see any authority given to the agent for this order. I am to request you to be good enough to initial the account for payment, if correct.

When this unfortunate man tries to bring in a little honesty into the department he is kicked out, body and boots, by the minister, but his bosom friend Roy, who pads the list, and the investigation into whose conduct has been delayed by the minister for from 16 to 18 months, is still in the employ of the department. It is high time that the minister should stop prating about the honesty prevailing to-day in his department and making reflections on those who preceded him. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries sat in this House from 1891 to 1896; the Minister of Militia sat in this House prior to that, the Minister of Customs also, and I challenge either of those hon. gentlemen to show one single case under a Conservative Minister of the Marine Department where there was an allegation of thieving or wrong doing by an official. I challenge them to instance a case of graft in that department. They must sit quiet, because they cannot prove the contrary. I will refresh their memory however by one case that occurred in that department. There was a man employed in a menial position, a cook on one of the vessels of the government in Georgian bay, and he was approached by a store-keeper in the town of Parry Sound and asked to do his trading with that store, and in consideration of his dealing there the store-keeper paid this cook $40. That happened in 1892. As soon as the case was reported in the newspapers and a charge was made, Sir Hibbert Tupper caused an investigation to take place before the county judge of the county of Bruce, Judge Kingsmill, I think it was, and what was the result? The result was that the man was at once dismissed from the service. Hon. gentlemen cannot find during all the time that Sir Hibbert Tupper was the head of that department a single charge laid at his doors in reference to middlemen or any go-between.

Mr. DEVLIN. Was the minister held responsible?

Mr. BENNETT. No, because as soon as the matter came to the minister's notice he had it inquired into and dismissed the official. I will say something further that will be interesting to hon. gentlemen opposite. The store-keeper who prompted this unfortunate cook to fall was a man named Johnston, and to show the fitness of things, this same Johnston is to-day Mr. McKay's candidate in the provincial election, a proof of the old adage that birds of a feather flock together.

Mr. DEVLIN. Who was the judge appointed to investigate?

Mr. BENNETT. Judge Kingsmill of the county of Bruce, I think he was retired at that time. Now one would imagine that this department which is so far above reproach, would have some champion here on its behalf, but it appears on this occasion, as on every other occasion, that the minister himself has to come to its rescue, while the man who is to blame for the whole thing is the Premier. He knew the antecedents of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, knew of his expensive tastes as Speaker of the House, knew that he was not a business man, and for that reason, considering the position the department was in, some person should have been put up to defend it other than the minister. The hon. gentleman has demonstrated his utter unfitness, despite all his self laudation, to conduct that department, by the fact that although these men Merwin and Brooks, were proved in the committee to have been guilty of illegal and improper relations with that department, these were the very first men that the minister dealt with and is dealing with to-day in that department. The minister cannot deny it, he sits there and assents to it. He sat in that committee and heard of all this grafting carried on by these men, and as long as the hon. gentleman is the head of that department I will venture the prophecy that Merwin and Brooks and the rest of them will find no more congenial field to do business in than the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Now I think this department is getting a little too much attention paid to it, because after all, while I believe thousands and thousands of dollars have been dissipated there, it is a mere bagatelle, for the greatest thieving department in Canada to-day is the Department of Public Works, and has been for years. It is conceded to be the greatest thieving department, and I am not making any reflection on the present incumbent of the office, because he has only been there a short time. But here is a department that openly has as its chief officials men who have committed and admitted for theft of public funds. The minister knows it, and the Prime Minister knows it, and every member of the Cabinet knows it. They have heard the case of the secretary of that department discussed on this floor half a dozen times, the man who took by misrepresentation upwards of $300 of public money and to-day he stands right in that department as the second official, practically, in point of salary and responsibility. The Minister of Public Works cannot dispense with his services nor can any other minister, because he is the man through whose hands pass all the public tenders involving millions of dollars. Take another official that the hon. gentleman has under his control, take the case of one of his chief engineers, Mr. Louis Coste. Where does he stand to-day? Why he stands here self confessed in the committee room that he was in receipt of money, not only from the government, but also from a company for whom he was making a large valuation upon which depended a grant to them of over $300,000 by this government. And this Mr. Coste is still in the employ of the department, paid $3,000 a year as an engineer, a further sum of $1,500 being attached to his salary as waterways commissioner. How can people have confidence in the departments when officials of this stamp are at their very head, and who apparently hold the minister by the throat, because the minister cannot dispense with their services. The public know that when corporations and grafters move up on this department they can do what they like with it.

Yesterday I cited the case of the Reid Company who sell office supplies to this government ,selling over $350,000 worth in the past few years. Why, Sir, look at the record in reference to one matter alone. It was necessary, at least a request had been made, that certain files should be placed in the Post Office Department. The Department of Public Works secured an estimate from this Reid Company of the cost, and the Reid Company gave them an estimate that the cost would be $30,000. Actually a vote was taken in the estimates for $30,000. But on account of the opposition of the Eclipse Company, by reason of the fact that there was competition engendered between the two, the Office Specialty Company did the work for $10,000 that they had estimated would cost $30,000. Why, Sir, companies like this Reid Company think that they can actually go into the departments and give an estimate for $30,000 for certain work and be paid that amount. Fortunately for the country, by reason of the Eclipse Company, I assume getting wind of it and forcing the competition, the Specialty Company only got $10,000 out of the government instead of what they had figured on getting.

Now I do not propose to go at length into the subject of the greatest stealing that is going on to-day in Canada, and that is in reference to the matter of dredging. But I want to say that if Judge Cassels or any independent and honest man could only go into that matter, there would be a repetition of the scandal that occurred in the United States in the case of Gaynor and Greene who are in the state penitentiary for thieving in connection with dredging operations. Look at the whole matter as it stands to-day, look at the men dealing with this department. There was no sooner a change in the government than this Mr. Bowman, M.P.P., and Mr. James Conmee, M.P., at that time in the local legislature, bounded into the dredging business. Then we find Mr. MacKay, the present leader of the Ontario opposition, bounding into the dredging business; and not to be behind them, we find Mr. Horton, of Goderich, bounding into the dredging business. And who is

Mr. Horton ? Why, Sir, Mr. Horton is the man who stood convicted in the West Elgin trial of introducing innocent young men to Pritchard in order that he might teach them to become ballot thieves. This gentleman is one of their dredging contractors too. Then we have this Ottawa company blossoming out, having among its members the son of the senior member for Ottawa (Mr. Stewart). The people do not expect anything straight in connection with this dredging business and they have not been getting anything straight. Only the other day, after the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) was importuned and begged for three months to continue contracts of this kind, or a number of them at all events, the minister consented to do that. But, it took three months for the minister to get coaxed into it. I do not know what moved the minister in the meantime to come down. I do not know how the minister was coaxed and I do not know whether the minister was persuaded but, wonderful to relate, it took three months to persuade the minister to have an order in council passed. He got it passed at last but the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made him take it back again within a few days after he had heard the exposure in this House. The minister nods his head.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Shakes his head.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, shakes his head. As I said before the minister is the greatest withdrawer in this country. He was a well known bluffer in his own little province and he tried it on when he came here. He told us of all the charges he was going to make against the leader of the opposition and that he was going to drive him out of public life. Was he not going to do that? He never drove anybody out of public life.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I defy the hon. gentleman to show that anywhere or at any time I ever intimated that I was going to drive the leader of the opposition out of public life or that I have ever said that I was going to make any charges against the leader of the opposition.

Mr. LENNOX. What about it at the Opera House?

Mr. BENNETT I have not the words of the hon. gentleman under my hand at the present time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You canot find any such words or anything suggesting them.

Mr. BENNETT. However, I have only this to say that very little attention is paid to anything that the hon. gentleman does say.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There seems to be a good deal of attention paid to things that I do not say.

Mr. BENNETT. If, as I have read in the paper, the government of New Brunswick make an investigation into certain dealings of a certain member of the late government with a certain railway company I do not think we will have the hon. gentleman in this House very much longer. The Minister of Public Works was taken to task over this dredging matter by the other members of the government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, Sir.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, then the minister did not back down of his own accord.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, Sir.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He did not back down at all. Whatever he did he did of his own accord.

Mr. BENNETT. That being the case it proves him to be a weak vessel because, the minister, after considering for three months and arriving at a decision, in a single night changes his opinion. The minister might tell us that and we may believe it or we may not believe it. But, if the searchlight was let into the Department of Public Works what a parade there would be. Talk of those who would flit, there is the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), whose bosom friends, Lott and Shibley, we found skiping to the United States. The departure and exodus of Lott and Shibley from Ontario, the Sabbath sojourning friends of the Minister of Railways and Canals would be nothing to some of these dredging contractors. The minister knows it, and he is afraid of it. Look at the Minister of Railways and Canals laugh. That is the way he laughs at his unfortunate friends. They got caught, and he is here. Well, every dog has his day. They may have the laugh later on. But the Minister of Public Works has been in the department a little while, and, as a shrewd man, he knows what has been going on during the past few years in that department. He cannot see those appalling rows of figures, up into the millions of dollars, without asking his engineers what there is to show for all this money, and his engineers can only tell him that there is very little or nothing to show for it with respect to these dredging operations because there is not. Any man knows that who looks at the matter for a moment. Supposing that Mr. Courtney, Mr. Fyshe and Mr. Bazin had gone into this department, and suposing that they had taken up these dredging operations, what a revelation there would have been. They would have found that these little paltry dredges that were for years paid by the government $70 or $80 per day were earning $250 and $300 per day, and that dredges that under ordinary circumstances should earn, if honestly operated, about $250 per day were earning $500 and $600 per day. The minister has been told by the officers in his department, I

have no doubt, that there is something wrong about it, and as a consequence he is looking into the matter, and I think he should look into the matter. I am going to give a few figures to show how these dredging operations are carried on at the expense of the people of Canada. I am going to take a little dredge owned by the Penetanguishene Dredging Company, and I am going to take random months and weeks. According to the public accounts, at one time she is earning $137 per day, at another time $144, at another time $151, or running up over $150 per day.

An hon. MEMBER. Of how many hours?

Mr. BENNETT. That is a 12-hour day. If that same dredge had been working by the hour she would have earned $100 a day. Here we have a steal of $300 per week or $1,500 per month and, in the season, a clear steal of $10,000 by a dredging plant that would not sell in the open market for $5,000. The minister has got terrified since he came into the department by these dredging operations and he has told the inspector that no matter what he states he cannot take his word, but that the inspector must make a solemn declaration and he will hold that over his head, and threaten him, and if it is not true he will prosecute him for perjury. The minister has awakened, and I think that is one of the reasons why the government do not want to have an inquiry into that and other departments. In conclusion, I want to say that it is patent at the outset that the inquiry which we are going to have is going to be a farce. That goes without saying. That is making no insinuation whatever against the judge to whom the investigation has been entrusted. Mr. Justice Cassels is simply going to be powerless in the whole matter because the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) has told us that Mr. Watson and Mr. Perron have been secured, and Mr. Watson and Mr. Perron are simply to hand out the case to the commissioner for adjudication. Mr. Watson is fairly well known in Ontario, and the West Elgin horror is still fresh in the memory of every one. Mr. Watson actually fell foul of Judge Barron in that case as prosecuting attorney. The judge insisted that certain things should be inquired into, and Mr. Watson thought they should not be. This government do not want the whole facts to come out, and it is apparent that the whole thing is simply a farce. We have proven that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been dealing with these grafters who were in his department for years before he came in. There is no charge laid at the doors of the officials that there is a lack of conscience on their part. That charge is laid at the door of the minister himself, and the country will treat this whole inquiry with the contempt that it eminently and richly deserves because of the farcical aspect that it presents.

Mr. BENNETT.

It would be really in the interests of the country if the government could be constrained to accept the very reasonable proposition which I submit—let the opposition have the choice of one lawyer at this investigation. But, that is something that they do not propose to do. They are going to endeavour to whitewash the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and they are going to preclude any inquiry into the Department of Public Works. With the exodus of Lott and Shibley I suppose that they imagine that no other leading Liberals could be well spared from the country at the present time, and therefore the Department of Public Works is not going to be inquired into. I propose to vote for the motion presented to the House by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, believing as I do that the fair sense of the people of this country regards the disbursements of public money by this government as being improper in the highest degree. It is evident that there has been grafting and thieving going on in every department of the government, that the middlemen have been given a free hand and there is every reason to believe that wrong-doing will be laid at the doors of men whose names have not as yet been disclosed. There is no doubt in the world that if there were a full and searching and thorough inquiry before these three commissioners, or before Judge Cassels, if he were unfettered in his powers, there would be an exposure that would startle the people of the country, but which, no doubt, in the end would do good service to the Dominion as a whole, and to the honest administration of public affairs for all time to come.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington). Personally, I do not like to take part in the debate at this late hour, nor do I like particularly following the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). However, while I do not desire to pay much attention to the hon. gentleman's remarks, there are among many of the harsh words which slipped so glibly from his tongue, one or two sentences which call for some reference It is now ten years since I first heard the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) make a speech, and his speech of to-night was very little different from the speech he then delivered in a by-election in South Ontario. Even in these early days of his political career the words : graft, grafters, ballot switching, pillaging, plunder, rolled just as glibly under his tongue as they do now.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman must confess that the overthrow of the Ross government amply justified my words on that occasion.

Mr. GUTHRIE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Benentt) has so accustomed himself to that language that I do not think it is possible for him to rid himself of the habit. But,

not only in the eyes of members of this House, but in the eyes of the people of the country the hon. gentleman is regarded in the light of the small boy in Aesop's Fables who continually called wolf, wolf, until when the real wolf came no one would believe him. And so, if the hon. member should ever happen to come across a minister, or a member of parliament, or a civil servant, who is derelict in his duty not one man out of 100 men would believe the member for East Simcoe, if he said so.

Mr. BENNETT. I suppose probably the country would believe——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) allow an interruption.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BENNETT. All right then.

Mr. GUTHRIE. There was one remark made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) to which I shall refer. He said there was not a member on this side of the House prepared to get up and say a word in justification of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Well, while I am not a prominent member on this side of the House, I know full well I voice the feeling of every member here when I say that we have the most absolute respect for and the most absolute confidence in the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and that we all recognize his ability, his integrity, and his desire and intention to do everything that is right and proper, and nothing that is wrong or censurable in the administration of his department. I may tell the hon. member for East Simcoe that it is not altogether courteous or chivalrous—I don't suppose he cares much about that for he does not accustom himself to the language of chivalry—I tell him it is neither courteous nor chivalrous nor fair to use such language as he has to-night used in reference to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. In the custom of chivalry when you cast down the gauntlet and asked some one to take it up, the challenge was made and answered. And to-night I would cast down the gauntlet to the member for East Simcoe and I offer him this challenge: If you can show that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been guilty of the slightest jot or title of dishonesty in connection with the administration of his department, I will take back all I have said in commendation of that hon. gentleman. And I say to the member for East Simcoe: If you do not accept that challenge then in the language of chivalry, if you lived in the old days, you would be spoken of as a coward, a poltroon, and a backbiter. I wish to draw the attention of the House also to another statement made by the hon. member for East Simcoe which I think was particularly unfair and misleading. He read from page 34 of the Civil Service Commission report the words: 'There would also seem to be lack of conscience,' and he said that contrary to the statement of the Minister of Marine, that reference was not made to officers of the department. Now, let me ask—not the member for East Simcoe—but let me ask any other member of this House to read the paragraph in which that sentence occurs and to see if it does not apply to the officers of the department, just as the minister has said. It is all in one paragraph and the paragraph goes on:

> If no one gets any benefit from trade with the government except the trader then it must be clear that in these great purchases made for the government, without discount, its officers must be assisting the trader to get better prices from the government than he can get anywhere else, for everywhere else he has to give discount. In other words, some of the government's officers are serving two masters, and apparently succeeding with both—scripture notwithstanding.

It will be seen therefore that in both instances, the reference is to the officers of the department and not to the department as a whole and not to the minister. I shall not take up any more time in discussing statements made by the member for East Simcoe, but I should like to refer to a few other things which have arisen in the course of the debate. It is perhaps my misfortune that whenever I have to make reference to the hon. the leader of the opposition and to the hon. member for North Toronto, I never have the pleasure of having them before me. However, I do not propose on account of their absence to hesitate saying that which I have to say with reference to their utterances of to-day. This motion, and the speech of the leader of the opposition were evidently launched for the purpose of circulating if possible more fully than it has been amongst the electors, the report of the Civil Service Commission, because fully 50 per cent of the speech of the leader of the opposition was made up of quotations from that report. The speech of the hon. member for North Toronto was his old pre-election harangue and if any one will take up the Toronto 'Mail and Empire' of about two weeks ago and read the speech then delivered by the hon. gentleman before his constituents he will find it is almost identical with the speech he delivered here to-night. I do not believe that either the hon. leader of the opposition or the hon. member for North Toronto seriously believe in the motion which they have placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker, on this occasion; but they are serious enough in their desire to spread broadcast throughout this country certain statements which may be taken from that report, isolated from the context, and which when so treated are positive slanders

against the persons at whom they are aimed. The hon. member for North Toronto acquitted himself with that force which he usually exercises when he addresses this House; but I must tell him that much clapping and slapping of the hands, much pounding of his desk, much gesticulation, does not add emphasis to his remarks, in the opinion of members on this side of the House, although such actions on the part of the hon member may and so call for loud applause from a band of his admiring followers. Now, what did he bring up which the House was not already in possession of? He went over the old land-deal scandals, or so-called scandals, the charges of impropriety in connection with timber and irrigation companies, charges which have time after time been investigated in this House and disposed of, merely to give what in his opinion was justification for a more extended inquiry than is proposed to be had before Mr. Justice Cassels. But he seems to forget that which we all remember, namely, that there had been the fullest, freest and fairest investigation of all these matters, from the original documents, in the Public Accounts Committee and otherwise, and therefore there is not the slighest necessity for any further investigation or discovery. But the hon. member for North Toronto said that the government were inclined to repudiate the commission, to find fault with it, to sneer at it. Now, I do not find, in any statement which has been made to-day by any one on this side of the House any such insinuation either on the part of the government or on the part of any member supporting the government. On the contrary, the government realize that this is a report made by their own commission, and I am satisfied of one thing, though I do not know the minds of the government, that having received that report from a commission appointed by themselves, they are going to give its recommendations all the weight and authority that such recommendations coming from such men should have. They are not going to treat the report as such reports were treated by Conservative governments in the past. I have no doubt in my mind that if the administration of the various departments to-day is found wanting in any respect, though I do not admit that it is, the reason is that the Liberal party did not take such action as they would have been justified in taking in the year 1896 when they obtained power. The party which introduced into this country and into the civil service of this country that iniquitous system known as the spoils system was not the Liberal party. There was a civil service in this country before confederation. Under the Act of Union of 1841 we had a civil service, and it continued until the year 1867. In the year 1868 a new service had to be instituted;

there were new provinces, new requirements, and new services to be performed. So that in that year was passed the first Civil Service Act, and a very crude affair it was. In the following year was appointed the first Civil Service Commission. That commission was to find out what was requisite in the way of a civil service for the country. That commission made its report, and in pursuance of that report the first civil service was established under the coalition government, though the premier was the late Sir John Macdonald. The coalition system did not work very well and did not stand very long; and shortly after confederation, instead of carrying out the idea of the fathers of confederation in regard to the civil service or the Senate, the spoils system was introduced deliberately, and appointments were only made to the civil service or to the Senate of political partisans of the government of the day. That was the first real introduction of that system into this country, a system which has for its motto, 'to the victors belong the spoils.' That system was continued. I do not say that the Mackenzie administration did not continue it as well as other administrations; but I do say that after the year 1878, after the Mackenzie administration went out of power, the system received fresh vigour at the hands of the Conservative administration which came in for a second time. It is well known that many of the Liberal appointments made at the close of the Liberal administration were deliberately set aside by the government of Sir John Macdonald and the places filled by prominent Conservatives. That surely was the maintenance of the spoils system. There was much outcry and much comment at the time, and it was on account of that that the Civil Service Commission of 1880 was appointed. How did the Conservative government of that day treat that commission? They appointed it, I think I can safely say at this time, for the purpose of fooling or hoodwinking the public. They had no real intention of taking the civil service out of politics, but their commissioners had that intention, and the only real suggestion or recommendation which that commission made, the most pointed and most prominent, was that all civil service appointments should be open to free competition. In 1881 there was nothing done. In 1883 there was very little done. It is true that there was a Civil Service Act passed and a board of examiners appointed, but there was no board of civil service commissioners appointed, as the commission recommended. It is true, the examination were prescribed, but not those that the commission recommended. The system of examination was changed, and although hundreds passed the examinations, only Conservative candidates could obtain ad-

mission to the service. That Act was amended every year up to 1889 and every amendment made to it was for the purpose of doing away with or relaxing conditions which the Act imposed. I make that statement on the authority of the commission which discussed the matter in 1892. They say there that the Act was amended from year to year for the express purpose of giving greater latitude to the government or relaxing its restrictions or conditions.

How did the next commission come to be appointed? It was appointed because there was a greater outcry throughout Canada probably than ever before. In 1891 this whole country was shaken and its people humiliated by the disclosures which had taken place before the parliamentary commission of this House. There was an outcry from one end of the country to the other that something must be done, that some reform must take place, and in order to meet that cry—but without the slightest intention of doing anything, except hoodwinking the public—another commission was appointed in November, 1891. That commission reported in the spring of 1892. Quotations have been made from that report on many occasions to-day, but there are some things in it which have not been brought out properly in this debate. The original powers given the commission were these. They were entitled to investigate any subject connected with the civil service which, in their opinion, required consideration and readjustment in order to attain the greatest possible efficiency. Their powers were similar to the general powers given the recent commission. Those powers are included under ten headings, and, besides the matters specially designated, the commissioners are authorized to inquire into any other matter relative to the service which, in the opinion of the commissioners, requires consideration. The commissioners in 1892 were four in number. Mr. J. M. Courtney was commissioner then as well as in the commission of 1907-8. The commission of 1892 made some express findings, which it is well to note. They found that there was political interference in the civil service; that the examinations were a mere mockery and the promotion examinations in many cases evaded altogether. They found that the departments were overmanned and underpaid; that they were overmanned through political influence and favourtism and that the purchasing system was very widely astray. They did not use the term 'discount' or state that no discounts appeared, but the statement they did make in that respect is to be found page 58 of the report:

A still further subject your commissioners deem worthy of note, before treating of the expenditures themselves, is that relating to the purchase of supplies and the prices paid for articles purchased by the several departments. In his evidence before the commission, the Auditor General stated most distinctly that when goods were purchased without tenders, such as furniture and other supplies for the public buildings, as a rule, retail prices were paid for the same when wholesale prices should have prevailed.

Thus admitting that the same system was in vogue in those days as, it is charged, has been continued since. The attention of the late Conservative government was called to all these matters in that report. They knew that the departments were being overmanned through political influence. They knew that purchases were improperly made, and that retail prices were paid where wholesale prices should have prevailed. They knew that the examination system was a farce and that the spoil system was in full force. What did they do? 1892 passed and nothing done. So did 1893, 1894 and 1895 and nothing whatever accomplished. 1896 passed and with it the Conservative government, and then there began to be some shaking up of the dry bones in the various departments. It is perhaps not altogether accurate for me to say that in 1893 absolutely nothing was done. Among the recommendations of the commissioners was one with regard to superannuation, and there was a bill passed on that subject. But to the positive recommendation of the commissioners regarding appointments to the service, examinations, open competition and so forth, not the slightest attention was paid, so that I think the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was not quite fair when he said that the recommendations of that commission had been carried out by three separate Bills. The commissioners themselves drafted a Civil Service Bill, a most elaborate measure. Read it carefully because it would make the basis of a splendid civil service enactment. But it was disregarded almost in toto, and a Bill introduced by Mr. Costigan in 1893. You can search through the sections of that Bill—sixteen in number—and you will find them the most formal kinds of amendment to the original Act of 1882. One or two clauses of the draft Bill of the commission of 1892 were incorporated in the Bill No. 29 of 1893, but all the main recommendations of the commissioners, all the main clauses of their Bill were emasculated and deprived of any effect. Now these hon. gentlemen say that that Bill was not passed because of the stand taken by the right hon. gentleman who now leads the government. Nothing can be further from the fact. The Conservative government had then a majority of forty or fifty and they would have passed that Bill had they so desired; but what was objected to by the right hon. gentleman, then leader of the opposition, was that the government's Bill was merely intended to give the government the chance f maintaining the iniquitous spoils system which they had maintained from confederation down to 1893. The Bill in any event was dropped and nothing

was done, and the Conservative government went out of power in 1896. What then happened? No sooner had the present government been sworn in than every Conservative newspaper in the land was crying out that the guillotine was at work and the Conservative heads of the various branches of the service were dropping into the basket. The late Mr. Tarte, then Minister of Public Works, did make some removals, and was caricatured throughout Canada with the guillotine beside him, as an unscrupulous tyrant. Sir William Mulock, then Postmaster General, made some removals, and he also was hounded and vilified. Certain removals were made in the Department of Agriculture, but strange to say the incoming government, having faith no doubt in the commissioners' report of 1893, as regards the Militia Department and the Department of Marine and Fisheries, made no removals that I know of, but continued on the same old Conservative staff in each department without a single exception. There is one distinction between the report of 1893 and the report recently presented, which I desire to point out. The report of 1892 made under a commission given general powers to investigate just as broad as those of the commission of 1907, contains this statement:

> The commissioners before entering into the consideration of the subjects laid down in the reference, desire to state, that it was not within the lines of their duty to follow up inquiries made by the Committee of the House of Commons in the session of 1891, which brought out certain irregularities, but rather to suggest such improvements in methods applicable to all departments as will tend to prevent irregularities in future.

They absolutely state they will not investigate these irregularities although their powers are almost identical with those of the commission of 1907. The commissioners at the very outset say they are not going to investigate irregularities which they considered were outside the scope of their commission. Certainly a certificate coming under such circumstances will have very little force, weight or effect throughout the country as there was no investigation into irregularities or anything of the kind, but the report of the commissioners states that they had visited the departments and that they found an extremely favourable condition of things in the Marine and Fisheries Department; they also make a complimentary reference to the Militia Department. Is it any wonder then that the incoming government should have made no removals in either of these departments? If they had in view, as I believe they have had for years, a new civil service system, whereby the spoils system will be absolutely abolished in this country; in 1896, they set out properly to initiate that system because the removals were few and under the circumstances should have been far more. How has it turned out? We had a commission appointed in 1907 and where is the fault found? Is there any fault found in that report with the Department of Agriculture, where derelict officials were removed? Hardly a word spoken of that department. Is any serious fault found with the Post Office Department, where objectionable Conservative officials were removed? There is hardly a criticism of the Post Office Department. Is any serious fault found with the Public Works Department where Mr. Tarte cleared the way? Hardly a word, they did not see fit even to investigate that department. But when you come to the Marine and Fisheries Department and the Militia Department where there was no guillotine, where old Conservative officials were trusted and continued, there your trouble arises.

The old system has been continued, until recently at all events, but I assume, although I do not know, that things could not have been going very well last spring. Some difficulty must have arisen and if any difficulty did arise, if there was cause for any suspicion, the government, I submit, did the proper thing under the circumstances in appointing a commission of three men in whom both the government and the public have absolute confidence, to inquire into the system. Why the government should now be condemned for that action I do not know. To my mind it was the only fair, honest, statesmanlike and businesslike course which the government could take. They themselves invited the investigation and they themselves, now that the report has been received, I think can be well trusted to remedy any defects which may have been reported in that system. I think, therefore, the motion which has been made on that subject by the leader of the opposition should fail. The investigation has been complete to an extreme, far more complete perhaps than any one anticipated, but it is well for the government and for the country that it has been so complete.

But there is a feeling in my mind and I think in the mind of any unprejudiced man, that the commission either did go too far or not far enough in some of their findings, and it is for that reason that a judge, highly respected by every one who knows him, has been asked to point out or to place his hand upon the real culprit or culprits, if there be more than one, in the Marine and Fisheries Department. I have no doubt, although I do not know the mind of the government, that they will take steps to remedy the defects that have been pointed out. I do not know just what lines of action they may see fit to take, but I am satisfied that when their measure does come down it will be found to remedy the defects and to satisfy the desires of every reasonable man in this country who wishes to see a better civil service system inaugurated and maintained.

The hon. member for North Toronto made what I would term a sort of wild election speech. He took his cue, no doubt, from certain remarks of his own leader when he spoke of the commission's report as being a sort of campaign document. It has been used as such a document by the Conservative party, there is no doubt about that. When the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) took the floor, he immediately reverted to what he called the revenge which the people had taken on the present government in New Brunswick. He spoke also of what had taken place in British Columbia and then he referred to some small municipal election in the city of Halifax, yesterday. I believe that in some of the wards some aldermen were elected. These are the indications which present themselves to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), and evidently convince him that there is a brighter day coming for the Conservative party than there has been for many years past. If he accepts these as positive or conclusive signs he is easily satisfied and we do not quarrel with him, but I think he went out of his way to say some unkind and very mean things in regard to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It was an unnecessary sneer for the hon. member to use in regard to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries when he said that the minister had gone down to the province of Quebec in 1896 to oppose military expenditures, in other words to raise a race and creed agitation in that province. I am satisfied that the statement of the minister in that regard is absolutely correct and the statement of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is absolutely unfounded. I cannot say that he made that statement knowing it to be false, but I can say that he made it in such utter, reckless disregard as to whether it were false or true that it should be condemned by every right-thinking man in this House.

There is another peculiar circumstance to which I wish to refer. The hon. member who leads the opposition, on the 20th day of August last, proceeded to Halifax, there to enunciate his political platform and to announce to the citizens of Halifax, the capital of Nova Scotia, that he had placed in it a plank in regard to civil service reform. Why he should have gone to Halifax to make that announcement for the first time, I do not know. Was it in the spirit of bravado that he went there? I think it would have been more fitting if he had gone to the county of Carleton to make that announcement than to the city of Halifax. The hon. member for North Toronto always reverts to conditions in New Brunswick; time and again he tells us what has happened, what is happening and what will happen in the province of New Brunswick. Why, Sir, the strangest thing of all is to see these two hon. members occupying the seats of the mighty in the opposition ranks of this House; the leader of the opposition himself, politically expatriated from his native province of Nova Scotia, driven to seek a seat amidst the preponderating Orange vote of the county of Carleton; the member for North Toronto, politically expatriated from his native province of New Brunswick, driven to seek a seat amidst the preponderating Orange Tory vote of the city of Toronto. And there they sit together, while Orangemen to the right of them, Orangemen to the left of them, and Orangemen behind them volley and thunder. I have no doubt, having regard to the constituencies which they represent in this House, that the hon. member for North Toronto finds it necessary occasionally to furnish some strong meat for his constituents, and he can best supply that by making sneers and jibes at something that transpired in the province of Quebec. The whole discussion of this question I think has gone rather far afield, having regard to the motion and the amendment which has been placed in your hands. However, at this late hour, I will not venture to trespass upon the time of the House by entering further upon the discussion.

House divided on amendment (Mr. R. L. Borden).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lennox,
Ames,	Macdonell,
Armstrong,	MacLaren,
Avery,	McCarthy (Calgary),
Barker,	McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Barr,	Marshall,
Bennett,	Martin (Queens, P.E.I.),
Blain,	Morin,
Borden (Carleton),	Northrup,
Boyce,	Perley,
Brabazon,	Porter,
Broder,	Reid (Grenville),
Chisholm (Huron),	Roche (Marquette),
Clare,	Schaffner,
Clements,	Sproule,
Cockshutt,	Stanfield,
Crocket,	Staples,
Daniel,	Walsh (Huntingdon),
Elson,	Ward,
Fowler,	Wilmot,
Ganong,	Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Haggart,	Worthington.—48.
Henderson,	
Herron,	
Hughes (Victoria),	
Lake,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Archambault,	Lemieux,
Aylesworth,	Loggie,
Beauparlant,	Lovell,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Macdonald,
Bourbonnais,	Maclean (Lunenburg),
	Macpherson,

Brodeur,
Brown,
Caldwell,
Carrier,
Cash,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Copp,
Crawford,
Cyr,
Delisle,
Demers,
Desjardins,
Devlin,
Dubeau,
Dugas,
Emmerson,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Galliher,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Girard,
Gladu,
Graham,
Guthrie,
Hall,
Harty,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Hunt,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne (Drum. & Arth.),
LeBlanc,
McColl,
McCraney,
McIntyre (Perth),
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLean (York, C.),
McLennan,
Major,
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin (Montreal, Ste. Mary's),
Martin (Wellington),
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Michaud,
Miller,
Parmelee,
Paterson,
Parent,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Pugsley,
Ratz,
Reid (Restigouche),
Rivet,
Robitaille,
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schell (Glengarry),
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Oxford),
Stewart,
Telford,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turcotte,
Turgeon,
Watson,
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—99.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Calvert,	Taylor,
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Talbot,	Bergeron,
Greenway,	Tisdale,
Fielding,	Foster,
Wilson (Russell),	Bristol,
German,	Lancaster,
Black,	Monk,
Oliver,	Osler,
Beland,	White,
Kennedy,	Pringle,
Gordon,	Kemp,
Clarke,	Maclean (York, S.),
Grant,	Seagram,
Ethier,	Leonard,
Conmee,	Wright (Muskoka),
Schell (Oxford),	Smith (Wentworth),
Carney,	Lalor,
Sifton,	Forget,
Turriff,	Beattie,
Mr. GUTHRIE.	
Adamson,	Jackson (Elgin),
Pardee,	Christie,
Roche (Halifax),	Lewis,
Law,	Thompson,
Bureau.	Paquet.

Amendment (Mr. R. L. Borden) negatived.

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

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT.—DOUKHOBORS AT YORKTON.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I desire to read a telegram that I have received this evening from Yorkton, Saskatchewan, and which is as follows :

Yorkton, Saskatchewan, April 30, 1908.

R. L. Borden, M.P., Ottawa.

Fort William contingent of vagrants presumably insane Doukhobors shipped here in charge of an official of Ontario government still in coaches on track here. Induced to come to Yorkton under misrepresentation that they were going to a warmer climate. Doukhobors in villages refuse to acknowledge them. Citizens strongly protest against them being dumped here. Some twenty in a nude state indecently exposing themselves. Provincial government inform us matter being taken up with Immigration Department of Dominion government. Matter extremely urgent. Please urge immediate action.

G. P. BRADBROOK,
Secretary Board of Trade.
R. H. LOCK,
Secretary-Treasurer.

I do not know anything about this telegram, except that it came addressed to me this evening and as they desire that the matter should be urged upon the attention of the government, I have taken this opportunity of reading it in order that the Prime Minister may determine whether any action can properly be taken.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As my hon. friend knows if these people have violated the laws of the province of Saskatchewan they are under the jurisdiction of the provincial authorities.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business may we expect to-morrow ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The same supply.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1. 30 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, May 1, 1908.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). Mr. Speaker, in compliance with a request made yesterday by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), I beg leave to lay on the table the letter of instructions to Mr. Watson in reference to the investigation before Judge Cassels, relating to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether the resignation of the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries which was tendered some time ago, as we were informed, has been accepted or is still under consideration.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I could not say to my hon. friend. The minister is not here.

SUPPLY—WANDERING DOUKHOBORS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Mr. Speaker, last night the hon. leader of the opposition called the attention of the government to a telegram which he had received shortly before from the town of Yorkton in the province of Saskatchewan, and which was as follows :

Yorkton, Saskatchewan, April 30, 1908.

R. L. Borden, M.P., Ottawa.

Fort William contingent of vagrants presumably insane Doukhobors shipped here in charge of an official of Ontario government still in coaches on track here. Induced to come to Yorkton under misrepresentation that they were going to warmer climate. Doukhobors in villages refuse to acknowledge them. Citizens strongly protest against them being dumped here. Some twenty in a nude state indecently exposing themselves. Provincial government inform us matter being taken up with Immigration Department of Dominion government. Matter extremely urgent. Please urge immediate action.

G. P. BRADBROOK,
Secretary Board of Trade.
R. H. LOCK,
Secretary-Treasurer.

The reply of the Prime Minister was as follows :

As my hon. friend knows if these people have violated the laws of the province of Saskatchewan they are under the jurisdiction of the provincial authorities.

I consider that a most unsatisfactory statement coming from the head of this government. Let me recall to your mind the facts of the case in regard to this special number of Doukhobors. They are well known to the public, having been freely discussed in the public press. In the early part of last summer a number of Doukhobors started eastward on a pilgrimage on foot. They went by easy stages and reached Fort William or Port Arthur at the beginning of the winter. They took a house and stayed at Fort William during the winter. While they were there they committed several offences against public decency, and finally on April 9, this spring, nineteen of them were committed to imprisonment in the central prison for a term of six months, I believe. While they were undergoing punishment and before they had been removed from Port Arthur, the Dominion government stepped in and ordered their release when they had been in prison only ten days. The Minister of Justice stated in answer to a question of mine the other day, that it had been represented to him that these Doukhobors had come from Saskatoon, and as there was no room for the prisoners in the prisons of the country, it would be advisable to pardon them, and, to use his own words, 'let them be removed to the part of the country from which they came.' On these representations he sent a telegram as follows :

April 14, 1908.

Mr. Police Magistrate Palling,
Fort William.

The Minister of Justice requests you will be good enough to send immediately report upon cases of ten male and nine female Doukhobors committed by you to Port Arthur jail.

A. POWER,
For Deputy Minister of Justice.

The report was received and submitted to His Excellency the administrator on the 18th of April, and the release of the prisoners was ordered. Thereupon the Doukhobors stepped out from jail defiant and triumphant at having successfully defied the laws of this country. According to the newspapers, another telegram was sent at the same time that the Minister of Justice was telegraphing to the magistrate at Fort William, and was received by that magistrate before he had time to answer the first telegram. That telegram was as follows :

Please report pardon for Doukhobors now in Port Arthur jail preparatory to their being shipped back to Saskatchewan, where they come from.

I do not know whom that telegram came from. At any rate, the Minister of Justice repudiates it. But the fact that the two telegrams were sent practically at the same time showed that the Minister of Justice must have been a party to the intention to ship these people west to the province of Saskatchewan. The Minister of Justice says that, as far as he was concerned, the Doukhobors were at liberty to

come and go as they pleased like any other citizens and that he had no intention of sending them to the province of Saskatchewan. That is evidently a quibble. He knew all about it and was a party to the steps which were taken, and the Doukhobors were released in order to be sent back to that province. I consider that the government of the Dominion have a considerable amount of responsibility for the release of these prisoners. I made inquiry as to whether the government would accept responsibility for having released prisoners almost immediately after conviction and before they had been properly punished. The right hon. the First Minister rather smiled and said no, that the administration of justice was in the hands of the provincial authorities. I hold, however, that when the provincial authorities have done their duty and put these people in jail, the Dominion authorities assume a great deal of responsibility when they order them to be released. The Dominion government assume responsibility to see that these people do not offend the second time shortly after their release, and also to see that any expense incurred by another province, in case these people should again offend, should not fall on that province. Only the other day I saw a case reported in the newspapers in which the Minister of Justice had released a man convicted for stealing horses. The man was released before the expiry of the term, and shortly after he got out of jail he again committed a similar offence and put the provincial authorities to a great deal of trouble and expense. I am glad to say that the man was captured again and again committed for a long term, and I trust the Minister of Justice will not take it into his head to again release that man and start him on his career of horse stealing again.

The first thing that strikes me is that these Doukhobors were sent to Yorkton, instead of to Saskatoon if they came from there. On arrival at Yorkton it was found that some of them were travelling in a state of nudity and the people of Yorkton object to having these people turned out on their streets to parade in that condition. The people of the province of Saskatchewan are thus put to the expense of preventing these Doukhobors from committing any further offence against public decency. This whole business is a public scandal. These people, who were accustomed to parade in this condition in the town of Fort William are released from the just punishment for their offences, put on board the cars, sent to another province and allowed to get out and offend the people there. It is time the government took some steps to look after these wretched creatures. They were brought into this country in the year 1899. They were placed in the province of Saskatchewan without the permission of the people of that province having been particularly asked, and yet that province is held responsible. That province has had a great deal of trouble with these people. It has been found impossible to make them obey some of our laws. They were brought in by this government with a great deal of eclat. They were the first fruits of the 'splendid' policy of immigration introduced by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). Liberal organizations all through the country made a great hurroo about them. Special receptions were organized, brass bands and all that sort of thing, and they were received in a way very liable to spoil them and cause them rather to look with disrespect on Canadians. The cost of bringing them out was pretty considerable because they received a bonus of one pound per head, although at that time immigrants from the British Isles were only receiving one-half that bonus. For the first year they cost the government in bonus and keep, $7.47 per head for every man, woman and child of them. Under the circumstances, I think this government are especially responsible, and should explain on what ground they were a party to shipping these people back to another province. These people remained there throughout the winter. In the early part of the winter we did not hear that they were acting in any very extraordinary way, but during the winter they apparently became demented. It is time for the government to take cognizance of this public scandal. The government are to be condemned for turning these people out naked into the streets of one of our Canadian cities.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). In the answer I gave to the question of my hon. friend last week, I stated as fully as possible exactly the circumstances. I stated that in this whole business this government recognizes and undertakes no responsibility whatever except for the recommendation to release these prisoners. For that recommendation I of course take the fullest responsibility. It was made by myself in the course of daily departmental business and was a proper recommendation under the circumstances. It was made, as I have already stated, upon the direct request and recommendation to me of the Attorney General of the province of Ontario, who is the proper official and the proper constitutional authority charged with the duty of administering justice within the province. And I may say that in the twenty-three months experience I have now had in the Department of Justice, in dealing with applications for the release of prisoners, it has been not infrequent that for some special reason the pardon or release upon ticket of leave of some particular prisoner has been suggested or recommended by the Attorney General of the province from which that prisoner came or in which the offence was com-

mitted, and I do not recall any instance in which such a recommendation has not been acted upon. Certainly, it is a recommendation of the greatest potency, and one which, in all ordinary circumstances, I would think, should at least be regarded, if not followed implicitly. In the case of these particular prisoners, there was an offence against good morals, an offence against society——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On what date was the answer given ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. On April 23, as found in unrevised 'Hansard, page 7210. In the case of these prisoners, I say, the offence was one against social order and one which had been dealt with by the local municipal authorities. The conviction had been made by the police magistrate of the city of Fort William, himself a provincial official. The application for the release of these prisoners was not merely supported by letter of the deputy Attorney General of the province in which their pardon was asked as something which he thought the best course to be taken in the circumstances, but the application was supported by the coming to Ottawa for that express purpose of two of the prison officials of the provincial government. These two gentlemen came bringing the letter I have referred to with them, and stating that the object of their application was in order that the whole of the colony of Doukhobors who had been living in Fort William for some months might return to the place from whence they came. It was stated to me that it was the wish of these people to rejoin their companions, their fellows, their family relations, I suppose, who remained in the province of Saskatchewan, and they were not willing to return if they were to be compelled to leave behind those of their unmber who had been imprisoned for the offence referred to. In the circumstances, I think, every hon. gentleman who hears me will concur in the feeling that the application came very strongly supported. I do not, at the moment, remember the length of the imprisonment to which these men and women had been sentenced, but I point out that, however much to be reprehended the offence is of which these people had been guilty, it is conceded on all hands that it was something which they had done contrary to good morals and social order, but in which there was, on their part, no intent to commit crime, in which there was on their part. it may be, conscientious action dependent upon motives of a religious character, and an offence which, at all events, was induced according to every account of it, which I have seen or which has been made to my knowledge, by a sort of religious mania or frenzy which possibly amounts, as the hon. gentleman has suggested, practically to a loss of reason or to insanity. Well, if people are in that condition, those who are best able to take care of their fellows whose reason has been affected or impared, upon whom the care of such poor people to be pitied, unoffending creatures, may most properly be cast, are the very family relations or companions to whom, as I was told, they were desirous of returning. The responsibility for the care of the insane, equally with that for the care of prisoners under shorter terms and for the less serious offences, is upon the provincial authorities. And, in these circumstances, it was simply a case where people in prison for a comparatively venial offence were, by the constituted authorities of the province, asked to be allowed to go in order that they might go with their fellows to their homes, to the place from which they came. Though it has been charged in the newspapers, and was in a sense endorsed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) who has just spoken, in the question which he put in the House, that the application to the convicting magistrate from the Department of Justice for a report in the case of these prisoners was immediately followed by a request, or direction, or suggestion, by telegram from the Department of Justice to the same magistrate that he should report favouring a pardon, I took occasion to deny that very unequivocally in the answer I made.

Mr. LAKE. I did not make the charge, but read the statement to that effect and asked if it was true.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Certainly, I acquit altogether my hon. friend (Mr. Lake) from any intention to make the charge. The language I have just used was that it was freely charged in the newspapers, and in a sense, endorsed by the hon. gentleman. I do not wish to be understood at all as saying anything to the contrary if the hon. gentleman wishes it to be understood that he did not at all share in the impression that this request for a report favouring a pardon had proceeded from the Department of Justice. As I have said, that was not the case at all, and I can only surmise from what source the telegram, which is quoted verbatim in the question I have referred to did proceed ; I supposed it must have come from the officials here in Ottawa at that time when they made the application for the release of these people and who were interested in getting them returned to the province of Saskatchewan. With anything that has taken place since the signing of the recommendation to His Excellency for the release of these prisoners, I have had nothing whatever to do, and I have no knowledge whatever beyond what has appeared in the newspapers, and from the reception yesterday of a telegram in identical words with the telegram read at the adjournment of the House by the hon. leader

of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). But whatever the situation in the province of Saskatchewan, or wherever these men may be, it is, I repeat, in my submission, a provincial matter, a matter in regard to which this government is under no resposibility whatever, and in regard to which any action that has been taken by the Department of Justice in this connection is not one that leaves the department itself in any way open to fair criticism. I have acted with regard to these prisoners exactly in the way in which I would have acted if the same men or women had been Canadian born, in the same way as if they had been of any other nationality whatever. The nationality of the people had not anything the slightest to do with the course taken with respect to them. And the number had nothing to do with it. It was simply a case with those convicted of this offence of going publicly without clothing, and an application on the part of the constituted authorities of the province in which that offence had been committed that these persons should be pardoned.

Once pardoned that person was absolutely free to go wheresoever he or she might see fit, and so long as no law of the country was broken, that person was not to be restrained of his or her personal liberty. That appears to be exactly what has taken place. These people have gone, it may be in charge of a provincial officer, from Fort William back to where they came from. The hon. gentleman representing a constituency in the province to which they have gone (Mr. Lake) thinks that it was wrong that they should have gone there. He speaks of the Dominion government having stepped in, as though the Dominion government had officiously, of its own motion, without having been asked to do so, interfered in this matter and done something to put these people off the province of Ontario and on to the province of Saskatchewan. I disclaim any such representation of what has taken place in regard to this matter. There has been so far as the Department of Justice is concerned—and that department alone of any in the government so far as I am aware has had anything to do with this transaction—no siding with one province or with another province. It is a matter of absolute indifference, so far as the Dominion authorities are concerned, in which province of this Dominion those people may be. But there has been a facilitating, if my hon. friend wishes to put it in that way, a facilitating of an intention expressed beforehand on the part of the officials of whom I have spoken, that these people should return to the place from which they came. It is in no other sense that there has been any sending of these men and women from one part of the country to another, and there is nothing in anything I have done in the matter which merits the application of the word 'quibble' which I understand my hon. friend has used in describing what has taken place. I have stated from the outset exactly what I knew of the matter. I was told beforehand that the object in asking that these imprisoned people should be set free was in order that with those of their companions who were at large they might go away all together, and because those who were at large declined to go leaving behind their companions in jail.

I cannot speak of the other case to which the hon. gentleman has alluded, because I do not identify it in any way. He complains that in some other instance, some man imprisoned for horse stealing was improperly released. Well, it only illustrates, and I ask any hon. gentleman who will be good enough to take the trouble to consider this, something of the difficulty of the position in which any man is who has to advise on many hundreds of applications of this character in the course of a twelvemonth. It is manifestly impossible to please everybody in such things. My hon. friend thinks it was very wrong to have released that prisoner. The hon. member for Durham not so very long ago with some other hon. gentlemen in this House thought it was very wrong that I should not release somebody else convicted from the same neighbourhood. I can only say that each one of these cases has to be dealt with, with all the care I am able to apply to it, upon its own individual circumstances. I am perfectly conscious, only too conscious and only too sorry, that in many cases mistakes are made. I am afraid that in some cases men who ought in all honesty and justice to be set at large are not set at large, and I am only too well aware that in too many cases men who ought not to be allowed to go have been, by some misunderstanding of the facts or by some reliance that has proved unfounded, upon too frail human nature, allowed to go free. These things will always occur and there may be plenty more cases besides the one to which my hon. friend has alluded in which the event has demonstrated that it would have been better had the prisoner not been the subject of clemency at the hands of the Crown.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont). Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Justice is not quite accurate in the reference he made to the case brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Durham. In that case the prisoner expressly disclaimed any desire to have a pardon. He declined to be pardoned, because he claimed strongly that he had never committed any crime. What he did desire was that he should be afforded a new trial in order to bring forward evidence which was not available at the time of his conviction. He also desired that he should be tried by a jury of his fellow countrymen.

So far as concerns the matter which has been immediately brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake), the Minister of Justice disclaims all responsibility except the responsibility of acting upon the recommendation of the Attorney General for Ontario. No one can criticise the province of Ontario or any of the officials of that province for desiring to get rid of these people. It was a perfectly natural desire that these persons, having come from somewhere outside of the province and having conducted themselves in such a manner as to justify their incarceration either in prison or an asylum, should be taken out of the province as soon as possible. But when you come to the question of sending them back to the province of Saskatchewan, you must assume a condition on their part which certainly calls for action by some government and one would think it might merit the interference of this government which is responsible for bringing those people into the country. Those people, if they are in their right mind, have as good a right to reside in the province of Ontario or any other province of Canada as they have to reside in the province of Saskatchewan. Therefore, there was no possible warrant for sending them back to the province of Saskatchewan even if there were warrant for pardoning them of the effence for which they were convicted and setting them at liberty. It is perfectly clear that the pardon was granted with the idea that they would be sent back to the province of Saskatchewan. If these men are in such a condition that they are to be bandied about from one province to the other until friction arises between the various provinces, such as arises between the guardians of one poor district and those of another poor district in Great Britain, we shall have a very curious condition of affairs in this country. Suppose that the authorities of the province of Saskatchewan take proceedings against these people for that indecent exposure which is even now being committed by them in that province, suppose that they are again incarcerated, and that the Attorney General of Saskatchewan recommends to this government their discharge in order that they may be sent to a warmer climate in British Columbia, will the same play go on, will they be removed from the province of Saskatchewan to the province of British Columbia by means of the pardoning powers of this government, and then shall we have another performance of exactly the same character in the province of British Columbia? Persons who conduct themselves in this way are fit inmates for a prison or an asylum, and if they are mentally deranged, as the Minister of Justice suggested, then surely the government of the Dominion, responsible for bringing these people into the country, should co-operate in some way with the government of some province and see that the public decency of the country is not any longer violated by such performances as those which have been going on in recent months.

Why did not the government of this country before exercising its pardoning power, make some inquiry of the authorities of the province of Saskatchewan to ascertain the circumstances under which these people hal left that province and come to a conclusion as to what the conditions would be if these people were deported from Ontario to Saskatchewan? It appears, notwithstanding all that has been said by the hon. Minister of Justice respecting the restoration of these people to family relations, that there are no family relations to be restored because the sensible Doukhobors, the majority of those people who are living, as I believe, quiet, decent, peaceable and industrious lives, refuse altogether to recognize this small section of the community which is bringing discredit upon the name of Doukhobors throughout the country. Why was not some inquiry made as to that before they were sent back to Yorkton? Under the circumstances, it seems to me that the action of the government is not very intelligent and that the Department of Immigration, or some department of the government, should get at once into communication with the authorities of the province of Saskatchewan and see that such steps are taken as will prevent a recurrence of any such scenes as those which have been heralded throughout the press during the past three or four months in eastern Canada.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Speaker, the Department of Immigration has now a somewhat wide spread responsibility, and as having charge of that department at the present time, I must really protest against the suggestion of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) that, besides having the responsibility for all effort in regard to bringing people into Canada, it should be responsible for all people in Canada after they come here. I take it that we have a division of responsibility between the different branches of the one government and between the different governments of this country. A certain responsibility rests upon the Dominion government, a certain responsibility rests upon the provincial governments, and I do not think that there is any gain to be made by a provincial government assuming Dominion responsibilities nor by the Dominion government assuming provincial responsibilities. The Department of Immigration, to which my hon. friend has consigned these people, has to do with such effort as is sanctioned by parliament to bring to people outside of Canada the advantages of Canada with the view of securing their re-

moval here, and two years ago it was clothed with the further power to remove out of Canada to the country from whence they came people who, within two years of their coming, had transgressed the laws or rendered themselves obnoxious or undesirable here. But, these Doukhobors in question are neither in one class nor the other. They have been residents of Canada for a matter of seven, eight, or nine years, and during these seven, eight or nine years, as far as I am aware, they have been not only ordinarily law-abiding but they have been extraordinarily law-abiding as far, at any rate, as coming in conflict with the administration of the law is concerned. I venture to say that there are no other 8,000 people of any class, country or condition, who have come to Canada, who, during the nine years of their residence in Canada, have come as little in contact with the officers charged with the administration of the laws as have the 8,000 Doukhobors now resident in Canada. Therefore, Canada has not, either in its provinces or in the Dominion as a whole, suffered from the presence of these people in so far as the administration of law is concerned, or in so far as they have been a burden upon the enforcement of law in this country. These people, it appears, saw fit, some time during last summer, to change their place of residence. Having resided in the province of Saskatchewan for a matter of seven, eight or nine years, they for reasons of their own, saw fit to change their place of residence and they exercised the right which is accorded to every person who is a resident of this country to remove from where he is to where he wants to be. They travelled through the settled portions of Manitoba, through its cities and villages and they were received with open arms wherever they went. The people supported them as they travelled along, gave them food, listened to their songs, admired their peculiarities, I presume, and sent them on their way rejoicing, until finally they arrived at Fort William. When they arrived there the people, or the authorities of Fort William, seemed to think that there was a possibility of occurrences that were not to their advantage. They communicated with the Dominion government here and asked the government to take some responsibility in regard to these people who had been residents of Canada for seven, eight or nine years, who had paid taxes and who were entitled to and had received the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship except the actual right to vote. Well, I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that the Immigration Department did not feel any responsibility and did not accept any, and I think the response which was sent to the inquiry from the authorities as to what the Department of Immigration was going to do with the Doukhobors was something in the nature of a general direction for them to go to work. The hint was taken, they went to work, they found employment and matters went on peaceably and quietly with them during the winter. But, it appears that as time went on, they saw fit to indulge in peculiarities which were in transgression of the law of Ontario. But, the authorities of Ontario did not take any notice of these acts. Whether they liked that kind of thing, or what their reasons were, I am not aware, but, at any rate, it was not until some time this spring that the authorities of the province of Ontario, charged with the maintenance of law and order in that province, took official cognizance of the actions of the Doukhobors, and when they did take notice of these actions and a proper penalty was placed upon them they at once appealed to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice for the release of these people who had transgressed their own law, who had offended against public decency in their own city and they asked that they be pardoned for the reason, as I am given to understand, that they simply wanted to be relieved from the burden of the cost of carrying out their own law—a law for the maintenance of public decency in the province of Ontario. Their request was acceded to and now these people are back in Saskatchewan. How they arrived there I have no knowledge. I want it to be distinctly understood that, in so far as the Immigration Department is concerned, it had no connection with the transport back to the province of Saskatchewan of these people, no interest in it and no knowledge of it.

If they went back as free agents and of their own accord I quite agree with the Minister of Justice that they had a perfect right to go back if they wanted to, and if they went back because of misrepresentation or by reason of undue force, then I presume that a criminal charge may be laid against those who kidnapped them. However, they are in the province of Saskatchewan now, the province in which they have resided—with the exception of their short excursion to Fort William—for the past eight or nine years. Whatever may be said as to the proper share of responsibility on the part of the province of Ontario for the conduct of these people I am at a loss to see what can be said by the people of the province of Saskatchewan. These people have been residents of that province, they have been subject to the responsibilities of residence in that province during all this period, and I submit it is the business of the province of Saskatchewan, when these people are in that province, to see that the laws of the province are maintained just as it was the business of the province of Ontario to see that the laws of that province were maintained when they resided there. The Dominion government has no responsibility with regard to these people in any way,

shape, or manner. The responsibility falls upon the provincial authorities and I assume the provincial authorities will discharge their duty and will deal with these people as is proper under the laws of the province. I might say that before provincial organization was given to Alberta and Saskatchewan and when the enforcement of the law rested upon the Dominion government, if any of these people then transgressed the law, the law was enforced upon them by the Dominion authorities. But now that the provinces have been organized and the responsibility for the enforcement of the law transferred to them I assume that the province concerned will discharge its duty and that the Dominion government will not be called upon, as it certainly ought not to be called upon, to exercise authority which it does not possess, and which if it did exercise in any province of the Dominion except in regard to these particular people, would be held to be a gross infraction of provincial rights and would be resented. I understand that these people are in a condition of mind which does not render them amenable to ordinary considerations, and such being the case it is not possible for this government which has no authority over them to deal with them effectively. Under the present circumstances I do not think it would be sound public policy for this government to undertake to deal with these people on any principle that this government has the authority to exercise. As I understand, their condition of mind is such that they are only subject to coercive measures and it is only the provincial authorities who have the power to apply these measures. Therefore it is a matter entirely within the control of the province, it is entirely within the responsibility of the province and in my humble estimation sound public policy requires that the province should deal with the matter as it should be dealt with under the ordinary laws and administration of the province.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I thought as I listened to the speech of the Minister of the Interior what a wonderful revolution has taken place in his ideas with regard to those particular people. The time is not far distant when he himself referred in most uncomplimentary terms in this House to the Doukhobors, and not only did he do so from his place in the House but well do I remember reading the caustic articles of the Edmonton 'Bulletin,' of which he was proprietor, in which he scored this government for having in the first place brought those people to Canada, for having in the second place granted them special privileges, and for not having after their first pilgrimage dealt more strenuously with them. The Minister of Justice may have legal justification for what he has done, but still I do not believe that the sensible people of this country will justify his action in liberating those people and dumping them back on the province in which they are apparently unwelcome. He has stated that he has only complied with their own request that they should be returned to their friends in the province of Saskatchewan, but it appears since their return to the town of Yorkton, that they have no friends, that their fellow countrymen refuse to welcome them, and as a result we have had that telegram which was read last evening by the leader of the opposition. It is distinctly stated there that those people were induced to return by misrepresentation, it having been stated to them that they were being conducted to a warmer climate. The people of Yorkton justly protest against their being dumped on their town. I have no doubt that the representative of that constituency will, before this debate closes, rise in his place to uphold the citizens of his town as no doubt he received a telegram in common with others, requesting that immediate action should be urged upon the government to prevent the disreputable scenes that have already been witnessed in Yorkton. The Minister of the Interior has stated that those people are most law-abiding; that during their recent pilgrimage they were fed by the people of Winnipeg and of the various towns and villages along the route, and that they were well cared for in the town of Fort William. Well, the people of the west are noted for their hospitality and they certainly would not see those people die of starvation, and so their charitable organizations supplied them with food and clothing which unfortunately was soon discarded. The Minister of the Interior has also told us that those people 'indulged in their own peculiarities.' Well, if my information is correct, very strange peculiarities they are. A short time ago I met two prominent citizens of Fort William on the train and they informed me of some of the peculiarities of those people which are certainly calculated to shock the moral sense of the community. So strange are those peculiarities which the Minister of the Interior has spoken of, that the municipal authorities of Fort William had to board up the windows of the house in which those people lived so that the boys of the town might not have an opportunity of witnessing such peculiarities. And yet, those gentlemen from Fort William stated that the Minister of the Interior (to use their own expressive words) had the hardihood to rise in his place in parliament and to eulogize those people as being the most moral people in the world. If the hon. gentleman had witnessed some of their actions, as represented by some of the reputable citizens of Fort William, I am sure that he would not rise in his place to defend them and refer to them as moral people; because they conducted themselves

in a manner to bring the blush of shame to people appearing on the streets of Fort William. I do not blame the people of Ontario for desiring to have those people removed beyond their borders. It is true, they came from the Northwest; but they were brought to this country by this government, and received special consideration, the government paying $5 a head for every man, woman and child. Had they been English, Irish or Scotch, they would have received only $1.75 a head, but being the peculiar pets of the government, they were given this special consideration. When they arrived at Halifax, they were met by immigration agents who were tumbling over each other to extend to them the glad hand of welcome, and to read addresses to them, eulogizing them as persecuted persons fleeing from the tyrannical wrath of Russia to seek homes in this new land of the west. They were conducted by those immigration agents on special trains to the west; and when they arrived in Winnipeg they were treated with special consideration by the municipal authorities and the charitable organizations there. They were given soup of a special variety, not made from animal food, lest it might not agree with their fastidious taste. Addresses were again presented to them and finally they were located on their lands in the west with the idea that they would settle down and become law-abiding citizens of this Dominion. From that time to this they have given constant trouble to the people of the localities in which they have been situated and to the people of the country wherever they appeared. Their first pilgrimage was to the town from which I come. They came there, not in dozens, but in hundreds. They were herded in the skating rink, and the people of the town had to provide for them until the immigration authorities appeared on the scene. When the immigration agent came, it was necessary to get a special train and put them on board by force and take them back to the town of Yorkton under guard of the mounted police, and return them to the lands on which they had been located. This would not satisfy them, and shortly afterwards another outbreak occurred, and from that time there have been repeated outbreaks of these fanatical people. Last fall they started out at great danger of losing their lives; men, women and delicate young children in inclement weather walking in a semi-nude condition, begging on the way to keep themselves alive, to the city of Winnipeg, where they stayed for a few weeks, and then on to Fort William, where they have been a burden to the town during the past winter. I remember the time when the Minister of the Interior spoke harshly of the Galicians and even more harshly of the Doukhobors, and I have here a clipping from the Edmonton 'Bulletin,' which gives in rather dramatic language the views held by the hon. gentleman in those days. This article, which appeared after the first pilgrimage, says:

The Doukhobor pilgrimage has ended without the tragedy that was confidently expected, and that would have occurred had it not been for the 'persecution' to which they were subjected by the authorities in being forcibly sent to their homes. What the next move will be remains to be seen. They may stay quietly at home and attend to business, or their 'religious' enthusiasm may take some other fantastic and possibly less harmless form. At any rate, the secret is out. They are not by any means the people they were represented to be. They cannot travel any longer on their reputation of being Russian Quakers, or of having been persecuted by an intolerant church and government for conscience' sake. They have shown themselves to be nuisances personally, socially and politically. Such people as this, this country has no room or use for. The difference between those who went on the insane pilgrimage and those who did not is only a difference of degree, not of kind. The pilgramage was the logical sequence of their beliefs. All believed, but the difference was that those who remained at home resembled many other people to the extent that they did not live up to their beliefs. How soon they will arrive at a sufficient exaltation of spirit depends merely on the effectiveness of the preaching of the next crank who strikes their settlements; and whose missionary efforts will be helped rather than hindered by their having come off their recent pilgrimage practically none the worse.

The question now is, shall such people be pandered to by the authorities in the future as they have been in the past? They have been dealt with and allowed to consider themselves, as a separate people. They have been aided financially as no other people have been or should be. Their disregard of law has been winked at.

Yet the Minister of the Interior states today that there could not be 8,000 more law-abiding people in the Dominion of Canada than these Doukhobors.

All no doubt with the best intentions. But only with the result that Canada has been put to serious cost and trouble and has been made a laughing stock by their antics.

This pilgrimage is the limit. It puts them outside of reason or excuse.

If that was the case at the time of their first pilgrimage, when they retained their clothing, what must have been the case at the time of their last pilgrimage when they walked through the streets of Fort William absolutely nude.

The authorities will not hereafter be justified in dealing with them otherwise than as ordinary citizens. The law of Canada exempts from military service all whose religious beliefs prevent their taking part in the defence of their country. The Doukhobors can claim that exemption with the Mennonites, Quakers, Dunkards and others. But beyond that not a step—not a line. Their peculiar ideas regarding marriage have so

far been 'respected.' This is a reproach to our laws and a danger to our social system. For if a Doukhobor may defy the marriage laws, why may not any other persons? Their political beliefs are a combination of theocracy, socialism and anarchy. The fact that they wash themselves is a strong point in their favour. But the other fact that they do not believe in work beyond providing for present need and are liable at any time to turn into a horde of tramps and beggars, completely knocks out the argument of their industrial value, which at earlier stages of the game was supposed to make up for every disadvantage.

There is a general objection to the importation of people whose presence, aspirations and votes tend against the proper social, political and industrial development of the country. The bringing of these Doukhobors was a mistake, but to allow them to remain on any other terms than as ordinary citizens would be a crime. They have made several attempts to find other locations. The sooner they find them the better for Canada, as removing a problem that, if it remains a problem——

These were the expressions of the hon. gentleman a few years ago. To be sure, he was not a minister of the Crown at that time, and was not called upon to defend the actions of the government in having brought those people of Canada; but to-day he feels obliged to defend not only the action of his predecessor in bringing them here, but the action of the Minister of Justice in giving them liberation and dumping them on the province of Saskatchewan. But it was not the hon. gentleman alone who condemned those people in past times. The Bible of the Liberal party, the Toronto 'Globe,' also advocated the removal of those people from our midst. I shall read a very short excerpt from it:

The Czar of all the Russias has never had much experience in welcoming subjects returning from foreign countries, and Canada should give him an opportunity to appear graciously and gracefully before the world in a new role. A Doukhobor Old Boys' Society returning to visit the scenes of youthful experiences, to renew friendships and revive happy memories, would be a felicitous occasion, on which the Czar could play the gracious host, and the returning pilgrims could bear the honours of distant successes with becoming modesty. They could sit by their old hearths and tell of the ways of immigration agents in distant Canada, of the kindly curiosity of the natives and the easy indifference of official authority.

We must admit that they have had sufficient to stimulate their curiosity. Anybody who has seen them on a pilgrimage will acknowledge that:

And the very easy indifference of the official authorities.

That is rather strong language for the Toronto 'Globe.' It goes on:

The homeward pilgrimage of a Doukhobor Old Boys' Society would be a delightful reunion from all points of view, and should be encouraged. The Doukhobors could make modest disclaimers when old friends gave congratulations on the distinctions won abroad. They could protest that, although their names were on every tongue, and their portraits adorned the illustrated press, they had not set their hearts on the applause of the multitude. And when pressed to remain and once more make their homes amid the scenes of happier years, they could temporize, hesitate and at last reluctantly yield, returning again to the ways and associations of their former life.

This would be gratifying, says the 'Globe,' from the Canadian standpoint:

Taking up the white man's burden is all very well in its way, but carrying it home is a far different matter. It is a practical move to send the assistant secretary of a charity organization to investigate a case of distress, but a far different matter to bring that case of distress home, and establish it in comfortable quarters. If the Czar did not mind, we could send out a force sufficient to impose the blessings of civilization as they have it in England on all the Doukhobors in his dominions. That would be a practical and systematic way to take up the white man's burden. But bringing the Doukhobors here to civilize them on the spot is positively inconvenient. The white man's burden is of the many things to which distance lends enchantment. If the Doukhobors will only return to their own home we will never lose our kindly interest in them. We will send them all the moral and religious admonitions that the censor will pass. We will subscribe to prizes for their annual pedestrian contests, buy tickets for their Christmas tea-meetings, entertain their walking delegates, send tourists among them, and reach out to them (across the ocean) the glad hand of friendship. We will give them the civilizing influence of our example at a distance. The personal freedom of this country does not appear to suit our friends of the lofty ideal. A Czar who would arrange their domestic and personal habits, determine their interpretation of the Scriptures, set forth where they should live, and what they should work at, when they should travel and when they should stay at home, would fill a much felt want.

This is from the great government daily, the Toronto 'Globe,' about those people, those people of whom the Halifax 'Chronicle' has spoken in a similar strain. I do not know that it is necessary for me to take up any more time except to condemn, as a westerner though not a resident of the province of Saskatchewan, the action of this government. Evidently it is resented by the good people of Yorkton and by the people of Saskatchewan as a whole; and I very much doubt if this continual game of battledore and shuttlecock unloading responsibility from one government to another and carrying on conferences all the time this great exhibition is going on—while those people are kept in a car on a siding at Yorktown, guarded by mounted policemen to prevent their making exhibitions of themselves—is one which the people will

stand much longer. Our people will show their resentment against the importation of that class of immigrants and the special treatment accorded to them. Those Doukhobors have refused time and again to obey our laws. Time and again they have protested to the government against having been brought here under misrepresentations, and because they have not been allowed to follow out their own views with regard to marriage laws, registrations, homestead entries and so forth. And while some of them have changed their ideas and become reputable citizens, there is a large element among them who cling to their peculiar views, only a portion of whom have been on the recent pilgrimage. Those people are liable to an outbreak of this kind every once in a while and to become a charge on the country. It was a huge mistake to bring them out in the first place and in the second place to give them special treatment.

Mr. SPROULE. I would suggest that the province to which these people belong and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) should join in making assignment of them to the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) in order that he might settle them on one of his numerous estates in the west and send for W. T. R. Preston to take care of them.

FIRE EXTINGUISHERS.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (Leeds). If there is no further discussion on this matter, I have one to which I wish to draw the attention of the House. I purpose dealing with it now in order that, when we get into Supply, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) may take cognizance of it. As the matter refers to two departments, and I know that you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, (Mr. Marcil) would rule me out on an objection sure to be raised by the Minister of Public Works, I think it better to discuss it while you are in the chair, in order that when we are in Committee of Supply, the minister may perhaps give some explanation. My hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) asked the minister to give an account of what he had done with a number of the fire extinguishers which had been purchased. The minister replied that he would get the information and bring it down, and I presume he will have it when we get into Supply. On the 22nd January last I moved for a return showing how many fire extinguishers had been purchased by the government for the different departments since the 1st June, 1906, to the 1st January, 1908, from whom purchased, the prices paid, and the total amount paid. The Minister of Public Works brought down a return, and after seeing that return and finding a number of other fire extinguishers, not included in that return, charged here and there throughout the Auditor General's Report, I raised the point that the order for these had not been complied with. Then a further return was brought down from the Department of Marine and Fisheries. That return showed that since the 13th June, 1906, to January, 1908, 53 fire extinguishers had been purchased from Mr. P. E. Perreault, at $14 each, making a total of $742. This extravagant department which pays such extravagant prices paid in this instance less than the Department of Public Works. Mr. Perreault evidently worked on a similar commission, and Mr. Gregory got his goods cheaper than did the Department of Public Works. Here is the return of the Department of Public Works which the minister brought down. The total number of fire extinguishers purchased was 195. From Patton and Company 95 were purchased, and from Charles Patton of Montreal 100, at $15 each in both cases. The Minister of Public Works therefore paid $1 more for the extinguishers he got than did Mr. Gregory for those he bought at Quebec for the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and I shall show the reason why. Last evening we listened to the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) eulogizing himself for the course he has pursued since he became minister of that department. Let me draw attention to a letter which he wrote, following the lines on which his predecessor had worked. It will be found in the report of the commissioners on page 79. It was written by the minister to Mr. Gregory, at Quebec, and was dated July 27, 1906:

> I have to inform you that if you consider that chemical fire extinguishers are necessary on board the vessels of the Quebec agency you are to purchase them from P. E. Perreault. 312 St. John street, Quebec. Mr. Perreault has been advised to call upon you in connection with this matter.

If Mr. Gregory could get a letter that indicated more clearly to him that he should purchase a number of these fire extinguishers than that letter written by the minister on the 27th July, 1906, I do not know what better authority he could have. This is the letter from the minister saying that a friend of his will call on him, and if he wants any fire extinguishers to purchase them from him. And now what do we find?

> October 8, 1906.—Gregory writes about fire extinguishers bought from Perreault, who is now an employee of the agency——

Because the minister employed Perreault and put him in the agency.

Mr. BRODEUR. Where does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) find that I ever signed such a letter?

Mr. TAYLOR. If the minister will bring down the files, I will point out the letter. He found the letter on the file and quotes it.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) says he has seen the file and knows there is a letter written by me? Does he assert that I have signed it?

Mr. TAYLOR. The commissioners have gone through the files and have given the House their report stating what they found. They found this statement on the files.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no statement that I signed this letter.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the minister will produce the letter, no doubt his signature will be found at the bottom of it.

Mr. BRODEUR. Does the hon. gentleman assert that I signed that letter?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am making no assertions. The hon. minister appointed a Royal Commission, and I am quoting what the Royal Commission said.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, that does not say that I signed the letter. Does the hon. gentleman say that I signed it?

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister will make his own speech. He made one last night—and of all the speeches I ever listened to since I came into this House over twenty years ago, that speech, as coming from a gentleman who ought to be a statesman, was the most extraordinary I ever heard.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) has stated that I signed that letter.

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not make the statement.

Mr. BRODEUR. I deny that I signed it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to make my speech. The minister is not going to put me down. I am reading from the report of the Royal Commission. And I will give him the page—page 79. And any gentleman who reads that will say that it comes from the department to the agents at Quebec, and from the head of the department.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman said I had signed the letter.

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not. The hon. gentleman cannot find that in 'Hansard.'

Mr. BRODEUR. Then. that is all right.

Mr. TAYLOR. I say this is from the head of the department, from the minister, for further down there is one from the deputy, and they quote his name.

Mr. CROCKET. There is no directing head of the department.

Mr. TAYLOR. No. But here is an intimation to Gregory, as plain as can be, to buy some of these worthless fire extinguishers from Perreault. The report goes on:

October 8, 1906.—Gregory writes about fire extinguishers bought from Perreault who is now an employee of the agency and has a lot of fire extinguishers on hand which he would like to sell to the department. Under the circumstances, as he is a poor man with a family, and now unable to go out and solicit their sale. This was well understood by the late lamented minister, who was his friend, and fully recognized the worthiness of the said chemical fire extinguishers. I would recommend that the department take them off his hands, as we have several stations requiring such protection.

October 12, 1906.—Letter from deputy——

The first was from the minister, but this is from the deputy.

Mr. BRODEUR. Does the hon. gentleman assert that I signed it?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am making my speech and the assertions in it will be pretty clearly understood. When I am through, if the minister wishes, he can make his speech.

October 12, 1906.—Letter from deputy—With reference to fire extinguishers purchased by you from P. E. Perreault, I find no authority on file in the department for the purchase of these fire extinguishers, and I notice that within the last couple of years large purchases have been made from this gentleman. In this connection, I may say that in 1904-5 the late minister purchased from Mr. Charles Patton fire extinguishers to the sum of $9,000. Of this number, 142 were sent to Quebec for the use of your agency lighthouses and Dominion steamers. Besides that, a number were stored in Montreal and are there still.

That is. they were still in store in 1906, though they were purchased in 1904. That gives you an idea how the department is run:

If you had notified the department that fire extinguishers were absolutely necessary to put on board the Dominion steamers and to be used at lighthouses, the required number could have been sent from Montreal. Instead of this. it appears you made purchases from Mr. Perreault without any instructions or authority from the department. The minister would like to have an explanation in regard to this matter. He would also like to have a statement of how the fire extinguishers purchased in 1904-5 were distributed.

October 8, 1906.—Gregory writes to department in answer to their letter of October 4 and 5 returning P. E. Perreault's accounts for chemical fire extinguishers, and asking me to inform you upon what authority the purchases were made. He refers to a letter of July 27, 1906.

That is the letter I have already referred to that came to him and was his authority; he took that letter of July 27 as a hint to purchase these fire extinguishers, and he did purchase them, and here the deputy is holding him for his action. He goes on, in his letter of October 15, 1906:

I shall have a statement prepared by the inspector of lights as soon as possible,

showing how the fire extinguishers purchased in 1904-5 were distributed, and forward the same to the department.

The statement is that 142 fire extinguishers were sent to Quebec for the use of the agency lighthouses and Dominion steamers, but Gregory contradicts that by his telegram which shows there were only fifty instead of 142.

I stated a little while ago that I would explain how it came that the Minister of Public Works paid $15 for these fire extinguishers, while the Department of Marine and fisheries paid only $14 at Quebec. Mr. Patton is a manufacturer at Montreal. He could not make so many sales up here at Ottawa as he wanted to. Mr. Grant, a lawyer in this city, suggested to Mr. Patton that they would form a partnership, and he would get an agent who had some influence with the government and would make some sales for him. So, there was a company formed at Ottawa. It was called Patton and Grant, because as I say, Mr. Grant is a lawyer here and he did not want to have his name appear as a selling agent for fire extinguishers. But they borrowed a name from a fellow by the name of Crowe. And the firm was called Patton and Crowe. But Grant did the business. He assumed the name of Crowe for himself. They sold to the government through the agency of Mr. Auguste Lemieux, who also is a lawyer in the city of Ottawa. He wanted a commission of $3 instead of $2, they had to raise the price to the government, and so the government paid $15 here while they paid $14 in Quebec. You will see how this was brought about. One hundred fire extinguishers were purchased from Patton in Montreal and 99 from Patton and Crowe in Ottawa. Patton and Crowe, of course, were Patton and Grant. Patton and Crowe put in an account to the Public Works Department and got the cheques which were made to Patton and Crowe. Grant handled the cheques. He himself personally paid Mr. Lemieux his commission to the amount of between $600 and $700 on the quantity he sold to the department here. Grant gave his own cheque to Lemieux, and marked on the cheque 'for commission.' These cheques were endorsed by Lemieux, put into the bank, and the money drawn, and the cheques were returned to Grant, and up to a certain time were in his office. But afterwards they were missing—they were stolen from his office for a purpose. A vacancy had loomed up in the representation for Ottawa——

Mr. PUGSLEY. How does that appear ?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is my information, and if there is anything incorrect about it——

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) will pardon me. I am asking the question because I am not informed what took place here a year or more ago. Is there any evidence of what my hon. friend is stating now before the Public Accounts Committee?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, it is not before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is it before any committee?

Mr. TAYLOR. We will be in public accounts in a little while from now and you can ask any of these questions you like.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman may say if it has been proved.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am giving the information I have. My information is that the proof is on hand. These cheques were taken from Mr. Grant's office and deposited in the safe of Mr. Lindsay. A vacancy was being created here in Ottawa by the transference of Mr. Belcourt to the Senate, and Mr. Lemieux, who sold these fire extinguishers, was an aspirant and thought that as his brother was the Postmaster General he had the pull, and should be the coming member to fill Mr. Belcourt's seat. Mr. Belcourt had his eye on another gentleman and had made a promise that when he vacated the seat that other gentleman would be the candidate. Mr. Lemieux had to be got out of the way. These cheques made by Grant payable to Lemieux, having been taken out of Grant's office, were missing. Mr. Belcourt was then down at Saranac Lake in the Adirondacks for his health. These cheques were sent down to Mr. Belcourt who would not trust the cheques across the ocean to the Prime Minister, but had them photographed and sent the photographs to the Prime Minister with an explanation. The Prime Minister wrote back: When I come home——

Mr. LENNOX. Why did he send them.

Mr. TAYLOR. To show that Lemieux had to be got out of the way. When the Prime Minister came back he said: There are the cheques already filled out for a commission to you, a lawyer selling goods to the government; you have to back out—and Lemieux quietly backed out and took no further part in the contest.

Mr. BENNETT. Would that not qualify him as a member?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not know but there were two of them who wanted it, and Mr. Belcourt and the Prime Minister wanted one man, but Lemieux and the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) wanted another man. Cheques come in useful sometimes. I have heard a statement, I have never had it verified, but from the facts it appears there was some truth in it. We remember when the late Minister of Railways left his seat on account of the Transcontinental Railway proposition which was being introduced by

the government, it was supposed that he was going to take the stump against the Prime Minister, and the information is that the Prime Minister called on the late Mr. Blair, and asked him his intentons, and that Mr. Blair said: I am going to go to the country in opposition to this scheme of building an opposition line to the Intercolonial and putting this country into $20,000,000 of debt. And the information is that the Prime Minister put his hand in his pocket and pulled out some cheques that a big contractor had made payable direct to Mr. Blair and with his name signed on the back of them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In justice to the memory of Mr. Blair I must say that there is not a word of truth in that.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to hear it, I thought it was my duty to tell the hon. gentleman. But the facts were there, Mr. Blair did not take the stump, the cheque shut him up.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Blair is dead, he cannot reply of course.

Mr. TAYLOR. But the evidence is here in these two returns. Perreault sold the government these same fire extinguishers down at Quebec at $14, and Lemieux sells them to the Minister of Public Works at $15. There is a dollar of extra rake-off anyway, and Mr. Grant paid his cheque to Mr. Lemieux for the commission on them, gave his own personal cheque and a gentleman who informed me saw the cheques, made payable to the order of Lemieux, and marked on the face of them 'commission.' That is the information I have in reference to it. If my hon. friend wants any information, this gentleman came voluntarily into my office and said he saw the cheques and gave me the information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a great mistake to believe all you hear.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am stating this, and if the hon. gentleman appoints a committee he will find that I am correct, and that he and his people paid a dollar more than was paid at Quebec. Look at the thousands of dollars, $9,000 in one lot, and $2,000 or $3,000 by the minister himself, expended for what is practically no better than a bottle of vinegar for fire purposes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Vinegar will not do any good.

Mr. TAYLOR. Just as good as this, mixed with a little soda and water. Any way they were giving $15 for these, and the Department of Marine alongside was giving $14. If they had bought from the manufacturer they could have saved the $600 or $700 paid to Grant. I want the minister, before we go on with his supply, to bring down information as to where these were distributed, to bring down the reports of the different engineers as to their value and all correspondence in reference to them. I want to know why $15,000 to $20,000 of the people's money have been paid in the last five years for fire extinguishers. I think it necessary that this information should be given before we go into the minister's estimates, in order that he might be prepared to answer the questions. The officials of the Marine Department will also give some information of what was done with this large quantity down at Quebec. I want to know particularly why the Department of Public Works paid $15 for the same article that the Department of Marine bought at $14, as shown by the two returns which have been brought down. There may be other departments that have not yet reported. I do not know how many have been purchased by the Department of Agriculture and some other departments. We have only two returns down, and when I moved for this return, the Minister of Public Works brought down the information simply for his own department, although my motion asked for all departments. I have since got the return for the Marine and Fisheries Department. Were there any others to which Lemieux has sold these fire extinguishers? I do not know, but we know he has sold, and has got his commission from Mr. Grant for 105 of these machines.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot promise to have these returns to-day, but as soon as possible I will have all the information desired so that the matter may be considered when we are in Supply. I would like to say that so far as I am aware there have been very few of these extinguishers purchased since I became minister. Probably there have been some. I am not able to say why the price is $15. That appears to have been the price paid before I became minister. With regard to the usefulness of the article, I understood from the chief architect that they were considered valuable for the purpose of extinguishing fires.

Mr. FOSTER. Their name would indicate that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Things are not always just what they would appear to be from their names, but I am told they are a pretty good article for that purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the minister bring down the report of his engineer or officer upon which they were bought?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, if there is such a report.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose there would not be any bought unless there was a scientific report.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was all before I went into the department.

Mr. FOSTER. They would not be bought without a report since you became minister?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am inclined to believe not.

TURTLE MOUNTAIN TIMBER RESERVE.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris). Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer for a few moments to a matter which I have brought up two or three times before. It is the matter of the timber reserve on Turtle mountain. I believe that the idea of preserving these timber reserves is a very laudable one but I think there should be some exception made when the conditions warrant it. I think there should be some examination made as to whether these are actual timber reserves or not, and further, I would like to inquire of the Minister of the Interior if he has had any information of late in connection with the special reserve to which I have referred. In speaking the other day I tried to show the Minister of the Interior that it would be absolutely impossible ever to make this particular reserve of any importance. The minister, in answering what I said, seemed to be labouring under the impression that I thought there was no large timber there and he said that the idea was not to produce merchantable timber but rather to produce what might be called climatic conditions. That is all good in its way, if the idea can be successfully carried out. But it will be absolutely impossible to make anything out of part of the timber reserve on Turtle mountain in so far as climatic conditions are concerned. I have made a personal examination of this reserve and I think that all the timber that is there—and when I speak of timber I really mean brush—could be put into two or three sections and it is a matter that affects about 70,000 acres of land. There has been a very small growth, some of the trees being but three or four years old. But, the point I want to make is that even what timber there is on this so-called timber reserve is being absolutely neglected. We have had a gentleman there whom the Minister of the Interior knows very well and whom I know very well, and, while I do not wish to say anything offensive, yet I think that a duty devolves upon me at the present time in connection with this particular reserve. There seems to prevail here a condition that apparently exists all over that western country and that is that the men whom the government appoint as overseers, or timber guardians, or whatever name they may be designated by, are, if not political hacks, to say the least, political organizers and we find that the gentleman who is supposed to be looking after this Turtle mountain reserve absolutely spends his time endeavouring to get promises of votes for the Liberal party. He is a man who has made an absolute failure of life in every other condition and as a last resort, he has applied for this government position and the people in that country have to suffer because they have to satisfy the political aspirations of one man. During this spring a fire has gone over the entire district and, according to a letter which I received last night and to an item which I have taken from a paper issued in the town of Boissevain, some eight or ten miles from that reserve, a great deal of destruction has taken place. I call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the fact because he may not be cognizant of it. From the information which I have I believe that this district will never be made a successful timber reserve. There were a number of settlers in one township of this reserve and they were offered certain conditions if they would leave that place and go to a place which had been designated by the government. I understood the Minister of the Interior to say that no definite promise had been made to these men, but it does seem, from my conversation with a number of them when I was there only a few days ago, and from the letters which I have received and which are in my possession, not from my own supporters, but from men who vote against me that there is a great amount of dissatisfaction with the condition of affairs on that reserve. I think the dissatisfaction is universal amongst the settlers of that district, whether they be Liberals or Conservatives and I believe that, the Minister of the Interior not being conversant with this matter, it was my duty to call his attention to it. As I have said, it affects some 70,000 acres of land. If this will never make a timber reserve under any conditions is it not practical business, is it not necessary in the interests of the department and of the district concerned, that the matter should be looked into ? I do not ask you to take my word. I would like you to make an investigation. I claim that these settlers, even though they were going to have some parts of this as a timber reserve, were doing a great deal of good there. They were looking after their own sections and they were on the edge of the timber reserve and, being in that position, they were able to prevent fires. But, most of them have been sent away, some of them are there still, not very many, and the consequence has been that the timber has all been burned over. There is another grievance. During last spring the gentleman to whom I have referred and who is the timber agent there had a large number of men planting seed on this soil in order to produce trees. The Minister of the Interior knows just as well as I do that this is money wasted and thrown away. You cannot find a settler anywhere in that district but would tell the Minister of the Interior and this gov-

ernment that it is absolutely useless to plant seeds under these conditions. I will not call it graft, but it is simply a waste of money and I am positive that the Minister of the Interior is not familiar with the facts or he certainly would prevent that condition of affairs from existing any longer. The paper to which I have referred contains the following paragraph :

Several men are employed in the timber reserve planting tree seeds on the land that has been burnt off. It is very questionable if the seeds will grow, or, providing they do, whether they will not be destroyed by fire as the bush has been hitherto. It would be a great deal better if the Dominion government would open up this land for settlement instead of using it as an experimental ground.

I am in entire sympathy with that statement. I am also in entire sympathy with the reservation of timber areas when it is practicable, but in this case where it is absolutely impracticable I say that the area should be thrown open to settlers, that those who are there should be allowed to return to their homes and that those who are there should be allowed to remain. I also received a letter last night from a gentleman who is familiar with the conditions in that district. Amongst other things he says:

Another thing which is something of vital importance, what is the use of keeping a man here looking after our timber reserve as you call it ? Why, the fire has went over the whole thing in the last few days and killed every green tree in the bush. All the young stuff is killed.

Then, further down, he says :

Now, I hear is out sowing tree seeds and planting trees. What is the use of wasting the people's money in this way? The fire will kill everything again. If this land is given out to settlement it will be taken care of. Each settler will take care of his own. As it is nobody is looking after it. Hoping what I have written may set the ball rolling, I remain,

Yours truly,

I have only one object in calling the attention of the minister to this timber reserve and that is to express the hope that he will give it a little more attention than he seems to have given to it up to the present time.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Speaker, I am rather sorry and somewhat surprised to hear the expression of my hon. friend (Mr. Schaffner) with regard to this particular reserve. Of course it is well that we arrive at a final knowledge or a final understanding of a certain condition. I hope my hon. friend does not wish to blame me for a misunderstanding in regard to this particular reserve because I would remind him that this reserve has been a reserve for many years. It was a reserve when my hon. friend was elected to represent the constituency in which it is situated. It was at first reserved by departmental order, then the Forest Reserve Act was introduced into this House and the provisions of that Act were approved of unanimously by the House. There was certain discussion as to the benefits that might accrue by that Act to the people who held timber limits within the reserves, but there was unanimity of opinion in regard to the general principle of making certain reserves and of preserving them by legislative enactment in the terms of the Bill then before the House. My hon. friend would have been protecting the interests which he now assumes to protect had he then given the House the information he has given it today. That would have been the proper time to tell us that this timber reserve was not necessary, that it was not a proper place in which to make a timber reserve, that the settlers who were then on it should have remained on it, but my hon. friend did not give that information and so he will have to assume at any rate joint responsibility with me for the legislation by which the responsibility was laid upon the Department of the Interior to see that those who were in residence upon the reserve were removed from it.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I scarcely understand how the Minister of the Interior can hold me in the least responsible. He himself admits that this was a timber reserve before I came into the House.

Mr. OLIVER. It was previously a timber reserve by order in council, and when the legislation was before the House to make it a timber reserve by Act of parliament that would have been the time for my hon. friend to put in his protest.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. If the hon. gentleman will refer to that occasion which is two years ago he will find that I certainly did put in my protest.

Mr. OLIVER. At the time the Act was passed ?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Yes, and I referred to these settlers at the same time.

Mr. OLIVER. It is not in my memory that the hon. gentleman did so, and if he did he is now in line with his attitude of that time. But apparently he was not able to impress the House with his views. Be that as it may, it was the will of parliament that there should be a reserve there and that the reserve should be cleared of settlers, and efforts have been made since to carry out the will of parliament. I have already expressed my regret for the necessity of action being taken which in itself cannot be other wise than a hardship. But it was not my action, it was parliament caused

it to be done. In accordance with the declaration of parliament we have secured the removal of several of these settlers, and if any promises have been made to them in order to secure their removal I can only say that my instructions are that every promise shall be fulfilled. If every promise has not been carried out it should be carried out, and I expect it will be. I appreciate quite as much as anybody else the difficulty of the situation of these people.

As to those settlers who are still on the reserve it is expected that they will remove possibly within the coming month and we are using all reasonable effort to facilitate their going and to make the conditions as little burdensome upon them as possible. Until parliament sees fit to rescind its action there is nothing left for the department but to endeavour to secure the removal of the settlers from the reserve.

I regret to hear that fire has swept the reserve. I suppose that having assumed the responsibility of taking care of the reserve we must assume some responsibility for fires that occur. But as we have only one man there to take care of the reserve which includes several townships, any of us who are familiar with conditions in the west will understand that there are times when an army would not be able to protect such an area from fire. It may have been our fault or it may have been the misfortune of circumstances.

In regard to the view of my hon. friend that it is wasting money and time and effort to plant tree seeds upon the ground recently traversed by fire, I can only say that my information is that in succeeding years after a burn has taken place a new growth comes up rapidly; and I assume there is no inherent reason why the same course of nature will not follow on the Turtle mountain reserve.

Mr. FOSTER. That growth comes up without any planting of seed.

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely.

Mr. FOSTER. Could the minister tell where it comes from ?

Mr. OLIVER. Unlike my hon. friend there are some things that I do not know.

Mr. FOSTER. I don't know either and that is why I asked.

Mr. OLIVER. We agree for once.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the strangest thing in the world.

Mr. OLIVER. It is a fact that a new growth does come up after a fire, and I assume that our planting of seed on the burnt ground will not be frowned on by Providence or by nature any more than if we did not plant seed there at all.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. But let me remind the Minister of the Interior that they were planting these seeds there long before the fire. They were spending time and money planting seeds on that soil which will never produce trees of any description.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, if it will not produce trees it is not very valuable land for any other purpose; and the idea in setting it apart as a reserve that it was not valuable for agricultural purposes, is confirmed by the statement the hon. gentleman has made. At any rate, I assume that we are not to any serious degree hindering the settlement of the country by keeping in reserve a tract which is not capable of even growing trees. However, I have better hopes of the case than my hon. friend.

I have some belief that the withdrawal of the land in the first place was fairly well advised ; and, being on the summit of an elevated and broken piece of country, the source of certain water supply for the surrounding country, both on the surface and under the surface, it seems to me that the Turtle mountain is the place of all others in the west where there is warrant for a forest reserve, and where every effort should be made to preserve and to perpetuate and increase the sources of the water supply for the benefit of the surrounding country. Our efforts may be mistaken ; we may be under a misapprehension ; there are many things yet to be found in the secrets of nature ; but we are using reasonable and legitimate efforts to seek what it is desirable to seek.

In regard to the political action of our officer there, I can only say that I regret very much to hear the statement made. I can assure my hon. friend that any such action is entirely contrary to my views or wishes, and the matter will be taken up on the representations which he has made, and will be dealt with.

It is quite possible that the reserve having been created a number of years ago, there has not been the fullest care taken in defining the boundary; that is to say, we have taken in more land than is perhaps suitable for the purpose. We have not had until quite recently a scientific organization, as it might be called, that would warrant us in revising these limits ; but we have been successful during the past year in securing the assistance of some gentlemen of eminence in forestry matters, and we hope, by investigations on the ground during the present year, to be able to readjust the boundaries, if such readjustment is necessary, so that we shall not be preventing settlement by holding land unnecessarily, and shall be doing the best we can to aid the surrounding settlements by securing the preservation of the existing forests and the reforestation of the deforested part of what is now the Turtle mountain forest reserve.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (Kings, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) was not objecting to the principle of forest reserves. I think that in common with all the other members of this House who have any knowledge of timber matters, he highly approves of the idea of creating forest reserves. The only fault I have to find with the action of the government with respect to this matter is that they have not set apart enough of the timber wealth of the country for the future—not only to preserve it for a time when it will be infinitely more valuable, because of its scarcity, than it is at the present time, but also on account of the water supply. There is one matter which has come up in connection with this subject that I think is deserving of some consideration on the part of the department, and that is the question of fire guarding. I understand that there are about 70,000 acres in this particular forest reserve, and yet the minister says there is only one person to protect it from fire. It seems to me that it is very bad policy, after setting apart such a large tract of country as a forest reserve, to take such meagre precautions to preserve it from fire. There are only certain times of the year when there is danger from fire, that is, early in the spring and late in the summer ; and it seems to me that the proper course would be at those times to have an efficient force to protect this property. It would cost something, it is true ; but you have a very valuable asset there, which it is worth expending some money for the purpose of protecting. It is valuable in more ways than one. It is valuable on account of the actual money's worth that is there ready to be turned into money, and also because, if fire sweeps over it, if you are going to continue it as a timber reserve, you will have to begin again at the seed, and it will take nearly a century for the timber to grow again. Therefore I strongly urge the minister, whose timber policy in this respect I have commended, to largely increase his force of fire protectors, putting them on, not the year round, but during the particular seasons when it is absolutely necessary to protect the forest from fire. If he does this, he will be deserving of the thanks of the House and the country.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I would ask the Minister of the Interior if he has made up his mind yet when to throw open to homestead entry the lands that have been taken out of the reserves that have recently been formed. For instance, in the Riding mountain timber reserve, as the hon. gentleman is aware, there were certain townships over which fire swept, destroying the timber ; and an order in council was passed taking these out of the reserve and throwing them open to homestead entry. That occurred over a year and a half ago. Many settlers visited the land office with the idea of making entry, in accordance with the newspaper advertisement, stating that on a certain date those lands would be thrown open to homestead entry, only to be disappointed. I have the same complaint to make as the hon. member for Souris, when he states that the timber inspector having charge of these reserves——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member has exhausted his right to speak.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Then I ask the Minister of the Interior when it is intended to have those lands thrown open to homestead entry ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. minister can only speak with the permission of the House, as he has exhausted his right to speak.

Mr. OLIVER I only wish to answer the hon. gentleman's question, if the House is willing. The lands which have been cut out of these reserves were announced as being open to entry by an error. They have been held under reservation for the purpose of accommodating squatters but we are moving them out of the reserve, and as soon as we are able to get the squatters out of the reserve and adjust it we will open the balance of these lands which were cut out of it. I regret that the officer who has been in charge of the work has been ill some months and the work has not gone forward as rapidly as I hoped. However we have succeeded in getting a large number of the squatters out of the Riding mountain reserve and we have every prospect of getting them all out by the end of this month.

THE MOOSEJAW-LACOMBE EXTENSION CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (West Assiniboia). There is a matter which I think of sufficient importance to bring to the attention of the House, and that is the providing of transportation facilities for that part of my constituency which lies remote from railway accommodation. I know that it is no part of the duty of the government to provide transportation for new settlements, but I am satisfied that I shall convince the House that there are exceptional circumstances connected with the case I have to lay before you, Mr. Speaker, which justifies me in taking this unusual course. I refer to the construction of the Moosejaw-Lacombe branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway. A charter to build that branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway has held for some years. Two years ago they built fourteen miles from Moosejaw in a northerly and northwesterly direction, but they have not laid any steel since. Last summer

they graded fifty miles more. From time to time they have announced that they would proceed with the construction of the railway, and relying upon those promises, settlers went into a district remote from transportation facilities, but although they have been there two or three years they still find themselves without these facilities. These settlers have been hanging on by their teeth, so to speak, throughout these years, and I do not think I need offer any apology to the House for taking the stand that a company such as the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has held this charter for years and which is building railways in other parts where competition is keener, should be brought to book for their neglect in this matter. I have been across the Saskatchewan river where this railway is supposed to run, and in that section there are many settlers from fifty to one hundred and fifty miles away from any railway. It is very inconvenient for them to get fuel. For a time they were able to obtain fuel from the small timber around their residences or in the valleys, in the creeks and rivers, but that is almost entirely consumed and there are to-day perhaps seven or eight thousand people who have gone in there relying on the promise of the Canadian Pacific Railway to construct this line. You will find there the finest farmers you will see anywhere, who have taken up the best lands you can find in the west. These lands are second to none in Canada. I have visited them myself and I have reports about them from very reliable sources, and I think that in a few years you will find my prediction verified that that land is going to be the most prosperous part of the Northwest Territory. I refer to that part lying near the elbow of the South Saskatchewan river, and north and west of that point. Last summer, in my capacity as representative of the district, I made an appointment with Mr. William White, and got from him the authority to announce that last year his company would construct a certain portion of the railway. Lest any one should take exception to my repeating the conversation, let me say that it was strictly in an official way. I met the vice-president of the Canadian Pacific Railway by appointment. He agreed to receive a deputation composed of my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. McCraney) and Mr. W. P. Sutherland, M.P.P., and myself. Through some misunderstanding I did not get word to my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. McCraney) so that Mr. Sutherland and myself only saw Mr. Whyte. He authorized us to say last year they would lay fifty miles more of steel and grade at least seventy more miles, but from that day to this they have not laid one foot of steel or done any more grading. But they let last fall a contract for seventy miles and gave the people to understand the road would be built at once, and the people accepted that promise in good faith. Throughout these years these people have been practising the strictest economy, but in the most cavalier fashion without giving any explanation the Canadian Pacific Railway have sent out the announcement that they have seen fit to cancel the contract which they had made with Mr. J. D. McArthur to build these seventy miles. Although I cannot expect the government to build this road or do anything very severe with the Canadian Pacific Railway I do think that this condition of affairs should be exposed and that the railway company should be censured for playing fast and loose with the settlers in that way. There are people out there who are being ruined financially—fine young homesteaders who cannot get their fuel in or their wheat out and who are in the impossibility of carrying on with any success their farming operations. That is a very serious condition of affairs, to which I call the attention of the House, and especially the attention of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham). I have in my hand a petition which is sixteen feet long by actual measurement. It is very closely signed and no doubt has about 1,000 names on it. I have another which, by actual count, contains over 300 names of people living in the vicinity of Tullisville near the elbow of the South Saskatchewan. I tried to present these petitions to the House, but as they ask for the building of a railway and therefore call upon the expenditure of public money they could not be received, anything connected with the expenditure of public money having to come direct from the government. The petition is as follows :

We, the undersigned settlers in and around the district of Tullisville, hereby petition the Dominion government to use their influence on behalf of our neighbourhood in securing a line of railway. In order to market any grain, we are obliged to draw it from 60 to 80 miles to town. Some of us have even greater distances than this to go. We also have the Saskatchewan river to cross which makes it very inconvenient, and being without railroad facilities we find little or no encouragement whatever in raising large quantities of grain until such times as we can get a closer market. If in the near future there are no signs of a railroad, the half of the neighbourhood threatens to pull out on obtaining their patent. This would mean a great loss to this district.

These people went in on the direct assurance of the Canadian Pacific Railway that they would construct the line. A railway company should not be allowed to give a pledge of this kind to the people and then place the people at a most serious disadvantage because of their non-fulfilment of the pledge. I have a letter here dated Fertile Valley, Saskatchewan, April 15th :

Could you let me have any definite information regarding the action of the Canadian

Pacific Railway in abandoning construction work on the Moosejaw extension? Also if you think it possible that the government or the Railway Commission could take up the matter and secure the completion of the line to the crossing on the South Saskatchewan river in township 29, range 8, west third meridian, this season. It is needless to point out that it is impossible to continue under present conditions. Hundreds, perhaps thousands, will follow those who have already abandoned the country.

KENNETH DUNBAR,
Honorary Secretary Liberal Association.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Knowles) if he has ever brought this grievance of the people in that part of the country before the Railway Committee of this House. These railways are always asking this House and its railway committee for additional legislation. I think that when they do that their attention ought to be called to any breach of contract of this kind. And I hold further that no road should get further legislation or further concessions from the government if there is a breach of contract on their part such as this appears to be. It may be that there are financial reasons why the company cannot construct the road at the present time. As to that, I am not informed ; although I do know that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has been able to procure large sums of money in the English money market within a short time. I have a strong opinion that these railways which constantly appear before this House and the railway committee for additional privileges should be told and told perhaps by the government, that no further concessions in the way of franchises will be given them until they make a reasonable effort to complete the roads that they have already incorporated, certainly to build the roads that they have given a pledge to build. If that is done, some kind of control will be held over these roads, and they will be compelled to keep bargains made with the people. The railways always talk of their vested rights and on those rights they insist. But the public also has vested rights ; and when the railways give a pledge they should seek in every way to carry it out. The only excuse I can imagine for not building this railway which will accommodate so many people, is, probably, the condition of the money market. But, so far, I have not heard that urged in this case. I think, if the hon. member (Mr. Knowles) and his friends from that part of the country go to the Minister of Railways and insist on his using his influence with the Canadian Pacific Railway and with the government as a whole, to have the government tell the Canadian Pacific and other railways that they shall not have further concessions until they complete the obligations they have undertaken, it will have a beneficial effect.

Mr. KNOWLES. With the permission of the House I may say that I have not brought this matter before the railway committee because it does not afford publicity enough. My wish was, I will not say to expose, but to reveal the position of this railway, and the railway committee does not meet my purpose.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But the Canadian Pacific Railway Company appears before the committee—has appeared this session —asking for these additional advantages, and that would be a good time to ventilate the matter.

Mr. KNOWLES. Again with the permission of the House, I would say, with regard to Mr. Whyte's promise, that he explained that he could not get ties.

Mr. G. E. McCRANEY (Saskatchewan). I desire to say a word in support of the position of my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles). I am familiar, to some degree, with the country through which he says this proposed railway would pass. The hon. gentleman and myself attended a picnic some forty or fifty miles west of the town of Hanley in the month of July last, and I must say that I never went through any portion of western Canada which appeared to be so fertile and so well suited to make the home of a prosperous people as that country is. There are many parts of the west in which our population is mostly foreign. But I was particularly struck with the fact that in this section it was almost entirely an Ontario population, and I found amongst the people there a number of persons whom I had known in Ontario. I think that if any hon. gentleman from Ontario had been there he would have felt himself, perhaps, more at home than in any other part of the west. They were all full of hope, but they were full also of requests that we should do what we could to influence the the Canadian Pacific Railway in the building of the road. I was to have accompanied my hon. friend (Mr. Knowles) to Winnipeg to interview Mr. Whyte, as my hon. friend has stated. The announcement which he was able to make after that interview was one very well received in that portion of the country. We found, on the trip to which I have referred, that there were two great needs. One was that of getting out the grain. The nearest market from the point we visited was Hanley. It is necessary to cross the south Saskatchewan river, and there is a journey of some fifty miles. The conditions make grain growing altogether unprofitable, but the people were in hopes that the railway might be put through in a very short time. There was also the other difficulty which my hon.

friend mentioned, one very apparent to us, and that is the necessity of making provision for fuel. I would point out to hon. members that, while we have heard nothing of the fuel question in the west during this session, we still stand in fear that, unless we get railway accommodation to some portions of the country which are almost wholly treeless, as is this part to which I have referred, we must look for a great deal of trouble in the future. The value which our land has is not derived from its grain growing qualities so much as from its proximity to transportation. What I have sometimes felt is that, in granting charters to railways, although there is no undertaking on the part of the railways to construct, we almost mislead people to go into a given portion of the country by the announcement that a railway may pass through. Unfortunately, our people seem to think that a charter is a railway. Of course, that is a great mistake. But when corporations like the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, with the credit it has, makes an announcement and gives a contract, it seems to me that the influence of this House and of this government should be made use of to compel, or, at least, to influence the railway to go on and construct. I feel that these people have a great grievance against a corporation which has received every consideration at the hands of this House, and I hope the Minister of Railways will use his good offices in having this contract completed.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). In reply to the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles) and the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. McCraney), Of course, it is regrettable that thickly settled portions of any part of the country should be so remote from the market and have no connection by way of railways or other rapid transit. It is a well recognized fact that the time consumed in marketing a product has much to do with the price and with the profit made in raising it. I can readily understand the disappointment that would result from a promise made by representatives of a great railway not being implemented. People, as my hon. friend (Mr. McCraney) has said, would rush into that territory, believing they were shortly to have railway communication with one of the best centres of that country, the city of Moosejaw, only to find, after they had been there a few months that their hopes were not to be speedily realized.

I certainly appreciate the bringing of this question before the House. I am inclined to think, without wishing to be anything of a scold, that if we could devote more attention in the House to bringing these matters that are of direct interest to the people, before the country and before those interested, we would perhaps, accomplish more for the public than we do by some of the discussions we have. This is a question that directly affects a portion of the people of Canada, and what affects one part of the country affects us all. It is of the utmost importance, that just as rapidly as possible in all parts of the country the people should be brought into the quickest possible communication with the best market. That is the reason that parliament assists in the building of railways. It is not at all, to my mind, that they want to assist the companies, as some hon. gentlemen would think, but it is an effort on their part to encourage the companies or urge them on with greater speed to bring the people in closer communion with the outside world and thus make their living more comfortable and their occupations more profitable. It is on that ground that parliaments assist railways. When a railway is assisted by parliament, it must assume an obligation in return for that assistance and I have no hesitation in saying that it is the duty of these companies, as rapidly as they can, to extend the facility of railway communication to all the people they can. As I understand, the Canadian Pacific Railway have built a stretch of about fourteen miles, had let a contract for seventy miles more, and have constructed one hundred miles at the other end. The great disappointment has been caused by the fact that they cancelled the contract for the seventy miles.

Mr. FOSTER. The whole mileage is quite long.

Mr. KNOWLES. About five hundred miles in all.

Mr. GRAHAM. It would be quite an extensive road if constructed. I am not here to apologize for the railway, but I think it fair to say that the past year has been very discouraging to railway companies. The Railway Committee this session has been very lenient with companies asking extensions from the very fact that they find it difficult to finance their present undertakings; and I think I can say with some assurance that in undertaking to finance any line they have to give a pretty direct account of what they propose to do with the money they obtain, and so the lines that are going to be profitable the quickest are the ones to which they are trying to devote their efforts.

Mr. KNOWLES. Does not the minister think they will look rather to the lines where there is competition?

Mr. GRAHAM. That might be, but the men supplying the money may, to a certain extent, influence that too. The last year has been very discouraging to the railway companies in two ways. First it was very

difficult to raise money, and second, the receipts from the railways during the past few months have fallen off very materially, and if my hon. friend will compare the receipts of the large railways during the past six months, with those of the corresponding six months of a year ago, he will see there has not been much recently to encourage them to extend their lines.

Another matter of which I think it is fair to speak is that a year ago or a little more, there was a great congestion of traffic in the Northwest. There was a cry, and a reasonable one too, all over the land that none of the railway companies provided a sufficient amount of rolling stock. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) took the position, and not unwisely, that the railways ought to be compelled to supply the present lines with complete railway stock before they were allowed to build another mile. That has been urged on the companies very strongly that they should increase their rolling stock, but recently that has not been pushed to any extent because there is not a railway on the continent but has many cars on sidings not being used at all. I am not saying this in apology for the railways, but am pointing out reasons that will be given by them. I think it wise to discuss these things before the House and give them the utmost publicity. I assure my hon. friends that I shall call the attention of the management of the Canadian Pacific Railway to this complaint and urge them, as far as practicable, to keep faith with the people of the Northwest wherever a charter has been given for the construction of a railway.

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton). While I did not hear the first part of the discussion and am not quite clear as to its purpose, it looks odd to me, that on Friday afternoon, when we generally expect to do a great deal of business, hon. members sitting behind the ministers should raise questions such as this and obstruct the Minister of Public Works in dealing with his estimates. It is apparently a concerted effort on the part of some of these gentlemen. The hon. member who first spoke (Mr. Knowles) a year or two ago opposed the renewal of the charter of this company.

Mr. KNOWLES. My hon. friend is all wrong, he is mistaken.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think I am very far mistaken, not over seventy miles. There was a strong movement by some members from the west to oppose the extension of the time for the construction of this road and now they come here and complain that it has not been constructed. Is it any wonder that the Canadian Pacific Railway would hesitate about going on, knowing the influence of those gentlemen with the government, and knowing that they might at any day cut their charter in two and hinder them from proceeding with the work. If I am making a statement that is not strictly correct, my information comes from a source which I think I can rely on, a gentleman equally interested with the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles). If he is serious in trying to get this road built, let him go to Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, to the Railway Commission or some one who has something to do with the building of the road and not come here. Governments do not build railways. It is true they are building the National Transcontinental, but they are not undertaking the construction of this road. I do not suppose they are granting an acre of land by way of subsidy or bonus or contributing a dollar towards it, and it is a matter of no moment to the government whether the road is built or not; that is to say they are not a party to it.

Mr. KNOWLES. I gave very distinctly my reasons for the special course I took and I think my hon. friend should at least be present to hear my statement before passing judgment on my conduct.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman should have given me an intimation before bringing it up. He cannot expect that we will be on hand at all times to discuss matters of this kind.

I think he should announce the day before at any rate and give hon. gentlemen notice that he is going to propose a great question, a question of prime importance to the west. I do not say but that it is a question of great importance to the west. I am not finding fault with the hon. gentleman in trying to get that road built because I think it is an important road. I understand it is constructed now from Moosejaw a certain distance, that it is constructed at the other end from Lacombe, and that there is a link in the middle which remains to be built. It is of great importance to the people in that country that the road should be built and I have no doubt that it will be built provided the hon. gentleman does not succeed in blocking a renewal of the charter. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman in his desire to have the road built, but I do protest against his wasting the time of the House in bringing a matter of this kind up when he knows perfectly well that the only thing that he could accomplish was to boom himself in West Assiniboia by making the people there believe that he is a great big man. I do not suppose that he had any other purpose. He knew perfectly well that it was no use. He could have gone to the Minister of Railways and Canals privately and asked him to assist him by urging upon the Canadian Pacific Railway to get that road built. He had the privilege of doing it because he is supporting the gov-

ernment and I will undertake to say that he would have got just as good a promise from the minister and one which would have carried just as much weight if he had gone to him privately instead of taking an hour or two of the valuable time of the Minister of Public Works and instead of blocking the Estimates and keeping us perhaps sitting here until twelve or one o'clock in the morning——

An hon. MEMBER. Until three o'clock.

Mr. HENDERSON. Or until three o'clock when we ought to be taking our rest. I hope the hon. Minister of Public Works, (Mr. Pugsley) when he does get into the Estimates, will not inflict a penalty on this House and keep us here until three o'clock in the morning, knowing as he does that his political friends have been the cause very largely of the waste of time that has been going on.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If we all hurry things along we may get through at two o'clock.

Mr. HENDERSON. If the hon. gentleman thinks he will get through at two o'clock I will tell him that, as far as I am concerned, I have an intense objection to sitting and talking Estimates after twelve o'clock. I do not think there is any need for it. I think we should get through with our business at twelve o'clock at any rate and if the minister gives direct answers to the questions which are submitted to him and does not ask us to vote money for unreasonable things I have no doubt he will get along sufficiently well to enable the government to adjourn the House at twelve and let us go home, take our rest and be able to come back in the beginning of the week refreshed. I think the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) expressed approval of what I am saying and I hope he will remind the Minister of Public Works that at any rate twelve o'clock is late enough to sit.

FIRE EXTINGUISHERS—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Mr. Speaker——

Mr. FOSTER. There is another obstructor coming.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will just take two minutes of the time of the House to make a personal explanation. At the beginning of the discussion of the motion which is now before the chair, the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) quoted from the report of the Civil Service Commission, at page 79, the following letter :

I have to inform you that if you consider that chemical fire extinguishers are necessary on board the vessels of the Quebec agency you are to purchase them from P. E. Perreault, 312 St. John street, Quebec. Mr. P. has been advised to call upon you in connection with this matter.

The hon. gentleman stated that this letter had been signed by me. I was greatly surprised that he should make that statement.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) absolutely denied that. He said that he had never said that it was signed by the minister. He repeated that denial and, in the face of that, I do not think that the minister should repeat the statement.

Mr. BRODEUR. At first he said that I had signed this letter.

Mr. SPROULE. No, he stated that he had not.

Mr. BRODEUR. The record will show in regard to that.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, let the Minister of Public Works go on.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think it is only right that I should be permitted to give a personal explanation. There are so many things being said against me that I think the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) should be willing to give me two minutes to make this explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I do not think you ought to.

Mr. BRODEUR. I understood the hon. member for Leeds to say that I had signed this letter. At all events I called his attention to that and I asked him where he had got his information that I had signed this letter. I sent over to the department for the file and I find that on the 20th July, 1906, Mr. Perrault applied to the department to sell some fire extinguishers, and on the 27th July, 1906, the letter which I have just quoted was written and was signed by the deputy minister.

Mr. BLAIN. Will my hon. friend read the letter ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. It is dated July 27, 1906.

Mr. FOSTER. No, Mr. Perreault's letter.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, it is dated the 20th July, 1906 :

Quebec, July 20, 1906.

Commander O. G. V. Spain, Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Sir,—The captain of the Canadian government steamer 'Minto' was speaking to me about putting some chemical fire extinguishers aboard his ship the same as I put aboard of all the ships at this agency. The 'Minto' has no chemical fire extinguishers whatever. You were present at a test I made on the King's wharf two years ago in competition with another make; mine proved itself far superior in every way. Inclosed please find cut giving information. The 'Minto' would require eight machines owing to the way she is divided up; ordinarily

from four to six is all that is necessary. I would be pleased to receive an order for any other ships you would like to equip. Price, $14 each. Can place same on board on her return here. I am on the patronage list. Hoping to receive your esteemed orders, I remain,

Yours respectfully,
(Sgd.) P. E. PERREAULT,
312 St. John street,
Quebec.

I do not remember having had any knowledge of this letter before I read it the other day in the report of the Civil Service Commission, but I find on the file another letter dated the 27th October, 1906. That letter was sent to me by the party named to the effect that Mr. Perrault had on his hands a certain number of extinguishers and that he would like to sell these to the government.

Mr. FOSTER. Who sent that letter ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Lachance, M.P. Perhaps I had better give the letter :

Quebec, October 27, 1906.

Hon. L. P. Brodeur,
Minister of Marine, Ottawa.

Mr. Minister,—Mr. P. E. Perreault had on hand a certain number of fire extinguishers when he was appointed to the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Quebec. He was then engaged as an agent in this trade. He has a certain number remaining on hand.

Could you not authorize Mr. Gregory to purchase them for the service of the lighthouses as well as in the steamers. Their efficacy has been several times shown by various experiments made at Quebec and elsewhere.

Yours truly,
ARTHUR LACHANCE.

Then my answer follows which I will read in French and translate into English. It is dated November 6, 1906, and is as follows :—

My Dear Member,—I received your letter of the 27th of October last concerning the extinguishers that Mr. Perreault desires to sell to the department. I have had Mr. Gregory written to on the subject and when his reply reaches the department I will communicate my decision.

It appears that Mr. Perreault applied 'de novo' to the department, and he received this answer :

I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 6th instant with reference to fire extinguishers and have to advise you that none are required by the department.

That is the correspondence concerning that matter. I am exceedingly sorry that the member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has tried to make a case against me without reason. Had he been kind enough to notify me that he would bring up this question I would have had the files ready to answer the insinuations he has made. The hon. gentleman did not think it advisable to do so, but I am nevertheless glad to put before the House the facts in connection with it.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose the hon. gentleman would have no objection to lay the file on the table.

Mr. BRODEUR. No objection at all. But I may say that some years ago the department brought before the House an original document, namely, the lease to Mr. Markey, and it was handed to an opposition member of this House and it has never been returned to the House.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the hon. gentleman know it was handed to an opposition member ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, because it was read by him in the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Does he know that the opposition member did not return it ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There has been no trace of it in the department since.

Mr. FOSTER. It may have been lost there. There was such confusion in the department that it may have been lost.

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh, not at all; if my hon. friend wants to see this file I have no objection.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister having quoted from it, I suppose there is no objection to laying it on the table of the House.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will of course put copies on the table.

Mr. BLAIN. That is not the point. The minister having sent to the department for the original file and having quoted it in the House, I suppose he will have no objection to lay it on the table.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have no objection to have all these documents copied and laid before the House.

Mr. BLAIN. That is not what I ask.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, if the hon. gentleman does not take my word for it, here is the file and let him consult it. I will send it over by a page, but I must thank him for the courtesy he has extended to me.

Mr. BLAIN. I expect to give fair-play to my hon. friends opposite and I would expect the same from them in return. I made no suggestion that the minister would not do as he stated. There was no such thought in my mind. I was pointing out that the minister having sent for the departmental file and having quoted from it, it was only fair that he should lay it on the table of the House.

An hon. MEMBER. Well, you have it now.

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

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC BRANCH LINES.

House in committee on Bill (No. 151) respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—Mr. Crawford.

Mr. CRAWFORD moved that progress be reported.

Mr. LENNOX. This Bill has been several times before the committee and I do not propose to object, but I may say to my hon. friend that I wish to deal with the matter by way of amendment at some time, and as I have been here ready on several occasions I hope that the Minister of Railways and the promoter of the Bill will concur in letting it stand over if it should happen that I shall not be here when it is called again.

Mr. GRAHAM. We will keep it for you.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE, HALIFAX.

House in committee on Bill (No. 154) respecting the Board of the Presbyterian College, Halifax.—Mr. Sinclair.

On section 1,

Mr. HENDERSON. Is the promoter of this Bill present? I would like to have some explanation of it.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I do not think there is anything in the Bill of a contentious nature, and unless my hon. friend from Halton has some special reason for desiring it to stand, I hope he will not press his objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. I will just say that this is a Bill which came before the Private Bills Committee. I had not an opportunity of being present, not being a member of that committee, and I know nothing about the Bill or the reason for it. I think we have been laying it down as a practice that a man is not expected to get his Bill through this committee unless he gives personal attention to it. I do not see why we should sit here promoting another man's legislation. If he does not see fit to come here and give reasons why the Bill should become law, I think we are perfectly justified in asking that it stand over. I would, therefore, enter my protest against further proceeding with this Bill. We have for some time laid it down as a distinct rule that a Bill should stand unless the promoter is present. I do ont see even the chairman of the Committee on Private Bills. We are legislating altogether in the dark, and I will ask the government to see that the rule, or at any rate the practice that we have adopted for some time back, is adhered to.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I do not know that the hon. member for Guysborough, in whose name the Bill stands, is any more its promoter than any other hon. member of this House. This Bill came from the Senate in the regular order and was placed in the name of the hon. member for Guysborough, who is probably more familiar with the legislation than a good many others, but who is in no special sense the promoter of the Bill. I am quite sure that the Bill has received careful consideration at the hands of those to whom it was committed, and that there is nothing in it that should not receive the assent of the House.

Mr. FOWLER. I think it is immaterial whether the promoter of a Bill is present or not when it comes before the House, particularly when it is a Bill that comes from the Senate. The hon. member for Halton with the Bill before him is able to look at its provisions, and, with his keen, incisive mind, I am quite sure that he could understand it as well as the hon. gentleman in whose name it stands. I do not know of any rule that requires a member whose name is attached to a Bill to be present in the House when it is under consideration. If there is such a rule, it is more honoured in the breach than in the observance.

Mr. FISHER. There is no such rule, but there is no doubt that it is a satisfactory practice, unless there is somebody else who can give explanations which any member may desire to have. However, as the hon. member in whose name the Bill stands is now present, he will probably be able to give any explanations that are desired.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. member for Halton did not mention any point on which he desired information. If he had asked for information which no hon. member present could give him, there would be a reason for allowing the Bill to stand over.

Mr. HENDERSON. As the promoter of the Bill is now present, my objection of course falls to the ground, but I believe it is a good practice to insist that those in whose name any legislation stands should be present to answer for it. I admit that there is no rule, but I said that we had adopted a practice of that kind, and when the Minister of Finance was present I believe he endorsed it as a good practice. I think the

promoter of the Bill might tell us in a few minutes what is the purpose of it.

Mr. SINCLAIR. This Bill was sent to me by the secretary of the Presbyterian Board at Halifax, and he informed me that all the clauses of it had been before the Synod of the Presbyterian church, and were quite acceptable to the parties in charge of the funds. This Bill is quite acceptable in every way to all parties concerned. I am not able to give the exact details but I understand that there are certain funds bequeathed to the different schemes of the church that are not supposed to be covered by the powers given the Presbyterian Board under former Acts. There are certain bequests which were made to the church in a general way, and it was held by some legal gentlemen that the board had not sufficient control over those bequests. I understand that the purpose is to make the Act so general that all bequests to the church can be dealt with by the board. I accepted the Bill on the recommendation of the secretary of the board, and I understand it was thoroughly threshed out by the members of the legal committee of the Synod of the Presbyterian church of the maritime provinces and is acceptable to them.

Mr. LENNOX. In what way does this differ from the clause we are appealing? We are appealing paragraph 'C' of section 3 of chapter 92 of the statutes of Canada, 1902. Is that a general or a special Act?

Mr. PRGSLEY. It was an Act to incorporate the board of the Presbyterian College of Halifax. The repealed section provided that the board should have power to receive, manage and administer property, real and personal, and titles and effects of every description then held or enjoyed by or under control of the board. The section was limited to what the board then had, and by this amendment the board has power to receive and administer property hereafter given to them as well. It applies not only to property they may now possess but which they may possess in the future.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

BELLEVILLE-PRINCE EDWARD BRIDGE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 20) respecting the Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Company.—Mr. Porter.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. member for Belleville (Mr. Porter), who is the promoter of the Bill, is not present, and he asked me to explain it in his absence. The Bill has been before the Private Bills Committee and has been amended in some particulars. It was perfectly satisfactory to that committee.

Mr. ALCORN. I have a copy of the Bill, as amended by the Private Bills Committee, and it is satisfactory.

On section 1—tolls.

Mr. GRAHAM. Why do you add that word 'driver' in connection with a vehicle?

Mr. ALCORN. Each person passing over the bridge is charged a separate fee and they might undertake to tax the driver.

Mr. GRAHAM. Suppose two people are in the rig.

Mr. ALCORN. There would be an extra fee for the extra person.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Are not the regulations of tolls on bridges in municipal rather than federal jurisdiction?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I think the worst specimen is in the municipality of the city of Montreal. The Victoria bridge has a list of tolls, sanctioned by parliament, which is the most exorbitant I know of. I was surprised, when parliament voted so much for that bridge, that the list of tolls was not greatly reduced. I hope that parliament will be more careful in sanctioning toll charges, especially when they are as exorbitant as they are on that jubilee bridge in Montreal. That bridge has a tariff of charges six or eight feet high printed in small letters. Every jackass that crosses is taxed to an exorbitant degree.

Mr. EMMERSON. You are not interested in that charge?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. My hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) is the patron of that class of quadruped. All I say is that these tolls ought to be carefully revised by parliament, and somebody ought to be responsible for them.

Mr. SPROULE. I am glad the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has reached that conclusion now. I know that when this Bill was amended I fought very hard against the tolls, but I had little support in this House. I remember distinctly, when this was passed, the contention was put up that it was very difficult to raise money to build a bridge, and that when it was built it would be very difficult to get means to keep it in repair, and these fees were agreed upon as reasonable at that time. I confess I looked with suspicion upon the proposal to increase that. In some instances they have been raised 100 per cent. Take, for instance, a bicycle and rider, ten cents. Ten cents for a bicycle and rider going across a bridge—that is exorbitant.

Mr. GALLIHER. It is only five cents.

Mr. SPROULE. They have increased it to ten cents. 'Bicycle and rider, 10 cents.'

Mr. GALLIHER. That is not as it was settled in committee. I was a member of

the sub-committee on the revision of these tolls. The hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) was present, though I do not know whether he was a member of the committee. The representative of the township of Ameliasburg and also the representative of the board of trade and of the city council of Belleville were present, and the fees were practically agreed upon and a compromise made. I remember distinctly that the fee for bicycle and rider was fixed at five cents. Why it is given as ten cents in the Bill I do not know.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It was five cents and it is raised to ten cents in the Bill.

Mr. ALCORN. The tariff as submitted by the promoter of the Bill was: 'Bicycle 5 cents.' It was afterwards agreed to make it 'bicycle and rider 10 cents.'

Mr. GALLIHER. Notwithstanding that that is in the Bill, my distinct recollection is that it was settled otherwise in the committee. I remember mentioning that, in my opinion, a bicycle going over a bridge did not cause very much wear and tear on the bridge, and that if the bicycle was charged five cents and the bicycle was ridden there should be no extra fee for the rider. I do not think it should be ten cents, and I am positive that it was arranged otherwise in committee.

Mr. BARKER. The last clause provides that these tolls are to be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. These rates are maximum rates, and will not be reached if the Governor in Council does not approve.

Mr. LENNOX. In reference to the point raised by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), I think we may well ask what right we have to deal with such a Bill as this at all.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it was held that this was over navigable water.

Mr. EMMERSON. That does not make incorporation in this parliament necessary.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But this parliament did incorporate the company.

Mr. LENNOX. I quite recognize that this is an amendment to an Act we passed in 1899. But our attention was not at that time so particularly directed to the necessity of being careful about this matter as it is now. I do not know whether we can do anything in reference to that point now, but I would call the attention of the committee to the fact that, if this were a new matter, it is one that ought to be regarded as purely within the provincial jurisdiction, and, therefore, one that ought not to be dealt with in this parliament. I call attention to this because I wish to be consistent. Whenever I find an effort to incorporate here a company that ought to be incorporated by the provincial legislature, I endeavour to discourage it. This looks to me like a matter that would be within the jurisdiction of the local legislature.

Mr. EMMERSON. If this parliament acknowledges—and I think it should be acknowledged—that a mistake was made in incorporating the company in 1899, the most this parliament could do now is to have a provision that the provincial governent of Ontario should have the right to regulate the tolls. On that point this parliament should not invade the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature. I think that the company should have been incorporated by the provincial legislature. Then, as the bridge is over a navigable stream, the company could secure permission of the Department of Public Works for the construction of the bridge. That is the course pursued in all the provinces so far as my experience teaches me. But that course was not pursued in this case. It seems to me this parliament should not undertake to regulate the tolls, but should have a provision in the Bill referring that matter to the abitrament of the provincial legislature of Ontario, or providing for the approval of the Governor in Council of Ontario.

Mr. GRAHAM. This bridge has nothing to do with any international or interprovincial water. It is only to make a short way across from the county of Hastings to the county of Prince Edward in Ontario. This company was incorporated away back in 1899 and tolls were then established for the traffic over this bridge. The county of Prince Edward being one of the real beauty spots of the Dominion is attracting a large number of tourists who go into the county both by land and water. On that account and to that extent we, as well as the inhabitants of the district, have an interest in this matter. Of course, if my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) and the promoter of the Bill are perfectly satisfied, that must have great influence with the House, for they are the people most deeply interested. My only object is to get the Bill exactly as the committee want it. In the case of the bicycle there seems to be a little difference of opinion.

Mr. ALCORN. The Bill is now before this committee, I have no doubt, as it was passed by the subcommittee and the Committee on Private Bills. This matter of the toll on the bicycle was a matter of compromise.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is disputed.

Mr. ALCORN. I think that the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Galliher) is mistaken; I have no doubt in my own mind that he is. I remember his making the observation to which he refers, but the same item came up a number of times and was the subject

of contention, and in conjunction with other items it was finally decided to leave it as it appears in the Bill.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I contend that no bicycle rider should be charged five cents for crossing this bridge. His bicycle weighs thirty pounds at the most. He crosses the bridge more rapidly by reason of that fact and wherever tolls are charged on roads they have not been imposed on a man because he happens to be on a bicycle. I think it would be a bad precedent to establish if parliament should double the toll on a man because he happens to be riding his bicycle. He goes faster, gets off the bridge in less time and so useful a mode of travel as the bicycle should not be discriminated against in this way.

Mr. FOWLER. Does not a man driving a light sulky, weighing about the same as a bicycle, have to pay as if he were in another vehicle? If you strike out the word 'bicycle' altogether, the bicycle would pay nothing because it is only the things mentioned here on which toll is paid.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. 'Or other vehicles' would cover that?

Mr. FOWLER. No.

Mr. GALLIHER. The more this is discussed the more positive I am that I am right. The very fact that we see the charge for each person passing over the bridge five cents and then lower down for each bicycle five cents, shows that for the two the charge is ten cents, and what would be the sense of saying 'bicycle with rider ten cents' because it would come to the same thing. I am positive that the arrangement in the special committee was that the bicycle, including its rider, was to pay only five cents, not ten cents. There is no doubt about that in my mind. I am sure the other members of the committee, if they were here would endorse my statement that we agreed to include the rider with the bicycle at five cents.

Mr. SPROULE. When the original Bill was passed the same question came up, does the charge for a vehicle include the driver?—and it was agreed it did. If you put the bicycle separate from the rider and then charge for each, you are changing the whole principle and raising the toll one hundred per cent.

Mr. GALLIHER. I say we do not, we leave it unchanged.

Mr. SPROULE. I say that if you agree to what we are told you agree, you do raise it. Who is the owner of the bridge now? It is claimed that this was a public convenience, that it was hard to get money to keep it up and that it was expedient there should be some toll but to make it as reasonable as possible so as not to prevent people from crossing the bridge or taking some other means of getting to their destination without crossing it. It was regarded as reasonable to charge the schedule brought down and agreed to, and I confess I do not see any ground for raising the charge. It may mean that some of those who desire to have it raised are the owners of the bridge. In the interest of the travelling public, I took the same ground with reference to the bridge at Montreal. I always think, in any of these bridges, you should make the lowest possible charge so that people may cross, may take produce and animals across with the least possible hinderance and not have the bridge holders make a big profit.

Mr. EMMERSON. The more one studies this tariff the more he will be convinced that this matter should be left to the approval of the Governor in Council of Ontario because for instance it will be seen that children under six years of age, accompanied by parent or guardian, are free, but by another clause a lady with a baby in a baby carriage would have to pay five cents additional.

Mr. FOWLER. That is struck out.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think that every principle of sound legislation leads one to the conclusion that it should be left to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council of Ontario.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. They could change it at any time. If Belleville suddenly developed into a large city, there is no reason why the tolls should not be reduced. It should be flexible and the Dominion parliament has more important things to attend to than adjusting these toll rates from time to time.

Mr. EMMERSON. Conditions no doubt will change there. You are establishing a tariff of rates that will remain for all time unless that company chooses to come back to this parliament and have a reduced tariff substituted.

Mr. BARKER. No, look at the last clause.

Mr. FOWLER. It is to be approved by the Governor in Council.

Mr. EMMERSON. Of the Dominion. Why should the Governor in Council for this Dominion take charge of a matter that is purely provincial?

Mr. FOWLER. That is another argument.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is the argument I am making and my objection to this Bill is absolutely from that standpoint.

Mr. FOWLER. I interrupted the hon. gentleman because he said that would have

to come to this parliament. It would be much more convenient to go to the Lieutenant Governor in Council than to the Governor in council.

Mr. EMMERSON. My observations have reference to the last clause. It seems to me to be self-evident that we were usurping the right of the province of Ontario with reference to the latter matter. It was done, no doubt, by mistake but having made the mistake I do not think that this parliament should ratify it. I think that this parliament should make an acknowledgment of the error and that a section stating that the tariff should be such a tariff as will be approved from time to time by the Lieutenant Governor in Council of the province should be inserted.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Make a motion to that effect and I will support it.

Mr. FOWLER. I will accept that.

Mr. LENNOX. As the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) says it is a matter which certainly comes within the provision of the British North America Act with respect to property and civil rights within the provinces and, therefore, if the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals would move an amendment of that kind in reference to the last clause, I think we ought to support it.

Mr. FOWLER. I quite agree with the position taken by the hon. member for Westmoreland that this is no doubt a provincial matter which has been made a federal matter by reason of the Act passed in 1899. I see no reason why the parties interested in the Bill should not accept an amendment of that kind providing that the tolls should be approved from time to time by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Mr. GRAHAM. The discussion has taken a somewhat wider range than might have been anticipated. The question of the rights of the provinces has been very well presented by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson). We ought to have the Bill reprinted with the amendments in them and allow it to stand until the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Porter), the promoter of the Bill, is here to take part in the discussion. I think it would hardly be fair to insert a clause in his Bill when he was absent.

Progress reported.

SASKATCHEWAN POWER COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 153) to incorporate the Saskatchewan Power Company.—Mr. McCraney.

On section 1,

Mr. PUGSLEY. I received a communication in regard to this Bill from the municipality of Saskatchewan. I would like to ask if the objection has been withdrawn before the committee ?

Mr. McCRANEY. As the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) explains, there were some objections made to the Bill in its original form by the corporation of Saskatoon. The objections have been withdrawn and I will read a letter that I have received from the clerk of the city in regard to the matter.

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, April 24, 1908.

Geo. E. McCraney, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa, Ontario.

Sir,—Re Saskatchewan Power Company. I am in receipt of your letter, also your telegram April 15, and in reply would say that I have been instructed by the city council to write you thanking you for the interest which you have taken on the city's behalf in regard to the passing of the Saskatchewan Power Company's Bill.

The council are of the opinion that it would not necessitate the sending of a delegate to Ottawa on Wednesday the 29th instant, as clause 3 seems to be in keeping with the petition that we forwarded to you some time ago.

I am, yours truly,
(Sgd.) A. H. TRUESDALE,
City Clerk.

The objections which the municipal corporation made are met by clause 3 of this Bill.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like to ask the promoter why he comes here to get this Bill crystallized into law instead of going to the legislature of Saskatchewan. From the slight information I have it seems to me that it is purely a local matter.

Mr. McCRANEY. I would be pleased to state to my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) the reason this company has come here for the incorporation for which it is asking. Under ordinary circumstances, in the province of Ontario, such a company would be incorporated and powers given to it by the local legislature, but hon. gentlemen will remember the question which arose in the discussion of the Saskatchewan Act and the fact that certain rights were reserved to the Dominion parliament in regard to the lands. I will quote section 21 of the Saskatchewan Act :

All Crown lands, mines and minerals and royalties incident thereto and the interest of the Crown in the waters within the province under the Northwest Irrigation Act, 1898, shall continue to be vested in the Crown and administered by the government of Canada for the purposes of Canada.

Then the Irrigation Act which is chapter 61 of the Revised Statutes of Canada provides as follows :

Section 6. The property in and the right to the use of all the water at any time in any river, stream, water course, lake, creek, ra-

vine, canyon, lagoon, swamp, marsh or other body of water shall, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed to be vested in the Crown, unless and until and except only so far as some right therein, or to the use thereof, inconsistent with the right of the Crown, and which is not a public right or a right common to the public, is established.

Mr. LENNOX. That is the Irrigation Act?

Mr. McCRANEY. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. It says 'for the purposes of this Act'. That is for the purposes of irrigation, is it not?

Mr. McCRANEY. But, the reference to the Irrigation Act is continued in the Saskatchewan Act.

Mr. LENNOX. What I want to suggest to the hon. gentleman is this: The hon. gentleman reads from the Irrigation Act and it says that the things that are enumerated are, 'for the purposes of this Act' vested in the Dominion parliament. I would understand that to mean for the purposes of irrigation and matters incidental to it and not necessarily for the purposes of this Act which is an Act to incorporate a power company. Any thing that is referred to in the Acts which the hon. gentleman has quoted does not change the situation as far as I can see.

Mr. SPROULE. I have here a copy of a letter sent by the Saskatoon city council I do not know whether the hon. member (Mr. McCraney) has had a similar one and has dealt with it or not, but I notice that they oppose this Bill very strongly.

Mr. McCRANEY. I have had a copy of the letter probably to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) refers and the objections which are contained in that communication are, the council say, met by the provisions of clause 3 as amended in the Senate. I will send my hon. friend the letter which I have received from the city of Saskatoon.

Mr. SPROULE. In my letter from the council of Saskatoon the objection is practically to the whole Bill.

Mr. McCRANEY. The letter referred to by the hon. gentleman is with reference to the Draft Bill presented in the Senate and which was very considerably amended there so that we are considering it now.

Mr. SPROULE. The city of Saskatoon contends that there is a valuable water power there which they do not desire to get into the hands of a private corporation and which ought to be controlled by the city, and with regard to which they are making an application to the government. As I understand it this private company seeks by this Bill to get control of the water power and thus acquire the right to charge perhaps exorbitant prices for the supply of power and which would prevent the development of manufacturing industries. It is a very bad principle to pass these water powers into the hands of private corporations. In addition to that my contention is that unless this is a navigable stream the province and not the Dominion has control over it. It may be that the Irrigation Act which the hon. gentleman has referred to gives authority to this parliament to deal with the matter but otherwise the province should own and control these powers and derive what revenue it can from them.

Mr. LENNOX. It would be desirable that the hon. gentleman in charge of this Bill should continue his explanation of it.

Progress reported.

The hour for private Bills having expired the House resumed in Committee of Supply.

Public Works, Buildings—Ontario—Belleville armoury, $75,000.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). At the last sitting of the committee I gave a full explanation of this item. I do not know whether any other gentlemen would like to have an explanation from the Minister of Militia or not.

Guelph armoury, $20,000.

Mr. CLEMENTS. What is the expected cost of this building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total probable cost of the armoury, with the heating, the electric wiring and fixtures, the fittings and furniture, including the site, is $114,537.30. We are now asking for $20,000, and will of course require a further amount later. In this cost is included the cost of a drill-hall which will be over the armoury. The building will be a very fine one.

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

Mr. PUGSLEY. During the present year.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will it be at the disposal of the live-stock fair that is held at Guelph?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know. I have had no application for the use of it.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to know the number of men the Belleville armoury is intended to accommodate. I would like also to know on what principle the size and cost of these armouries are determined; because they are becoming very costly. My desire was to have the Minister of Militia present, as he alone could give us that information.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The 15th regiment, composed of eight companies, is the principal military unit that will occupy that armoury. That is about 400 strong. In addition to that, one company of a rural battalion, the 49th regiment, consisting of between forty and fifty men, will

have its headquarters in this armoury. In arranging for an armoury the Militia Department makes an estimate of what accommodation is required for the existing militia strength, and for some additional accommodation to provide for the natural growth of the place. I should say that Belleville has had for many years an armoury which was found to be insufficient, and it was torn down; so that this new armoury is really taking its place. This and other city regiments do not go into camp annually, but do their drill at headquarters in the evenings. In most of the cities it is impossible to obtain the consent of the employers of labour to give the men of these corps the time to attend to their drill in the day time; the consequence is that they do their annual drill, and give a great deal more of their time than the equivalent of twelve days, in the evenings; and these armouries are the homes of these regiments during the long winter and spring months. I think they are an absolute necessity, and have been the means of doing a great deal of good to the militia. In fact, we could not get on without them.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a rural battalion in that county in addition to the city one?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, the 49th regiment. It has eight companies, one of which is situated at Belleville and will use a part of the armoury for storage of arms.

Mr. SPROULE. How many companies are there outside?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Seven.

Mr. SPROULE. Where are they accommodated?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is a grant of money to each company of every rural battalion. The captain of the company receives this grant for the care of arms, and he keeps them in a building of his own or where he likes. That is not done in the cities to anything like the same extent, but there the money goes to pay a caretaker by the year for looking after the armoury and the stores.

Mr. SPROULE. What is to be the total cost of this building when completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $139,776.31.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the size of it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hall will be 175 feet by 80 with a range of armouries along the north side. The walls of brick on stone foundation. The centre portion three stories high.

Mr. CROCKET. I see that the specifications were prepared by the Architect Engineering Company at a cost of $1,755. Why were not the plans prepared by the architects of the Public Works Department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. At that time the staff was exceeding busy with other work.

Mr. ALCORN. What is the cost of the site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $9,000.

Mr. ALCORN. Why was the old armoury replaced? It was a very commodious and convenient building, and I would have thought it would answer every purpose of the militia of Belleville and the vicinity for many years. Why was the site purchased so near the business centre? It is on a street next the main street, and land could have been obtained further away at very much less price. The old building was one street further away from the main street.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The site is not under my control but as to why a new building is required I remember distinctly that strong protests were made that the old building was not sufficient, and strong pressure brought to bear to get a new one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would call attention to the fact that the lot is a corner lot, 260 feet 6 inches on one street and 150 feet 6 inches on the other, and is quite close to the best business portion of the city.

Mr. ALCORN. From whom was it bought?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From Mrs. Yonker and Mr. Richard Harnett.

Mr. CLEMENTS. What is the annual cost of keeping up an armoury such as you are building?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The caretaker gets from $1 to $1.50 per day. Then there is the expense of fuel, which I do not think is very great because the whole building is not heated all the time. I should think the cost of keeping up the building, including heat, light and caretaker, would be from $1,200 to $1,500 per year.

Guelph armoury, $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This building is to be built of brick with stone dressing on stone foundation. The portion fronting on Hassells street is 146 feet by 36, exclusive of projections. It is three stories high with a basement. In the rear there is to be an extension 80 feet wide and 190 feet deep, which will have two stories. The site cost $5,000, and the total cost will be $148,527.20, including the armoury and drill shed.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is the strength of the force which will be provided for?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This armoury will accommodate two field batteries

of artillery, the 11th and 16th, also one company of the 30th Regiment.

Mr. HENDERSON. Where is the headquarters of the 30th ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is a Wellington county regiment.

Mr. HENDERSON. Guelph would be the headquarters ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It may be, but there is only one company resident there. The regimental headquarters will be there. Then there is a company of the Army Service Corps numbering 110, so that the number of men will be about 400, and these two batteries are among the most important in the country. There are six field guns in each battery. There will be accommodation there for these guns and harness and all the material connected with them. The same remark will apply to the Army Service Corps. There are wagons and a great deal of stores connected with a corps of that kind. Also, No. 1 company of the 30th Regiment keeps its stores and equipment in this armoury.

Mr. CROCKET. Were plans for this armoury prepared in the Public Works Department ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and tenders were called for as usual, and the lowest tender accepted.

Mr. CROCKET. Are plans for these armouries usually prepared in the department ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. The hon. gentleman gave us to understand that the reason this was not done in the case of Belleville armoury was that the architects in the department were very busy. I think he said twelve architects were employed in the department. That would seem to me a very good staff.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a great deal of work and it is more pressing at some times than at others.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the hon. gentleman think that twelve architects are insufficient for carrying on the business of the department ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If I were to express an opinion, I would say they are not sufficient.

Mr. CROCKET. Twelve architects not sufficient to prepare the plans for the public buildings put up throughout Canada ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They do more than prepare plans—there is the preparation of the specifications, the making of progress estimates and looking after a large number of buildings.

Mr. SPROULE. When was the building commenced ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract was on June 1, 1906.

Mr. SPROULE. Then it has been going on ever since ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BARR. How long before it will be completed ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We expect to finish it this year.

Mr. HENDERSON. Who are the contractors ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nagel & Mills, of Ingersoll.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there a clerk of works on it all this time ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is in charge of a supervising architect, who is paid a commission of two per cent.

Mr. ALCORN. How were these troops previously accommodated ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The batteries were accommodated in a building hired for the purpose. The company of the 30th Regiment, I suppose, had no special accommodation. I have explained that, in such cases, there is an allowance to the captain to provide accommodation such as he can. The Army Service Corps I think also was accommodated in a rented building, although it has not been very long organized and I could not be absolutely certain as to that.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the Minister of Militia himself decide, in cases of this kind, where new buildings should be erected?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. As a rule, the military head of the district brings the matter to my attention, and I submit it to the proper officers of my department for a report. If that report is to the effect that the accommodation is needed, I asked for a statement as to exactly what is needed. When that information is procured, I forward the information to the Department of Public Works. Plans are prepared there, and, after they are prepared, they are returned to me. I go over them again with the assistance of the officers of the department, and, if they are satisfactory, they are sent back to the Department of Public Works initialled by myself.

Mr. ALCORN. The items we have had this evening are very large amounts. The minister has stated the routine by which it is decided whether new buildings are necessary and desirable. Will he state the reasons which led to the decision that this was necessary ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have not the correspondence before me.

Mr. ALCORN. Cannot the committee be informed what representations were made and by whom ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have a memo. here showing that this was strongly urged by the Department of Militia as early as January 15, 1903. The General Officer Commanding reported that it was absolutely necessary that the two field batteries, the city companies and the bands should be properly housed.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think that was in Dundonald's time.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is the estimated cost of this structure, completed in every respect ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The estimate is $148,537.

Mr. CROCKET. The contract was something over $80,000. How is the rest made up ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The amount paid for the site was $5,000—it was bought from the city council of Guelph, and formed part of the property known as the fair grounds. It is a corner lot. The survey of the site, printing, advertising, travelling expenses——

Mr. CROCKET. What is the amount of printing and advertising ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have it in a lump sum with other items which make a total of $3,139.21. Payment to the contractor up to 10th December, 1907, was $53,130, making the total expenditure to 10th December, $61,259.30. The amount due on the contract is $26,870, which makes the amount of the contract $80,000. Then, the amount due on the drill hall over the gun shed is $34,925.

Mr. CROCKET. Was there a contract for that ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. The same contractor ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. The amount for heating and boilers is $5,000, electric wiring and fixtures, $2,500, fittings and furniture $7,000, sidewalks $3,000 ; contingencies and superintendence $7,983—making a total of $148,537.30.

Mr. HENDERSON. Has the government reconveyed a portion of this land to the city of Guelph or to the Guelph Fat Stock show people ? I understand a deputation came down for the purpose of asking a reconveyance. They wanted to purchase a portion of this land which was not required.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That has not been done, it is a large lot 178 by 467 feet.

Mr. ALCORN.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the size of the building ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 146 feet on Huskisson street with a depth of 36 feet exclusive of projections and an extension of 88 feet in breadth by 190 feet deep. The building is of brick and stone with a stone foundation.

Mr. ALCORN. The former site of the Belleville building was on the next street. What became of the old site? Has it been sold by the government or what disposition has been made of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know, I shall make inquiry.

Mr. ALCORN. It is a very valuable site and I think abuts on the present site. I would like to know whether it has been retained and will be used with the new site for the new building or whether it has been disposed of.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When we are in supply on Monday or Tuesday, I shall give the information.

Mr. FOWLER. What accommodation was there formerly ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think two buildings were hired for the two batteries, but I am not sure. The batteries as my hon. friend knows require good accommodation and it is difficult to get such buildings. They were rented prior to the time of constructing this building.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me there is a very large expenditure in connection with these military buildings. I made a rough calculation and find that out of the 46 items for Ontario public buildings, 18 are for military buildings and out of the $727,000 for Ontario about $390,000 is for these buildings. But that is not all, these are only preliminary steps in connection with most of these buildings. Take this Guelph armoury, you are asking a vote of $20,000, but the total cost will be $148,000, over seven times the amount you are asking to-day. On the same basis the total for the province would amount to $2,500,000. That would be hardly fair, but it will cost $1,500,000 at least to complete the buildings asked for this purpose. I question whether such an expenditure can be justified under the circumstances, when so much money is required for purpose of greater importance than these drill halls and armouries. If Canada was amply supplied with transportation facilities and other facilities required for the business of the country it would perhaps then be quite proper to expend large amounts of money in erecting buildings for the accommodation of the troops. We seem to have got along very well in past times without all this tremendous expenditure, but it looks as though the Militia Department

wants to level up its buildings in accordance with its staff. It is like the man who put a cupola on his house, then had to furnish accordingly and wound up by putting on a big mortgage. It looks as though the Militia Department, having established a very large and particularly extensive staff, would wish now to have al the buildings throughout the country in connection with the militia in proper proportion to the staff they have created. I must for my part, protest against such a large expenditure. I do not think it is required or necessary in any sense. I do not think you will be able to enlist men any more easily by reason of these expensive buildings than you would have been without them. Here is a building costing $150,000 to accommodate two batteries, and one company of infantry.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. And an army service corps.

Mr. FOWLER. And you are spending $150,000 in buildings for them. It is not only the initial expenditure in connection with these, but the annual expenditure for repairs, caretakers, etc., which will be tremendous. I do not know what great influence the Minister of Militia must have in order to get these large votes passed through council. I wish to offer my protest against this tremendous expenditure, because I think it is entirely uncalled for and I do not believe it will increase in the slightest degree the efficiency of the militia of the country.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The whole question, of course, of the extent to which the government or parliament is justified in carrying the expenditure upon these buildings or upon the militia generally, is very important and interesting, but we can hardly take it up conveniently at this hour. I do not see much relevancy between the expenditure on the general staff and the expenditure upon these public buildings. I shall be prepared at the proper time to discuss the expenditure upon the staff and upon all branches of the militia and I am always anxious to hear fair criticism on these points.

I must differ from my hon. friend as to these expenditures in a general way. I am not prepared to say that the expenditure in some cases is not larger than is justified. I am rather inclined to agree that there have been cases in the past and in recent years and no doubt there will be cases in the future, where the same good results would be obtained with a smaller expenditure, but I believe in the principle of supplying the men who give their time and their money for the purpose of being prepared for the defence of the country with fair and reasonable accommodation, particularly in the large cities. Owing to the fact that employers of labour in those large centres absolutely refuse, in many cases, to allow their employees to attend their annual drill or to give their time during the day towards perfecting themselves in drill, it is absolutely necessary to provide suitable buildings for these men to drill in comfort in the evenings. Some of the most efficient regiments in Canada are to be found in the cities. I do not care to mention any particular regiment, but, take the regiments of Toronto and of Hamilton ; take the 13th regiment of Hamilton and the other regiment there—they are among the most creditable regiments in this country. No finer regiments are to be found anywhere. They could not have reached that pitch of perfection without reasonable accommodation and I do think that this country can well afford to give proper accommodation and that the country, when it understands the position of affairs, will be glad to give all reasonable accommodation to encourage these men to make themselves proficient in drill.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the cost of the Hamilton drill hall?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We are coming to that.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister has confirmed my argument, I think, because he has particularly mentioned the efficiency of the Hamilton regiment and they have arrived at that state of efficiency in a building very much inferior to the one which you propose to spend this money on. Do I understand that there is a vote for the Hamilton drill hall?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Hamilton has doubled and trebled its strength.

Mr. FOWLER. The expenditure of an additional $100,000 will not result in that regiment attaining a higher state of efficiency because the minister states that with inferior quarters they have reached a very high state of efficiency. Surely the efficiency of a regiment does not depend upon having a $150,000 or $200,000 building to drill in. Surely a building erected at a reasonable cost ought to do just as well. I quite understand that in cities it is necessary to have drill halls just for the reason that the minister has pointed out, that it is difficult for the employers of labour to allow their men to go out for the length of time necessary to attend annual drill, not that these employers of labour are not as much actuated by the patriotic spirit as other people, but because it is a serious detriment to their business and therefore it is necessary for the men to drill at night. At the same time I think we have gone mad on the cost and style of these buildings. A very much cheaper building would answer the purpose just as well and the government could save the country a large sum and employ it in purposes which

would be more beneficial than in these expensive buildings.

Mr. ALCORN. I presume that the size of these buildings is to be accounted for by the fact that the space inclosed is used for the drill purposes?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. ALCORN. Does not the minister think that accuracy in ride practice is of more consequence than perfection in mere drill, and that the enormous sum, in the aggregate, expended on the large number of buildings which this government is now erecting would be better expended in the encouragement of rifle practice by some concrete scheme which would apply to the whole country. The constitutional objection which might be raised upon the ground that the subject of education is one coming within the purview of provincial authorities, could be overcome.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Rifle practice is carried on in all these buildings.

Mr. ALCORN. Not rifle practice with ordinary weapons?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, with a minature cartridge.

Mr. FOWLER. The sub-target gun?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, the sub-target gun is used in every armoury.

Mr. ALCORN. Would it not be possible to evolve some principle for teaching all young boys of a certain age to become experts in the handling of the rifle, and would it not be more useful than the effort to achieve perfection in the more costly and showy elements of drill?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not know.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence if he has had any demand or request from the citizens of Valleyfield to erect an armoury in that district. There are two companies there and I think they could form a good many more, in fact, a whole battalion if it were necessary. This place is very near the frontier and I would like to know if any demand has been made, how the minister would receive such a demand and what he would think about it?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There have been two deputations to wait upon me in connection with the matter. There has been some difficulty in connection with the old battalion at that point, part of which was recruited, I think, from Valleyfield, and which has been temporarily disbanded. The people of Valleyfield are very anxious to organize a city battalion, to begin with four companies, and, of course, in that connection they would expect an armoury to be constructed at that point. No decision has been reached. The matter is still under consideration.

Mr. BERGERON. There are already two companies. I think there were four before, and there may be four yet.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think there were eight companies altogether, but they were scattered all over that part of the country.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes. Referring to what my hon. friend said a moment ago, consideration must be given to the question of taking care of the arms, because the government would have to pay some person to take care of the arms and some place must be had for that purpose. It is a city of about 12,000 or 15,000 people and being near the frontier would it not be, in the opinion of the minister, a suitable place in which to establish an armoury? It could be done at a relatively small cost and it would be a very useful thing.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If my hon. friend will convince the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) as to the soundness of such a policy, personally, I should be very glad indeed to co-operate in having a suitable armoury constructed at such an important centre as Valleyfield.

Mr. BERGERON. I would rather try to convince my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence than my hon. friend from Kings and Albert, because I understand that my hon. friend has not consulted the hon. member for Kings and Albert as to the building of armouries. I would rather address myself straight to the minister.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) asked for an armoury at Valleyfield because that town is close to the frontier, but I would remind him that an armoury is not a fort. In Sussex, New Brunswick, where I live, we have an armoury there the contract price for which was $4,700 and that armoury suffices for storing the equipment of all the troops in the province.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Stores are kept in St. John and also in Fredericton.

Mr. FOWLER. The reserve stores are kept in St. John but the stores used by the militia of the province in camp are kept in this armoury the contract price for which was $4,700.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was the mere building without fittings.

Mr. FOWLER. You spent $2,000 on a clerk of works because the department engaged him and forgot to discharge him for two or three years. Then you had to add the heating, and the windows being left open the pipes froze and you had to heat the building again, all of which misman-

agement increased the price to about $10,000. But the contract price of the Sussex armouries which serves the men in camp for the whole province would not build a porch for this armoury in the town of Guelph.

Mr. BERGERON. I suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) wants to show his impartiality by criticising me as well as the government. I quite understand the difference between an armoury and a fortification, but knowing that it is the duty of the Minister of Militia to provide accommodation for the troops which most need it I brought before him the claims of Valleyfield.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the population of Valleyfield ?

Mr. BERGERON. Between 12,000 and 15,000. The volunteers in Valleyfield belong to the battalions which distinguished themselves on the frontier during the Fenian Raid in 1866 and 1870 and also at the battle of Chateauguay in 1812 which saved Canada for the British Crown. The men in those battalions to-day are descendants of the men who fought in 1812 and in 1866. These historic battalions have always been ready to march to the call of duty and they deserve special consideration from the government of Canada. Anyway, on the basis of the policy laid down by the Militia Department an armoury should be built in that city. The Minister of Militia has admitted that a petition has been received for the erection of an armoury at Valleyfield and I rose to endorse the prayer of that petition. I can tell the gallant member for Kings-Albert (Mr. Fowler) that there are no more historic battalions to be found in all Canada than are to be found in my constituency, and when he rises again to criticise the government I trust he will not turn his criticism on the member for Beauharnois who knows perfectly well the difference between an armoury and a fortification.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman first wanted an armoury at Valleyfield because it was near the frontier which would indicate that it was a fortification he was thinking of. Now he gives as a reason that these battalions are filled with veterans of the Fenian raid which took place 42 years ago.

Mr. BERGERON. They are the descendants of these men.

Mr. FOWLER. I understood my hon. friend to say that they were the descendants of the men who fought at Chateauguay. Now, if these men were 20 years of age 42 years ago at the time of the Fenian Raid they would be 62 years old now and it is a hospital they wanted instead of an armoury.

Mr. BERGERON. There are none so deaf as those who do not wish to hear. What I said was that these battalions fought at Chateauguay and during the Fenian Raid and I know that in England different regiments are proud of their history and of their brave deeds in years gone by.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not rising to ask the Minister of Public Works to erect a drill hall in any part of the county I have the honour to represent notwithstanding that we have in that county a battalion eight companies strong and numbering possibly 400 men. In that regiment, the Lorne Rifles, the 20th battalion, 400 men have to be provided for ; and if you took all the drill halls in the county, and put them up at auction or sold them at private sale, you would not realize more than $10,000 for them ; whereas in the adjoining county of Wellington, where 400 men are to be provided for, the Minister of Public Works at the request of the Minister of Militia is going to spend $148,000. Does the Minister of Militia not see that this is discriminating against the rural battalions? If he is going to maintain the force at full strength and give encouragement to the young men to connect themselves with the militia of the country, he should see that there is a more equal division of the expenditure. I am not going to complain of the amount that is being expended in Guelph, nor am I going to ask at the present time that any money be expended in my county, because the expenditure of this country has grown so enormously that practically we are not at liberty to ask that it be increased to any extent. We are getting on very well ; I see no signs of war in the near future ; our battalion is held together very well ; they go out to drill in good force and I dare say that if they were called out for any other purpose they would be equally at the command of the minister. But the minister is a little more particular about building up the city corps than the rural corps, and I am going to give him a concrete case. Some time ago a troop of cavalry called the Massassaga Horse was formed with headquarters in the city of Toronto. The minister permitted one squadron of that troop to be raised in the county of Halton, right at the corner of the county which was the headquarters of No. 1 company of the 20th battalion. What was the effect ? The captain of that company found that his men were being decoyed away, because they were more willing to join a cavalry troop. It was a little more pleasant, and when they went out to drill, each man received pay for his horse as well as himself, so that there was a little more money in it; and the captain of No. 1 company at Oakville found it a difficult matter to keep his men. I think an invasion of that kind should not have been

allowed, as it may have the effect of injuring or wiping out that company. The minister may tell me that he had nothing to do with it, that somebody in Toronto controlled it. It is strange to me if the minister cannot dictate where a squadron shall have its headquarters, and prevent recruiting for one branch of the service where it will interfere with that of another. I shall be glad if the minister can tell me that he has taken steps to prevent that sort of thing in the future.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend is quite correct in supposing that I am not directly responsible. I am responsible, of course, for the administration of the Militia Department, but this particular case I never heard of before. The officer commanding western Ontario, General Otter, one of the ablest officers in Canada, had that matter under his control, and what he did he no doubt did with the best intentions, however it may have worked out. I would suggest to my hon. friend that very likely the individuals who are objecting are not the young men themselves who have had the privilege of joining this cavalry regiment, but the infantry officers who find it more difficult to get recruits.

Mr. HENDERSON. I grant that is the case.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am disposed to think that I shall favour the majority, and if the young men, who own their own horses and are ambitious to belong to a cavalry squadron, want to do so, and the officer commanding thought it was wise to meet their wishes, while I am sorry that the captain of the infantry company should be put to any inconvenience, the lesser must suffer for that which is of greater importance. I know that that difficulty does happen in my own county. I represent a purely rural constituency where we have an infantry regiment and I think two or three squadrons of cavalry, and the officers of the infantry regiment tell me that it is absolutely impossible for them to keep their regiment up to its strength because of the extension of the cavalry regiment. It is a question which is the better of the two. In my own county the farmers' sons are well to do and own their own horses, and there is no better place in the world in which to recruit cavalry regiments than in localities of that kind. My hon. friend from Kings (Mr. Fowler) knows that the same conditions exist in his county. Wherever there are districts in which the young men are ambitious to form cavalry regiments and where cavalry regiments are needed, I should be disposed to give every facility to their organization—I do not think it is necessary to put the rural militia in opposition, so to speak, to the city militia. I think it is quite possible to do full justice to both, and I do not think that because a city regiment, or two or three regiments, secure handsome drill halls or armouries, it necessarily follows that we should neglect the rural regiments. In my county there is a regiment of infantry with eight companies and a regiment of cavalry with, I think, three squadrons, and yet I can tell my hon. friend that during the whole time I have been Minister of Militia, not more than $1,200 has been spent in my county. In fact there is only one armoury there where all the arms are kept. It is an old armoury which was built fifty years ago, and two or three years ago I spent $1,200 on it to put it into proper shape. My hon. friend will see that I at any rate have not abused my position by spending large sums on my own regiment. This question has been discussed on many previous occasions and I would like to say this. I believe that we should gradually, but as rapidly as possible, supply armouries for all the different companies throughout the country. This can be done at a very reasonable cost. An armoury for one company, which would be a building with a good lecture room and accommodation to hold the stores, could be constructed for some $2,500, perhaps less. A larger building where there are two or three companies together, at a place where the commanding officer of the regiment lives, could be constructed for perhaps $4,000 or $5,000. During the last three or four years $50,000 to $75,000 has been voted each year. I regret that some of the armouries will cost more than we expected, but we have constructed a number in British Columbia and the Northwest, a few in Ontario, one or two in the province of Quebec and two or three in Nova Scotia. My intention is to continue constructing such armouries and to give them in order of merit to the different rural battalions throughout the country.

Hamilton drill hall—addition, $100,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There has been a drill hall in Hamilton for sime time which will continue to be occupied. The new building will be a very fine one. It will be built on a site with 100 feet frontage and 300 feet deep. The main drill hall will be 128 feet by 220. There was paid for the site $29,000, and this $100,000 is required to complete the building. The tota cost is estimated at $315,089.76, inclusive of the site. It will accommodate the 13th Regiment consisting of 600 men, the 91st Highlanders with 500 men, the 4th Field Battery with 115 men, the Army Service Corps, 106 men. The 7th company, 36 men, will occupy the old drill hall.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this under contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the size of the present building and how much did it cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The old building measures 250 feet long by 116 wide.

Mr. FOWLER. Of what material is it built ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Brick with stone dressings.

Mr. FOWLER. What about the new building ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is to have a frontage of 367 feet by 300 feet in depth. Its main hall is to be 128 feet wide by 336 long.

Mr. FOWLER. Was the new building found too small ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, the strength of the militia in Hamilton has been doubled within the last four or five years, and they could not drill properly in the old hall.

Mr. FOWLER. The 13th Regiment has its headquarters there. And what are the others ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The 90th Regiment, the 44th Field Battery, with a strength of one hundred odd, and the 19th Army Service corps, with 110 and No. 12 Field Ambulance, and the band.

Mr. FOWLER. About one thousand men altogether.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. More, for these regiments are about 500 men each.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, say 1,200 men. None of these regiments or corps have been created within the last five years ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have not the record before me, but I think it was within the last five years there has been an increase in the numerical strength of both regiments, and I think the Field ambulance company has been started within that time.

Mr. FOWLER. As a matter of fact, these different corps do not have to drill on the same night ? The matter could be arranged so that one would use the drill hall one night and another the next night, and so on. In that case, there would be room enough in the old building. You are going to spend $315,000 additional for this building. The original building, I suppose, cost $200,000—that is, you will have spent over half a million to accommodate 1,200 men. It seems to me this is altogether unjustifiable. The minister should have resisted the pressure put upon him by the members from Hamilton or—if they were not together in this matter—from the member for Hamilton. The only real necessity for this great expenditure was the re-election of the ministerial member for Hamilton (Mr. Zimmerman). However useful a man that hon. gentleman may be—and I say nothing about that,—this is a very large price to pay for the pleasure of having him here. I protest most strongly against this expenditure as absolutely uncalled for—a waste of public money.

Mr. SPROULE. I am glad to hear a military man say that, for I have entertained much the same opinions for a length of time, but have usually concluded that my judgment would not carry much weight, as I take so little interest in military affairs. I have often wondered whether some of the money that we spend in these palatial buildings for military purposes could not be spent to much better purpose in some other line. I do not pretend to be competent to judge as to the efficiency of a militia force. But many years ago the force seemed to me much more active in our country than it is to-day—I mean in the case of the rural battalions. They have dwindled until now you can hardly get a company together. The last few days before they go to camp the officers are doing their best to get recruits, while a few years ago there was no trouble to keep the companies up to their full strength. There was comparatively little trouble to keep them for the full length of time, and now they go in for a year and then drop out—no one seems to have any interest in it. But while this retrograde process is going on, we seem to be enormously increasing the expenditure. I dislike to seem captious in regard to these expenditures, for I believe every country should make reasonable provision for its own defence, and to keep its citizens in military training. But it seems to me that we are not spending our money in the best way. Nor can I say that I am prepared to give suggestions as to how to spend it better, not being sufficiently informed in military affairs to outline a system. An hon. member made the remark the other night that we had one officer for every two and a half men on the average. That being the case, the force is evidently topheavy. It seems to me that not sufficient encouragement is given to the rural battalions. But our experience is the same as that of other countries, that, when it is necessary to put a force in the field for the defence of the country, the rural battalions are superior to those of the city. They have a better physique and are of a higher type of self-reliant manhood, making them a most valuable force in trying circumstances. Yet, these rural corps do not seem to be given due encouragement, but all the eclat of military life is afforded the towns and cities.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am glad the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has spoken as he has. I entirely agree that the rural battalions do not receive the consideration to which they are entitled. I repeat what I said before, that I am not going to advocate larger expenditures, but I do desire to emphasize the idea that there should be some equitable distribution of

this money, less for the cities and more for the country. I believe that the bone and sinew of the militia of this country is in the rural districts. One of the best regiments that served in putting down the Northwest rebellion was the York Rangers made up practically altogether of farmers' sons, men capable of enduring greater hardship than those drawn from mercantile shops, banks and other business houses. In time of trouble I believe it would be found that the most reliable forces were the rural battalions. I am an advocate of reduced expenditure but I do contend there should be a more equitable distribution and that the rural battalions should receive something more than they have received, even if it is to be taken away from the city battalions.

Mr. FOWLER. I regret that it seems to be my fate to disagree with my colleagues as to military matters. I do not believe that the rural corps require any further consideration than they receive. I think the rural battalions are very well taken care of so far as expenditure is concerned and I do not think they require any more. I contend that altogether too much money is being spent on the city corps and that too much money is being expended on armouries and everything of that sort. One would think to listen to the hon. member (Mr. Henderson) that it was necessary to take a lump sum and spend it on the militia. I say that the expenditure on the militia is many times greater than it should be in this country. Years ago when less money was spent we had quite as efficient a militia force as we have to-day. If there is any trouble about enlisting men in the rural battalions it is due to the manner in which they are officered at the present time. In the olden time the officers were taken from the rural community itself and farmers sons were in command and the officers and the men were of the same social grade and they worked in harmony. But to-day the conditions are different and the reason is on account of the prohibitive expense of the outfit necessary for an officer. There is too much gold lace, too many frills, too many feathers ; the officers are drawn from the cities and there is no fellowship between them and the men. If the regiments to-day are not composed of the same class of men as formerly—and that is truer of the infantry than of the cavalry—it is due to the reason I have stated. I have before expressed these views in the House and the minister has agreed with me but nothing has been done. My contention is that we should have a system like the Boer system, an inexpensive system where the men would be taught fewer of the frills and more of how to shoot. There should be more money spent on teaching the men rifle practice than on teaching them how to march past with grace. You don't have much of that sort of things to do when you get into active service. At all events no war would come so rapidly, that after you have your enrolment you cannot give your men sufficient drill to fit them for active service. If you simplify the uniform of the officers so as to make it possible for men of small means to become officers you will have the officers drawn from the same community as the men and you will have a better class of men going into the ranks.

Hamilton post office—addition to buildings, $7,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the complete alterations to the rear of the Hamilton post office. The total estimated cost is $20,-053.37.

Mr. HENDERSON. This is another instance in which the money of this country is not equitably distributed. In the county of Halton which I represent there has not been one dollar expended in the way of furnishing post offices and yet in the adjoining counties, because they contain towns and cities of considerable dimensions, very large sums of money have been expended. In the city of Guelph something over $40,000 was spent in the improvement of the post office although it is a puzzle to the people of Guelph when they look at the building to know how they managed to put away all that money. The government, in these appropriations, should take the rural districts into consideration as well as the cities and larger towns. I am contending for a more equitable distributing of public money and even if a county has no towns and villages exceeding 1,500 or 2,000 population they should not be ignored whilst large expenditures go to the cities.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You and I agree exactly.

Mr. HENDERSON. Some years ago after making a very careful calculation in my own county I estimated that if $30,000 was set apart it would at that time have erected a building in each of five incorporated towns and villages at a cost of $6,000 in each place, and would have provided a good post office containing a residence for the postmaster. I do not say you could erect buildings now at the same cost, but I know that when I made my suggestion it was endorsed by Sir Louis Davis then a minister, who said the thing could be done for even less money. My plan was not accepted. It seemed that the government could not erect a building of such small dimensions as would call for an expenditure of $6,000. I made a calculation to show that there would be a saving to the government that the interest on the whole $30,000, provided the government borrowed the money at 3 per cent would be less than the rentals that were paid by the government for the various post offices. Then an advantage would be that in every case

the post office in these five towns and villages would be in a brick building where a vault could be put in for the protection of the valuable letters passing through the mail, and exit as well as an entrance could be provided which would prevent the very congested condition that we find in a great many of our village post offices in the morning and evening just after the arrival of the mails. I am going to show you how we get post offices in Halton. I picked up a local newspaper and I found an item under the following heading :

New post office for Burlington.

Burlington is in the county of Halton. It is about seven miles from the city of Hamilton. It may be a surprise to the Postmaster General or the Minister of Public Works, to find that the village of Burlington is to have a new post office. It is provided in this way :

Burlington will have a new post office this summer. Mr. William Kerns has decided to build a substantial brick structure on the site occupied by the present post office. The figures are being obtained from local contractors, and the contract will be awarded in a few days. Mr. Kerns is to be congratulated upon his step to improve our beautiful village, and the change should be appreciated by the public generally.

I have no doubt it will be appreciated by the Postmaster General.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What is the population?

Mr. HENDERSON. 1,400 or 1,500. I know very well the building where the post office is now kept. It is a small place and, I think, belongs to the gentleman whose name is mentioned here.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is it a private residence ?

Mr. HENDERSON. No, the postmaster lives in his own home, but this gentleman who owns the present building, with that enterprise which characterizes him as a leading citizen of the town, proposes to remove this building and erect a substantial brick building and have it used as a post office. I have no doubt the Postmaster General will appreciate the change. It will not change the location of the post office. It is left exactly in the same place, but it will be a more substantial and a more commodious building. That is the way we get post offices in Halton. I regret however, that in all the towns and villages we have not men of the same enterprise and consequently we have in many cases very inferior buildings, crowded and congested in the morning and evening when the mails come in and not at all equal to the requirements of these places.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think I will have to take a step up into your constituency.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would be delighted and you will see one of the most beautiful counties in western Ontario.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are many beautiful counties in western Ontario.

Mr. HENDERSON. If the hon. gentleman should come some time in the month of June we will regale him with the finest strawberries that you can find anywhere in the Dominion.

Mr. FOWLER. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman may say 'no.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not better than Sussex Bay ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I never heard of Sussex Bay. Oakville strawberries were known forty years ago throughout this country.

Mr. FOWLER. Sussex Bay strawberries were known a century ago.

Mr. HENDERSON. And you will find every kind of fruit almost—peaches, pears, plums, gooseberries——

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is enough ; I will come.

Mr. FISHER. He cannot go until the session is over.

Mr. HENDERSON. There will be lots of delicious fruit after the session closes. We have it the whole summer through and the hon. gentleman can come at any time. I hope his coming will be of some advantage and that it will result in the levelling up of these expenditures. I do not mean that you should increase the expenditure.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Just a readjustment.

Mr. HENDERSON. Just a readjustment. It will simply take a little from Hamilton, Guelph, Brampton and Toronto and give it to the county of Halton and other rural counties. I am satisfied that that is sound policy and that is a policy that will be appreciated by the rural sections of the country. That is all I have to say about the matter, and I hope I am not misunderstood.

Kincardine public building, $7,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total cost, including everything, is $29,000. The original contract was $17,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that building completed ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No the contract was only let last fall.

Mr. SPROULE. You did not spend any money last year at all?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The town gave the site so that there was no site to buy, and there was no money expended last year.

Mr. FOWLER. How much have you paid to the contractor ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nothing has been paid yet.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you a clerk of works ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. FOWLER. Nothing has been done on the contract at all ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract was let last November.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the population ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1901 it was 2,077, and the population of the township was 2,855. Kincardine is in North Bruce.

Mr. FOWLER. $12,000 seems a large amount in addition to the contract.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In these days the cost of fitting up a public building is considerably greater than it formerly was. It has to be wired for electric light and electric fixtures and heating apparatus have to be provided.

Mr. FOWLER. What kind of heating apparatus ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hot water heating.

Mr. SPROULE. This is another illustration of the unwisdom of the course we are following. I notice that at Kincardine the revenue was $3,053 last year and that we paid an allowance towards rent and fuel of $150. That is practically the full cost.

Mr. PUGSLEY. $200.

Mr. SPROULE. It must have been changed since because the Postmaster General's Report for 1907 which I have before me gives the amount which I have stated.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is $200 for the Post Office, and $60 for the Customs, and this building will provide for the Customs, Post Office and Inland Revenue Departments.

Mr. SPROULE. Interest on the money for the erection of the building, the cost of caretaking, insurance, repairs and taxes, if there are any, will amount to somewhere about $1,600 or $1,700 a year, while we are getting the accommodation to-day for $150. If that is good business policy, I do not understand business.

Mr. ALCORN. This is for a post office and customs house I suppose ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Custom house and examining warehouse and inland revenue office.

Mr. ALCORN. Is the policy of the government in erecting these buildings the same as in former years ; are vaults erected in these buildings or does the government supply safes in the offices ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think there is usually a vault built in the building.

Mr. ALCORN. I asked that question with regard to a similar building in my own town and was told it was not the policy of the government to put such vaults in these buildings. They are used for post offices, customs and inland revenue purposes and it appears to me it would be a much better policy, considering the value of the government property contained in these buildings, to erect suitable vaults and not depend upon safes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I must correct my statement. I have been in some public buildings and have seen vaults, but the chief architect tells me that in the smaller buildings it is not the practice to build vaults but to furnish safes.

Mr. ALCORN. Would it not be much cheaper to have vaults ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would favour vaults myself.

Mr. FOWLER. The vault would be more expensive, but better, and the expense would really be slight. You could build one in one of these buildings for $300 or $400.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall discuss that with the chief architect. I would favour building vaults.

Kingston—new gun shed, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a revote to provide a new gun shed in the Artillery park, Kingston. It was requested by the Department of Militia in 1906 and they again urged it in 1907.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Owing to the unsanitary condition of the old buildings. The location is unsanitary.

Mr. FOWLER. How?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Because the drainage from the city sewer comes in at a point just at the barracks, and we have had a great deal of difficulty there from typhoid for years. We are considering the gradual abandonment of these barracks.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that the total cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect has not the full particulars from the Militia Department but they state that that will be about the expense.

Mr. SPROULE. This was voted last year and not spent. Was it voted the year before ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think so.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There was no vote the year before.

Mr. ALCORN. Here are seven items of expenditure at one point, Kingston. Would the minister state the aggregate estimated cost of these seven works at Kingston ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am afraid I cannot give that at the moment because they are all revotes and the chief architect has not suffcient information to estimate with accuracy.

Mr. SPROULE. What forces will this accommodate ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is for the permanent force. There are probably between 200 and 300 in the permanent force there. Then we have the 4th Hussars headquarters, the 5th Battery Field Artillery, the 14th Regiment of Infantry, the 47th Regiment and No. 3 Ambulance. That is the strength of the garrison besides the permanent force.

Kingston Artillery Park—new guard house, including offices, &c., $8,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This was requested by the Militia Department as early as October, 1906. It is to be a brick building on stone foundations, two and a half stories high, 80 feet by 32 feet. There is no contract let yet.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the estimated cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect has not yet made an estimate, but I should think that $8,000 would be sufficient to cover the cost of that building.

Mr. FOWLER. Why is it necessary?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Owing to the unsanitary state of the old barracks and the bad condition they are in generally.

Mr. CROCKET. Why have tenders not been called for if this vote was asked for as early as 1906?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We do not always yield to the requests of the Department of Militia. We try to hold them back as long as we can.

Mr. CROCKET. But you got a vote last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. I cannot say just why the work was not proceeded with. It is possible that it was owing to there being no permanent minister.

Mr. FOWLER. I think I can supply a reason. I fancy that you were a little short in the matter of architects. Are the plans drawn yet?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No plans have been drawn. Some sketches have been submitted to the Militia Department by the chief architect, but they have not been returned yet.

Mr. CROCKET. Is it intended to call for tenders during the present year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, that is the intention.

Mr. SPROULE. These buildings are either needed or not needed. If they are needed, they should be erected, and the votes not kept on the estimates year after year, because they may be at any time used as a temptation in the event of an election. If they are not needed, the money should not be voted.

Kingston—new hospital for A and B batteries, $10,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the matter with the old hospital?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The scheme is to put all these buildings on the Artillery park.

Mr. CROCKET. Has any contract been let yet?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. FOWLER. How about the expenditure?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not had sufficient particulars from the Militia Department yet to enable us to say what it will be.

Mr. FOWLER. How can you have a vote unless you have an estimate of the cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman insists, we will let this item stand.

Item allowed to stand.

Kingston Royal Military College—new servants' quarters, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision for the erection of new servants' quarters. They are called servants' quarters, but they are for the non-commissioned officers at the Royal Military College. These are to consist of two buildings, 167 feet long by 33 feet broad. They are to be placed on two opposite sides of a square, with yards in rear. Each building consists of eight dwellings two stories high, of brick with stone facings, and with stone basement. The contract is let for this work; the amount of the contract being $77,939. In addition, there is the heating and boilers, $6,000 ; the electric wiring and fixtures, $3,000 ; furniture, &c., $2,000 ; sidewalks and fences, $2,000 ; contingencies, $5,061 ; total cost, $96,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What are you doing with non-commissioned officers' quarters in the college except among the cadets?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They consist of sixteen different dwelling houses.

Mr. FOWLER. That is $6,000 to each house. I think it is a pretty good job to be a servant in the Royal Military College, to be housed in a $6,000 house with steam-heating, electric lighting and all the rest.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand that they are non-commissioned officers.

Mr. FOWLER. What are non-commissioned officers doing there?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They are teachers and instructors in connection with the college.

Mr. FOWLER. Where are they living now?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In rented houses.

Mr. FOWLER. I want to protest strongly against this expenditure. The greater part of the expenditure on this institution is money thrown away. From what we have seen in the public press and have heard elsewhere, the gentleman who is at the head of that institution is absolutely unfit to have charge of the instruction of young men. His habits, his methods of instruction, his ideas of proper conduct are entirely at variance with those ordinarily accepted; yet he continues to occupy the position of head of this school. We are now told that there are some sixteen non-commissioned officers, drill instructors, for this school. How many pupils are attending the school ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. About 100.

Mr. FOWLER. It evidently is as much over-officered as the militia. There is about one instructor to every six cadets. The thing is absurd. We ought to have more information before we allow this item to pass. I do not know for whom these buildings are intended, but it is absolutely impossible that sixteen drill instructors should be required to instruct one hundred cadets.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When the plans were submitted to me and I saw the class of buildings, and when I read the statement that they were for servants' quarters, it struck me that these buildings were altogether too expensive for persons occupying that position. I sent to the Militia Department, and either the deputy minister or Mr. Jarvis called upon me and informed me that these persons composed the subordinate staff of the institution and that this accommodation was absolutely required, and that this class of dwellings was not at all more than was reasonably required for the staff.

Mr. FOWLER. We have them now called the staff, a while ago they were servants, and then they were called drill instructors. Now it appears they are the staff. I have no doubt that the average dwelling of members of this House does not cost $6,000, and yet we are authorizing a vote for this amount to house non-commissioned officers. I do not think that they deserve better housing than we ourselves get, and I would ask the minister not to press this item until we have more explicit and more detailed information

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will bring a list showing exactly who these people are, and what are their duties.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the average salary and allowance which these drill instructors receive ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Perhaps I used the term drill instructors improperly. I know that one man teaches gymnastics and some of them take charge of the horses and are servants connected with the college generally. I do not say they are all teachers.

Mr. SPROULE. We ought to have full explanation from the Minister of Militia regarding what is done at that institution and the number of graduates turned out before we pass these items.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The best time to give that would be when the estimates for the Militia Department are up and when I shall make my statement and have all the papers necessary.

Mr. SPROULE. But should we then reach the conclusion that the military college should be done away with, we will have voted the money for these buildings. We ought to have a full explanation before we vote a dollar. We have heard of some very absurd things that have transpired in that institution. For instance a young man was asked if he had shaved off the down on his upper lip. If he had said he had not, no one would have been any the wiser because it was not visible, but he was manly enough to say he had done so, and he was put in close custody for four days. Did any one hear of anything so absurd ? Young men go their of the highest moral and religious type, and there they learn to play cards and gamble and smoke cigarettes and cigars and learn other vices of that kind. That is not the kind of training which parents desire their young men to have.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Many splendid men have come out of that institution.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, but sometimes the institutions degenerate. They are good or bad according to the class of men who control them and carry on the work of tuition.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I would like to ask the minister if he could not give us within $20,000 to $30,000 an estimate of the cost of those buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would not be fair to me nor to the committee if I should guess at the cost.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I want to enter my protest against expenditure of this kind. It ought to be an object lesson to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to see the paltry amount he gets for his department when so much is expended on the militia. The statement made by the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) is perfectly correct when we are asked to vote such sums as these for the militia compared with the votes for agriculture.

Mr. GANONG. The Minister of Militia says there are about 100 students in that institution. He should give us a statement showing the cost of graduating each of these students.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is if the total cost of the institution and the number of students be given, the average can be calculated.

Leamington public building, $7,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote, and the proposed building is for post office and customs purposes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. What is the estimated cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is $20,000, exclusive of site.

Mr. CLEMENTS. From whom was the site purchased ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are two lots, one at $2,000 from Mr. Enoch Windsor, and one at $500 from Mr. G. A. Brown.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Leamington is a thriving little town and deserving of a public building. If less money were spent on these items we have just left over and put into such buildings as this in Leamington, it would be better. When will the building be gone on with ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. During the year.

Mr. SPROULE. Why was it not gone on with last year ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We had not the site.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Are plans out for this building yet ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Will they be got out by officers of the department ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. GANONG. This seems quite a justifiable expenditure, as the revenue of this town, both customs and post office, seem fairly large.

London military buildings—magazine, $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nothing has yet been done with regard to this. It is supposed that $3,000 will cover the cost.

Mr. FOWLER. Where is it to be placed ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The location has not yet been fixed, nor the site procured.

London military buildings—new gymnasium, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote. This was requested by the Department of Militia and Defence in February last.

Mr. FOWLER. What will be the total cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the information from the Militia Department which will enable me to speak of that.

Mr. FOWLER. Better let that stand then.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no objection.

Mr. FOWLER. Before we pass from that item, have any steps been taken for the capture of the man who murdered one of the officers who was taking a course of instruction in this school ? And how was it that nothing was done until next morning—as I understand to have been the case—by the 150 officers and men who were there? These seem to be the facts as published, and they are, as they stand, a reflection upon the force. Has the Minister of Militia, as the responsible head of that department, any explanation ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I cannot give an answer. I will ask for the report in the morning and give it to the House or to my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler).

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand that the provincial authorities have been searching for this man.

Mr. FOWLER. It has always been the boast of our people that a murderer was hunted down, no expense necessary to that end being spared. There was a case in the Klondike where $30,000 was spent in order to trace and capture a murderer there. It was a splendid object lesson. But this seems to be an object lesson the other way. It is a very unfortunate thing that this man should be murdered in the city of London, and nothwithstanding that the country thereabouts is thickly settled the murderer——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) suggest that the provincial authorities have not done their duty ?

Mr. FOWLER. I suggest that all the authorities have not done their duty. As soon as the murder was known, every one of these men should have been turned out in search of the murderer and the search should not have been remitted until he was captured. A reward should have been offered and everything necessary done.

Mr. SPROULE. The authorities here have not even a report yet, for the minister (Sir Frederick Borden) has told us that he will ask for one to-morrow morning.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) knows that the administration of the criminal law is in the hands of the provincial authorities. The offering of a reward would be the proper duty of those authorities.

Mr. FOWLER. It is true that the enforcement of the criminal law is in the hands of the provincial authorities. It is true also that an officer attending a course of instruction in the military post at London was murdered by one of the members of the force, and yet no effort was made——

Mr. PUGSLEY. How does the hon. gentleman know ?

Mr. FOWLER. It is so stated in the newspapers and not denied. As a matter of fact, if they had turned out at once they could have caught him.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It does not follow.

Mr. FOWLER. It certainly does.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I did not say that I would ask for a report to-morrow morning. I have no doubt the report is in the department here, and I have promised to get it to-morrow morning—at least that is what I intended to say.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, I misunderstood the hon. minister.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. There is no doubt that this is a serious matter. It seems very strange that, with the number of soldiers about when this crime was committed, this man should have been allowed to get away. There seems to be a feeling abroad in this country in favour of shielding the criminal. I have heard several people, in conversation about this man, express the hope that he would get away. I do not think any such spirit should be encouraged in the country. Many people are in the habit of allowing these things to go along the lines of least resistance, as when in the old days, if train robbers entered a car every one would hold up his hands, until once in a while they would meet a man who would not and then everything was turned the other way. A few instances like that would have a good effect. I think it is the duty of the government to press on the people that they should not shield this man, because he must get food and shelter, and some steps should be taken to impress on the officers and non-commissioned officers at London that it was their duty to arrest that man, dead or alive, within 15 seconds. I see reports of jealousy between the London detectives and the rural police. A little instruction to the people of Canada in the treatment of criminals is required.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would not be prepared to say that any person is in fault. I would rather assume that the officers do their duty. That is the experience I have had in the enforcement of the criminal law and I prefer to believe that until there is evidence to the contrary. The mere fact that the murderer is at large is not positive proof that the authorities are neglectful.

With regard to the London post office, we are asking a revote of $3,000, of which $1,475 is for vault fittings, and $500 for paving the streets.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. I do not see any item here for a drill shed for the 45th regiment at Lindsay.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, there is nothing here.

Mr. ALCORN. Did the minister say that part of this $3,000 for London is to be expended on pavements ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $500.

Mr. ALCORN. What rate per square foot will be paid ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect does not know but he tells me the prices run in different parts of the country from 11 cents to 26 cents. The average, I think, is somewhere in the neighbourhood of 16 cents. It is 18 cents a square foot in Ottawa.

Mr. ALCORN. A price of 26 cents was mentioned the other day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was at Antigonish but that included some things unusual. The street was not level and had to be filled up to make it level.

Mr. ALCORN. I suppose that was the levelling that is done in every case. I may say that the town of Picton laid down several miles of cement walks and the average price has been 11 cents. Certain walks were laid about the public buildings side by side with this and the government walks cost 18 to 22 cents. What explanation can there be of that ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As a rule we make an arrangement with the municipality to lay them.

Mr. ALCORN. In this instance the same man laid both sidewalks, and there is that difference in price.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps he did better and more substantial work for the government.

Mr. SPROULE. You can get it in some parts of the country from 9 cents a foot. Take the cases of Flesherton and Dundalk.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have had it done for 11 cents.

Mr. SPROULE. Any one paying more than 12 cents a foot for granolithic sidewalks would be considered with us to be paying too much.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That depends on how accustomed to laying them the people are. I know in the village where I have a summer home, where we have no persons experienced in this class of work, I would have to pay a great deal more than I would in Ontario where a great deal of this work is done.

Markham public building, $4,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has this anything to do with the late election there ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to erect a building in the town of Markham on a site which was purchased at the corner of Main and St. Joseph streets.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. When was the lot purchased ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. July, 1907.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. For how much ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $1,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Markham is a much larger place than Glencoe ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Population does not always govern as to cost.

Mr. SPROULE. What will this building cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $14,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the minister know anything about promises that were made in the recent by-election in the village of Markham ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I am not aware of any having been made.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The money was voted a year ago and nothing was done. Then when the election came on in Centre York this was brought to the front again and the pledge was given that if the people there would do their duty and vote for the Liberal candidate the building would be proceeded with this year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. May I, without offence, ask the hon. gentleman if he is speaking from personal knowledge or from mere gossip?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am speaking from what appeared in the newspapers at the time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In regard to the necessity of the work, Markham is a thriving place and in 1901 the population was over 1,100.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It is a fine town.

Mr. GANONG. Is this building going to be used for a post office and custom house?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is expected to give accommodation for both purposes.

Mr. GANONG. What are the customs receipts ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no collector of customs at that point yet.

Mr. GANONG. There never has been a custom office there ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister says that the building will cost $14,000 and the site $1,000. This makes $15,000 altogether. Interest, cost of caretaker, lighting, fuel, and taxes will make a permanent charge of $1,175 a year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that it is possible to allow the postmaster to be the caretaker of the building and an arrangement of that kind can very often be made.

Mr. SPROULE. That is merely a guess without knowledge.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the case in many instances.

Mr. SPROULE. We have no information that it is going to be the case here. There will, in all human probability, be a permanent charge of $1,175 a year and yet we have the accommodation there to-day for $92, including rent, fuel and light.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is $120.

Mr. SPROULE. I am taking the amount from the last report of the Postmaster General.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Are you not taking it for nine months ?

Mr. SPROULE. Well, if it is for nine months, it will be one quarter more. The town of Markdale, in which I live, has a revenue of $1,909 while Markham has a revenue for $1,929, or $20 more, but no person has ever asked for a post office in Markdale.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The information was that the post office in Markham was in a miserable condition and that there was very poor accommodation.

Mr. SPROULE. If it were impossible to get another building there would be a justification for erecting a new building, but when you can get a suitable building for $125 or $150 a year there is no justification for spending thousands of dollars to get that accommodation for the public.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will you say that it would not be a reasonable thing to erect a post office and custom building in your town?

Mr. SPROULE. It would not be reasonable because this accommodation is obtained for $100 a year with fuel and light. There is a fairly good post office and the accommodation is all right. It might be a little later but it is all right.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is different from Markham. They have wretched accommodation.

Mr. SPROULE. I would be ashamed to put the country to an expense of $15,000 to erect a post office when we could get suitable accommodation for $100.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my hon. friend stands almost alone in that regard in the House.

Mr. SPROULE. No, I do not think it. I think that there are a great many more who will agree with me.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister has said that they are going to use this for customs purposes as well. Has he any authority directly or indirectly for making that statement? I do not believe he ever heard there was going to be a custom officer there. It is only a few miles out of Toronto and what is the use of the minister saying that? We will accept his honeyed smile and pleasant manner but let him not try to bluff us.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the memorandum submitted in behalf of those who urged the erection of that building it was very strongly put forward that an effort was being made to have a collector of customs appointed and they thought it would be used for that purpose.

Mr. SPROULE. There was even a more important reason for presenting that view and that is that there was an election coming on. Senator Campbell hawked around the country a number of blue prints and told the people that if they supported the Liberal candidate they were more likely to have a new building erected and it was important to leave the impression that there was going to be an outport of customs and an Inland Revenue office established at that place.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have been trying to obtain from the minister a return since the 5th of February in reference to the St. Joseph pier, the Grand Bend pier and the Bayfield pier.

Mr. PUGSLEY. These are in course of preparation, but they are much longer than I would have supposed, particularly one of them. But I expect that next week the returns will be brought down.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I cannot help thinking that the minister has got it into his head that I am pretty easy. I asked for these returns on the 5th of February and I have asked a number of times across the floor of the House and he has given me a very polite reply, but I have not received the returns, perhaps the minister can tell us something about that to-night.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Better leave it until we come to wharfs and harbours.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If the minister is determined we are not to have the returns in our hands before that time——

Mr. PUGSLEY. They will be down next week. We are badly off in our department for assistance. We could arrange for our staff to work after hours, but we feel it is not a good policy to make extra allowances to the staff and we have no room to bring in outsiders. You have no idea the large number of returns called for. I am informed that one of those returns would take one man a whole year to prepare. I have asked the hon. gentleman who moved for it to allow me to leave out a lot that has already been brought down. The returns moved for by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) are being prepared as rapidly as possible and next week will be submitted to the House.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Without any reflection on the staff, if the minister would see that they work as they ought to work for the salary they receive more work would be done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think they work pretty well.

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is not my judgment from some of them I have seen round the city.

North Bay public building, $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The building is 55 feet 6 by 90 feet, two stories high over basement, built of brick, stone fittings and a stone foundation. It is intended for post office, customs and inland revenue. North Bay is an important and rapidly growing town.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. When the Canadian Pacific Railway runs to Sudbury instead of North Bay, North Bay will be merely a crossing on the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I doubt that; I think it will grow.

Mr. CLEMENTS. What is the total cost of the buildings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total cost of the buildings, including site, is $61,375.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the population of North Bay?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1901 it was 2,530, but I think it has grown considerably since that time.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the cost of the site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would appear to be expensive, it cost $8,100.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. From whom was it purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From Mrs. William Doran. It is a valuable lot and is well situated on the corner of Main and Fraser streets; it is 66 feet on one street and 132 feet on the other.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is this building isolated?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot say.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister should consider the importance of having these buildings isolated.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a good idea.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I have had the pleasure of being in North Bay several times and I think it deserves a reasonable building, but to spend $67,000 in a town of 2,500 population and to spend nothing in other larger towns is not treating the latter fairly. I approve of public buildings in any town of reasonable size in the Dominion provided the money is properly spent, because it is important for strangers coming into a town to see ornamental buildings. But I will not approve of spending so much money in a small place and neglecting larger places. A $25,000 building in a town of that size would be sufficient.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not prepared to say that I would approve of erecting such an expensive building, but I presume the minister was impressed with the importance of North Bay and considered it was for customs purposes as well as for post offices.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It is a distributing centre for all that country.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When was the site purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The 31st March, 1905.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Taking the cost of the lot at $8,000 and the total cost at $61,000, that would leave $53,000 for the building, which is $13.000 more than Mr. Hyman, when minister, said it would cost.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He probably did not include the fittings, which cost $6,000, and the heating and boilers.

Mr. ALCORN. $8,000 is an unconscionable price to pay for a lot 66 feet by 132 in a town like North Bay.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My information is that the lot could be sold to-day for considerably more than the government paid for it. Everything depends on the location of a lot and the possibility of securing other suitable lots. Under the circumstances I think $8,100 was nothing excessive.

Mr. ALCORN. By what means, under what conditions, and from whom was the site purchased?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was purchased from Mrs. Doran and I have nothing here to show that it was not a direct purchase.

Mr. ALCORN. Who recommended the site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. An officer of the department was sent up to examine it.

Mr. ALCORN. Of course, that would be after the site was offered. Was it taken on the recommendation of a member?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know as to that; I have no information. I know that the minister interested himself very much in securing the erection of the building. There was a petition from the citizens of the town and also from the board of trade.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I understand that the population of this town is about 2,000. and this is at the rate of about $45,000 an acre for the land, which seems to me to be a very unreasonable price for land in a little village.

Mr. PUGSLEY. North Bay is not a village.

Mr. ALCORN. The minister has not not yet given any information as to how the department came to purchase the site.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no information whether any other lots were offered or not, but the department sent up an expert on land values, and on his report they authorized the purchase.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the minister the name of that expert?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not this evening.

Mr. HENDERSON. I must say that the price of this lot is to my mind altogether out of keeping with the value of property in that section of the country. Land is not so scarce there. There is abundance of it; and as to location, I do not think it is absolutely necessary that the post office should be in the centre of the town. You may put it in the centre of the town to-day, and in five years it may be in the suburbs. If an expert was sent to value the lot, he must have been misled terribly by the people who were pressing the sale of this lot on the government. It is now ten minutes past twelve; we sat late last night, till about half-past two; the House is very thin, and I would recommend the minister to allow us to go home and get a rest. I promise the minister that between twelve o'clock and two, if he insists on our remaining here, he must not expect to get any estimates through. I do not think it is reasonable to ask us to sit after twelve o'clock on Friday night in a thin House. The

business of the House will go on much better if the minister will give us time to rest.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Most of us have Saturday as a holiday and then Sunday. I really think we ought to get along with the business ; I think both sides of the House ought to bend their energies to that. We have had every opportunity for discussion. I do not want to keep the House unduly, but suppose we go on and pass a few more items.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister talks about bending our energies. The government have been holding back all the important measures. The Northwest Land Bill and the Election Bill are going to take up considerable time, and these estimates will be passed more quickly after we are apprised of those measures.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Land Bill has not anything to do with these estimates.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It has everything to do with them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would be sorry if our hon. friends were to give an intimation that they are really going to prevent the passing of estimates in the next hour or two. It would be unreasonable to do so.

Mr. LAKE. Surely it is unreasonable, after the late hour that we were here last night, to keep us here longer to-night.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think it would be unreasonable to pass a few more items.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We want the name of that expert before we let this item pass.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We will let this item stand until I get the name of the expert.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. We were here yesterday morning till half-past two, the morning before that till three o'clock, and the morning before that till half-past one. We on this side of the House cannot help feeling that the government are trying to force us to remain here at unreasonable hours.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Surely my hon. friend will not suppose that the government could tire out the opposition. They look as fresh as anybody could wish. All I ask is that we shall be reasonable and show the country that we know how to work and are prepared to work in the public interest.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister talks about what is reasonable, but I say it is not reasonable to keep us here longer in view of the fact that we were here one night till half-past two and another night till three. I think there is a great deal of reason in the contention of the hon. member for Halton and other members who say that considering the lateness of the hour to which we sat in the last three or four nights, we should adjourn at this hour of the morning.

Mr. HENDERSON.

Mr. BARKER. Perhaps the hon. minister will allow me to point out a matter that has some bearing on the present situation. No doubt we did sit up until about two o'clock yesterday morning. I do not myself desire to see any obstruction to the passing of the estimates, but the four or five following items are of a very general character that will be discussed probably at length. The next item is that of public buildings for Ontario.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Small items only.

Mr. BARKER. Yes, but small items become in the main big items. There are four or five of them and these are the items probably the hon. gentleman wants to go on with. We have passed $200,000 or $300,000 to-night after a very long tedious sitting. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he should show a little good nature and that if he does it will perhaps bring to him a little indulgence and assistance later on. I have listened to the discussion and I am quite sure that, from the nature of the following items, they will take more time than he thinks.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Now that the minister has decided to adjourn, I would like to ask in what part of the public accounts we can find a vote for the monument on the battlefields and also a monument to Champlain. I am glad to see the Postmaster General present. He will remember a certain occasion on which a number of the gentlemen connected with the press gallery were sailing up the beautiful river and approaching the falls named after a distinguished French writer, and he will recollect the conversation and the proposal to erect a monument to the late Samuel de Champlain on that beautiful spot opposite the falls. I have looked in vain through the estimates for any vote for that monument.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This item for Ontario public buildings fire escapes we ought to pass.

Mr. HENDERSON. What about the North Bay vote ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That stands. But this item for the Ontario public buildings fire escapes, $5,000 we ought to pass. These public buildings are at Belleville, Goderich, Guelph, Hamilton, Orillia, Petrolia, Paris, Port Arthur, and a large number of others, and the items are all for fire escapes aggregating $5,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Now that the minister has given the names of these places, we will find them on 'Hansard' and tomorrow we shall be able to look into the matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. These cannot be at all controversial. Anything that is at all controversial I will let stand over.

Mr. HENDERSON. I trust the minister will regard these as controversial. I would supplement what was said by my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) a short time ago. I do think that all the sessions of parliament that I have attended, the government has this session shown the least disposition to go on with business.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yet when I am trying my level best, you will not let me get along.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman is very anxious to get his money, but there are measures on the Order Paper we never hear of and it seems to me he should advise his colleagues to bring some of those forward before he exhausts his estimates. To my mind there are important measures that ought to be dealt with before we deal with those estimates. I do not believe in leaving those to the end of the session when every one is anxious to get home and when proper consideration cannot be given them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There will be the fullest opportunity to consider them.

Mr. HENDERSON. Provided we remain here, but I do not think the government has shown a disposition to advance business this session as they have done in former years. I have no hesitation in appealing to the minister to adjourn the House now and let us go home. I do not consider that we are responsible if the estimates are not put through. The government have been delinquent and have allowed business to stand too long.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If you will consider the Ontario public buildings, I will pass over the military building and the Printing Bureau and the Ottawa departmental buildings and we will adjourn You are in such a pleasant mood that we might get through the items that are not controversial.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, suppose we allow the minister to escape on his fire escape, then we can go home and will come back here even in better humour than to-night—and I think we have been in pretty good humour.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, work a little longer; it is early.

Mr. HENDERSON. Early in the morning, but rather late too.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Carried.

Mr. HENDERSON. No, it is not carried. And I do not propose it shall be carried so soon as that. I do not know whether these fire escapes have been provided for the public buildings before or not. Where is it intended to purchase them ? Are they to be iron stairways outside the buildings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister cannot get an iron stairway for $120. It must be only an iron ladder.

Mr. GANONG. Have they a landing at each story ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. From whom are they purchased ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Very often they can be purchased in the town in which the building is situated. It is ordinary blacksmith work, you know.

Mr. GANONG. Very few can be got that way. These are made by people with special machinery for that purpose.

Mr. CROCKET. From whom has the department been purchasing the fire escapes which have been in use ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a firm in Ottawa named Smith which made quite a number and also a firm in Toronto.

Mr. CROCKET. How much was spent in fire escapes last year ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the figures.

Mr. GANONG. Do I understand that this fire escape has a special name ? Is it a patent contrivance?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I speak of the Shipway Iron and Bell Co., of Toronto.

Mr. GANONG. This is not a contrivance controlled by anybody ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What did that firm receive from the department last year ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was a vote of $3,000 last year, principally spent on fire escapes for the Printing Bureau.

Mr. CROCKET. Did the same firm supply them and put them up.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. What was the average cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From $150 to $175.

Mr. ALCORN. Have the government been in he habit of providing fire escapes for public buildings ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only in some cases. But on account of some of the dreadful accidents that have happened, there is a general disposition throughout the country to require that public buildings should be provided with fire escapes and by-laws have been passed in many places to that effect.

Mr. ALCORN. For instance, we have no fire escapes on this building in which we meet ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. ALCORN. Or on the other public buildings in Ottawa ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think not. We have started in by putting them on the printing building.

Mr. ALCORN. Did one firm supply all the fire escapes for the Printing Bureau ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. ALCORN. Is it intended to purchase fire escapes for other places from the same firm ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no intention one way or the other.

Mr. ALCORN. What change has necessitated this sudden determination to supply fire escapes where they were not supplied before ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I gave the explanation —the calamities that have happened in Canada and the United States in public buildings.

Mr. ALCORN. Not more in recent years than formerly ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, there was the dreadful fire in Montreal only last year. By-laws have been passed in a number of places, and the chief architect is of opinion that fire escapes should be placed upon public buildings.

Mr. ALCORN. He has come to that conclusion lately ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. In fact, requests have been made by various authorities.

Mr. ALCORN. Are tenders to be asked for the supply of these fire escapes ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, prices will be asked.

Mr. ALCORN. From specified firms?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If they can be got locally, they will be got in that way.

Mr. GANONG. I do not think that any one objects to the expenditure suggested by the minister. Personally, I think it most desirable. But the minister need not talk about securing these locally. I have had a little to do with fire escapes, and I have learned that you must get them from some one in that particular business. A local man would scarcely know how to measure a building to supply a fire escape. Who had the contract for putting fire escapes on the Printing Bureau building, and at what cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Ottawa Brass and Scale Company, at $4,200.

Mr. GANONG. Were tenders asked for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. ALCORN. How many tenders were received ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect does not remember.

Mr. GANONG. Does he know whether more than one was received ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is not able to say.

Mr. GANONG. Does he know whether tenders were really asked for publicly, or was notice sent out to those on the patronage list ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They were not advertised for.

Mr. GANONG. Notice simply sent out to friends of the government ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To those engaged in the business.

Mr. GANONG. Especially friends of the government ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. SPROULE. I think we would be disposed to let this item pass, together with two more, Parkhill and Peterborough. It was suggested that we might take the Owen Sound buildings, but it would have to be opened up again and I think it better, instead of taking Owen Sound, to take Peterborough which is of much the same character and would not elicit much discussion.

Mr. CLEMENTS. On the item of fire escapes I would suggest that a great deal of money can be uselessly spent on fire escapes. On buildings like the Printing Bureau it is quite proper to have them, but I do not see why a small building should require a fire escape, for instance a post office. They are built practically fire proof and it is not necessary.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What would be the total cost of the Parkhill building, the cost of land and the amount necessary to complete the building ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is on a site 50 by 150. We have been for a good while negotiating with regard to a lot and as a result of the negotiations, in which we were very materially assisted by Mr. Ratz, the member for Middlesex, the Grand Trunk gave the land free to the government. We have only succeeded in getting a title very recently. Therefore plans have not been prepared and no contract has yet been let. The population is about 1,750. The chief architect says the plans will be for a building to cost about $20,000.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FISHER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will be taken up on Monday ?

Mr. FISHER. We will go on with Supply.

Mr. SPROULE. The same branch ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.45 a.m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY May 4, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). With your permission, Sir, I would take opportunity to refer to what my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) said Friday last in the course of the debate on the Estimates. Referring to my hon. colleague the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), he used these expressions :

> The hon. gentleman is very anxious to get his money, but there are measures on the Order Paper we never hear of and it seems to me he should advise his colleagues to bring some of those forward before he exhausts his estimates. To my mind there are important measures that ought to be dealt with before we deal with those estimates. I do not believe in leaving those to the end of the session when every one is anxious to get home and when proper consideration cannot be given them.

If this means anything, it means that in the mind of my hon. friend, and perhaps in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite, the impression prevails that if we get our Estimates through, we might abandon what remains on the Order Paper, notably the Election Bill. We have no such intention. We intend proceeding with that measure but we tried to get the Estimates through because we thought they were the most pressing. It is immaterial to us in what order we take up the government measures, but when we have moved the House into Supply we have made but little progress. To meet the views of my hon. friend, I now give notice that to-morrow we shall take up the Election Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will my right hon. friend state whether or not there are any other Bills to be brought down by the government this session ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, there is the Manitoba Boundary Bill and one or two others.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What are the other measures ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot give an answer off-hand but will to-morrow.

OLD AGE PENSION BILL.

Mr. PRINGLE. I would like to ask my hon. friend, the Minister of Labour, when he intends proceeding with the Old Age Pension Bill which has been referred to a committee.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Minister of Labour). Not seeing the hon. gentleman here for a few days, I did not want to convene the committee in his absence. I intend calling it this week, and if suitable to my hon. friend will give notice for Thursday.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. ALEXANDER MARTIN (Queens, Prince Edward Island). An order of the House was passed on the 15th of January for a return of application for licenses respecting the granting of lobster fishing and packing licenses in Prince Edward Island from 1904 to 1908 ; also on March 23, for names of all persons in the province of Prince Edward Island to whom fishing bounties were paid between 1905 and 1908 ; also on April 6 for reports for Federal legislation to give sailing vessels equal rights in their proper loading turns at the coal ports in Nova Scotia and Cape Breton, as demanded by the Charlottetown Board of Trade.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I will make inquiries. I was under the impression that the second one was brought down but may be mistaken.

SASKATCHEWAN POWER COMPANY.

House in committee to consider Bill (No. 153) to incorporate the Saskatchewan Power Company.—Mr. McCraney.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not desire to take any strong objection to this Bill, if it is the view of the committee that it should pass. But I would call attention to the fact that it is purely local in its character. It is a Bill to incorporate a company for the development of a water power on the Saskatchewan river, simply in one province. I would think myself that this is peculiarly an undertaking which ought to be under the control of the province, and that the company ought to be incorporated by the province. I do not know whether the committee to which the Bill was referred has given that matter consideration. My own view would be that progress should be reported, and that this point should be considered. If we keep on, we may before long be in conflict with the province of Saskatchewan, just as we are with the province of Ontario.

Mr. HAGGART. This Bill proposes to deal with a navigable stream. I do not think it would be under the jurisdiction of the province.

Mr. HENDERSON. I raised the same question on Friday last when this Bill was before the committee. I quite agree with what the Minister of Public Works has said. I think this is purely a provincial matter, but I may be mistaken. One of the members for Saskatchewan gave an explanation the other day, and perhaps he will repeat it to-day. To my mind, this is a provincial matter, and should not be dealt with here.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If I may be allowed to give an illustration of the mode in which questions like this should be dealt with—in the province of New Brunswick we have frequently incorporated companies to construct works of this character, to establish booms and that sort of thing in navigable rivers, and then the company avails itself of the provision of the federal law which requires that before interfering with a navigable river there shall be an approval of the works by the Minister of Public Works for Canada. But the incorporation of the company, it seems to me, properly belongs to the provincial legislature, because by the terms of the British North America Act a provincial legislature is exclusively invested with power to incorporate companies for carrying on local undertakings with local objects.

Mr. McCRANEY. I understand the objection of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) is based on the ground that the incorporation of the gentlemen who are named here should be undertaken by the province, and that then permission should be obtained from the Dominion parliament for the use of those waters.

Mr. PUGSLEY. From the Minister of Public Works, under the revised statutes relating to navigable waters.

Mr. McCRANEY. By this Bill we are coming here for the authority of the Dominion parliament to use the waters of the South Saskatchewan river under terms which are set forth in the Bill. True, we could go to the provincial legislature and get incorporation, but that would involve a delay, which we desire to avoid. This Parliament could give the rights which we ask to individuals, who could assign those rights which they acquire to a company to be incorporated by the provincial legislature. I think, however, it is much better that we in this parliament who give the right to make use of the river, should also incorporate the persons to whom it is intended that these powers should be given as a corporate body, and that we should set forth the powers which are incidental to that incorporation. If the minister wishes to have it stand for further consideration, I can offer no objection.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Stand.

Progress reported.

ANGLO-CANADIAN AND CONTINENTAL BANK.

House in committee on Bill (No. 141) to incorporate the Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank.—Mr. Guthrie.

Mr. FOSTER. Has this Bill had the revision of the Finance Department? The Finance Minister does not appear to be here.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This Bill comes from the Senate, where I think it was brought to the attention of the Finance Minister.

Mr. MILLER. It was carefully considered in the Committee on Banking and Commerce, and the Minister of Finance was present. There was some little objection made as to the financial standing of the incorporators. However it was thought that under this Bill capital would be brougth in from England and France, and the general opinion of the committee was that the Bill should pass.

Bill reported, read a third time and passed.

OCCIDENTAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 131) respecting Occidental Fire Insurance Company. —Mr. Duncan Ross.

On section 5,

Mr. HAGGART. I observe that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) who looks after these Bills is not here at the moment. As I understand, this insurance company operated under a provincial charter. There are contractual engagements, of course, which will be limited by the provincial law. But the effect of this Bill will be to leave them free of these and place them under federal jurisdiction.

Mr. MILLER. This Bill provides that all the liabilities of the old company shall remain as liabilities, notwithstanding that it comes under this proposed Dominion law. One clause of the Bill particularly discussed in the Banking and Commerce Committee was that providing that calls might be made on the stock to the extent of 25 per cent. The original Manitoba charter was consulted, and it was found that it provided that calls should be limited to 10 per cent. It was thought unfair to saddle the shareholders with larger calls than had been provided for under the original Act. And so the clause permitting the 25 per cent call was changed to 10 per cent in the present Bill.

Everything in the measure was carefully considered.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know what the insurance law of Manitoba provides, but I know that under the Ontario law an insurance company such as this is allowed to make only a certain contract with the insured party—it cannot contract itself out of certain liabilities. I do not know whether there is such a law in force in Manitoba. But the effect of this Bill would be to remove that safeguard, if it exists, from those who have insured with this company, by transferring the company to federal jurisdiction.

Mr. MILLER. Their longest contract of insurance would be for three years, and a large number of them would be for twelve months or less. So, this would not be so serious a matter as in the case of a life insurance company.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) proposed the amendment of section 5 of a corresponding Bill, the name of which I have forgotten, upon my bringing to his attention the possibility of certain difficulties arising under that section. It seems to me that section 5 of this Bill should be amended in that way. Has the attention of the government been directed to that point ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it would be better to have the Bill stand until the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is here, as he gave attention to a similar Bill and had some change made.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, it would not be advisable to pass this Bill in one form when an exactly corresponding Bill has been passed in a different form.

Progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 126) to change the name and head office of the Anglo-Canadian Insurance Company.—Mr. Rivet.

Bill (No 156) respecting the Northern Bank and the Crown Bank of Canada.—Mr. Guthrie.

QUESTIONS.

YUKON GOLD COMPANY.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Has the attention of the government been drawn to an advertisement signed by one Thomas W. Lawson, of Boston, which appeared in several of the newspapers of Canada and the United States, of Friday, the 27th of March, 1908, with respect to placing on the market the shares of a company known as the Yukon Gold Company, and of which one Daniel Guggenheim is represented to be president, and Isaac Guggenheim is represented to be secretary?

2. Is it true that the Yukon Gold Company holds claims for the Dominion government in the Yukon Territory located on Bonanza, Eldorado, Bear and Hunker creeks, and which have a production record of approximately $100,000,000, as stated in the report dated New York, 6th of March, 1908, of Oscar B. Perry, a synopsis of which appears in said advertisement?

3. If so, what is the extent or area of the company's holdings, and upon what conditions are they held by the company?

4. Has absolute title been given to the company of any holdings on the aforesaid creeks, or are they to operate conditionally? If the latter, what are the conditions?

5. Is it true that the company, as stated in the said advertisement, has purchased sufficient creek claims and upper lever or bench deposits to control the mining situation in that portion of the Yukon Territory?

6. If so, from whom did the company purchase its creek claims—from the government, or the previous owners?

7. If from previous owners, have any assignments or transfers been recorded in the Department of the Interior? If so, from whom to whom?

8. Has the so-called Treadgold Concession been granted to the Yukon Gold Company? If so, upon what terms and conditions?

9. Has the Yukon Gold Company acquired the following low grade areas, as stated in said advertisement, to be profitably treated at a later stage, namely, Hunker creek bottom, with its tributaries, Last Chance creek, Gold Bottom creek, Hunker hills and Last Chance hills, Lower Bonanza hills, and Klondike valley below Bear creek? If so, what is the extent or area of such claims, and upon what conditions have they been granted to the Yukon Gold Company?

10. What are the total holdings of the Yukon Gold Company in the Yukon Territory, and what fees or royalties has the company to pay to the government in connection therewith?

11. If the statements, or any of them, appearing in the said advertisement are incorrect or misleading, what steps have the government taken to warn or protect the investing public?

12. Has the government, or any member thereof, any communications, written or oral, with the Thomas W. Lawson named in said advertisement, or with any member of the Guggenheim syndicate, with reference to the purchase or acquisition of the aforesaid mining claims, or any of them, or regarding the public flotation of 700,000 shares of the stock of the said company at $5 per share?

13. Is the government aware that the said Yukon Gold Company is capitalized at $17,500,000, and that the public has subscribed for shares therein on the faith and basis of the statements contained in the said advertisement, as to the absolute ownership by the Yukon Gold Company of the aforesaid claims?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. No.

2. The Yukon Gold Company hold placer mining claims in the Yukon Territory situated on Bonanza, Eldorado, Bear and Hun-

ker creeks, but as no record of production by creeks has been kept, the government is not in a position to corroborate the approximate production record as stated.

3. Many of the claims held by the company have not been surveyed, and as they vary in size according to the regulations under which they were acquired, the total extent or area cannot be computed.

The claims are held under the conditions of the Yukon Placer Mining Act.

4. Title to the claims is conditional. Work to the value of $200 must be performed on a claim or in connection with it each year, and a renewal fee of $15 paid. The conditions are those set out in the Placer Mining Act.

5. The government has not sufficient information to make a definite statement.

6. From the previous owners.

7. Assignments in favour of the company of the claims which they have acquired are filed with the mining recorder in whose district the claims are situated, in accordance with the provisions of section 46 of the Yukon Placer Mining Act.

8. The question is not understood; but, if it has reference to a right at one time granted Messrs Ewing, Treadwell and Barwick to acquire certain reverted or abandoned claims, which right was subsequently rescinded, the answer is 'No.'

9. The Yukon Gold Company have acquired certain claims on the streams mentioned, the exact area of which is not known as all the claims have not been surveyed. These claims were granted under the provisions of the Placer Mining Regulations and Act.

10. The total number of claims acquired by the Yukon Gold Company appears to be 820. The fees and royalties paid by the company are those specified in the Placer Mining Act; that is, $15 for the annual renewal of each claim, and a royalty of 2½ per cent on the gold exported from the territory.

11. The government has no information as to the statements appearing in the advertisement.

12. No.

13. As the company appears to be operating under local ordinance, no doubt a statement as to the amount of capitalization was filed with the territorial government. The government, however, has no information.

DREDGING, &c., AT RIMOUSKI.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

What is the total amount of money spent by this government at Rimouski in building wharf, dredging, lighting, and all necessary work, in order that the steamer 'Lady Evelyn' could deliver passengers and mail?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). The question is a little difficult to answer because there has been an expenditure upon wharfs, but, according to my information, dredging is the only work which can properly be considered as having been done in order that the steamer 'Lady Evelyn' could deliver passengers and mail.

This improvement results also in advantage to other vessels entering and departing from Rimouski.

The cost of dredging was $11,077.97.

SOURIS WHARF.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked:

1. Is the government aware that during the past summer a wharf or block has been built on the southern side of the railway wharf at Souris, Prince Edward Island, opposite the Souris fish drier, and within five feet of the railway wharf?

2. Was permission given to any one to build such wharf or block at Souris? If so, to whom was such permission given?

3. Does the government claim any right or interest in this block?

4. Has the government paid Mr. E. A. Wallberg, or any one else, any money for the construction of this block?

5. Has the government any knowledge of this block being built by Mr. J. J. Hughes, or any one else?

6. Under the present law, is it permissible for private parties to build wharfs or blocks alongside of government wharfs and close up to them?

7. Does the government intend to allow the railway wharf to be used as an approach to this block?

8. Did any one besides Mr. Hughes during the last five years apply for permission to build a block at or near where Mr. Hughes is building his? If so, who applied, and why was he refused?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). There is no information in so far as this department is concerned, with reference to a wharf being built by Mr. J. J. Hughes, or any one else, further than that contained in the answer to the question asked in the House by Mr. A. A. McLean, to be found on page 2463 of the 'Hansard,' of the present session.

HOURS AND PAY OF LETTER CARRIERS.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Blain—asked:

Is it the intention of the government to bring the service of letter-carriers to an eight-hour-a-day service and to grant them an additional week's leave of absence, and also to adopt an increased schedule of salaries therefor, as recommended by the report of the Civil Service Commission, 1908?

Hon. R. LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

(a) Practically the letter-carriers have an eight hour a day service at the present time.

(b) Under the present law it is possible for the letter carriers to obtain a period of vacation greater than three weeks not allowed to other members of the service.

(c) Any increase in the salaries or vacation of letter carriers recommended by the

Civil Service Commission, 1908, must receive the general consideration of the government, the same as every other branch of the service.

SOUTHERN ALBERTA LAND COMPANY.

Mr. HERRON—by Mr. Lake—asked:

1. Has the Southern Alberta Land Company, Limited, successors to the Robbins Irrigation Company, made application to the government to exchange a portion of the lands granted under their contract for other lands situated outside the original area?
2. If so, what quantity of land do they propose to re-lease, and what quantity do they ask in lieu thereof?
3. In what townships are the lands applied for in exchange located?
4. Is it a fact that the company claims that the success of their scheme from a financial point of view depends upon securing the new area applied for?
5. What are the intentions of the government in respect of said application?
6. In case of the government consenting to such exchange, will the contract be amended so as to contain a clause fixing the maximum selling price of lands without water privilege?

Hon. F. OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes.
2. (a) 186,000 acres, approximately; (b) 186,000 acres, approximately.
3. Township 13, range 6, townships 14 and 15, ranges 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10, west 4th meridian.
4. Yes.
5. The Commissioner of Irrigation has been directed to make a personal inspection of the company's scheme in connection with this application, and the application will not be dealt with until his report shall have been received.
6. No decision has been made. See answer to No. 5.

CHARTER OF CAPTAIN HACKETT'S TUG FOR PATROL WORK.

Mr. CLEMENTS—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. Regarding the patrol work in which Captain Hackett had charge of up to last season for the government in the vicinity of Lime Kilm Crossing, Detroit river, did Captain Hackett resign his position, or was he discharged by the government?
2. What remuneration did Captain Hackett receive for the work?
3. What individual or company is doing the work now for the government and at what remuneration?
4. Were tenders asked for the work? If so, was the lowest tender accepted, and how many tenders were received?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Captain Hackett's tug was chartered by the government last season at $50 per day, with a double crew for night and day work, the $50 including everything; the charter was subject to withdrawal at 48 hours' notice; the patrol was discontinued at the end of the season of navigation.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Captain F. Trotter, same remuneration.
4. No.

PURCHASE OF HACKETT DOCK, AMHERSTBURG, ONTARIO.

Mr. CLEMENTS—by Mr. Blain—asked:

Has the government any intention of purchasing the Hackett dock, in the vicinity of Amherstburg, Detroit river, for use as a government wharf?

Hon. W. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). The matter has not been considered by the government.

COLLECTION OF CUSTOMS AT BATHURST.

Mr. CROCKET asked:

1. Has the Minister of Customs received a reply to his letter to the collector of Customs at Bathurst, New Brunswick, in reference to the complaint that said collector engaged actively in the late provincial election in Gloucester, New Brunswick?
2. If so, does the collector deny that he addressed a number of political meetings in different parts of the county in the interest of the Liberal candidates, or that he engaged actively in said election, as alleged in the letter of complaint?
3. What action has the minister taken since communicating the matter of the above complaint to said collector, or what action does he propose to take in reference thereto?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. Yes.
2. I have a copy of his reply in my desk which if the hon. member desires, I can read, but as it is somewhat lengthy I might say that as I understand it, Mr. Venoit does not admit that he addressed a number of meetings in the interest of the Liberal candidates, but he admits that he spoke at some public meetings, defending himself against personal charges made against him.
3. In view of the explanation given by the collector. no further action has as yet been taken.

N. F. HARBOTTLE.

Mr. LAKE asked:

1. Was a person by the name of N. F. Harbottle employed in the excise office at Edmonton until recently?
2. Did the said party leave the service after having taken moneys belonging to the government? If so, what was the extent of his defalcation?
3. When was the said Harbottle appointed and upon whose recommendation?
4. What other employees of the government at Edmonton have, during the last three years, left the service under similar circumstances?

Hon. WILLIAM TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue):

1. Neville Harbottle was employed in the excise office at Edmonton.
2. Yes. $6,918.44.
3. August 1, 1903. Upon the recommendation of the Minister of Inland Revenue.
4. The Department of Inland Revenue has no knowledge of a similar case.

W. D. CURRIE OF SOURIS.

Mr. R. N. WALSH asked :

1. How much has been paid by the Department of Marine and Fisheries to W. D. Currie of Souris, Prince Edward Island since March 31, 1907?
2. What was the amount and date of each payment, and for what were said payments made?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. $218.81.
2. August 3, 1907, $187.71. Provisions, &c., for herring drifter 33. October 9, 1907, $20.87. Provisions, &c., for herring drifter 33. January 16, 1908, $2.95. Small supplies and cartage for Souris East light. February 6, 1908, $7.28. Small supplies and cartage for Souris East light. Total $218.81.

HALIFAX COUNTY MAILS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked :

1. Is Gordon Farnell a contractor for the carriage of the mails in Halifax county, Nova Scotia, or has he had such contract?
2. If so, during what periods and over what route?
3. What are the terms of his contract, and what amount has he received each year during the period of his contract?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. Yes.
2. Contract commenced April 1, 1906—due to expire March 31, 1910.
3. Service tri-weekly ; distance twenty-eight miles each way. Usual conditions of contract. $475.

STE. ANNE DE SOREL LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

1. Has the government taken any land from Martel Rajotte, of Ste. Anne de Sorel, for the building of a lighthouse in that locality? If so, by whom was the government authorized to do so?
2. Is it true that the government employees destroyed many trees planted by Rajotte on said land?
3. Is it true that the landslide occurred on account of the disappearance of those trees, causing great damages to Rajotte?
4. Is it the intention of the government to recompense Rajotte for such land and damages so caused? If so, has anything been done to that effect?

Mr. LAKE.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Yes. A plot of land 50 feet square with right of way from the public road 10 feet wide. The proprietor offered the property in question to the department for the sum of $100, which was reported a fair price by the agent of the department at Montreal. The right of way being for 1,350 feet long.
2, 3 and 4. No. The employees of the Department of Marine and Fisheries constructed a lighthouse foundation on this land and for that purpose had to clear away the natural growth of brush. There were no trees of any consequence on the site.

LATE HON. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE.

Mr. BOYCE asked :

1. On what date did the late Hon. Raymond Prefontaine leave for England previous to his death?
2. Who was acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries during his absence and until, and after his death?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. The late Hon. Raymond Préfontaine left Montreal on November 20, 1905, and sailed from New York either the night of the 21st or morning of November 22, 1905.
2. The Right Honourable the President of the Privy Council.

SUPPLY—SHIPPING AT COLLIERIES.

Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.). I desire to draw the attention of the government to a matter which is of great moment to the shipping interests of the maritime provinces. I refer to the system of loading vessels at the different collieries; the rule now in vogue being that steamships shall be loaded first. No matter how many sailing vessels may be waiting for loads, steamers that come in immediately receive their cargo, and this practice has become so much a nuisance that in the maritime provinces that sailing vessel owners are being compelled to withdraw their vessels from that trade and to leave it practically in the hands of steam vessels owned by Norwegians and other foreigners. In consequence of the present practice to which I have referred the rates on coal were increased last year and the price of coal in Prince Edward Island was advanced about 50 cents per ton. I have here a letter written by Mr. Alexander Weatherbee addressed to the editor of the Halifax 'Chronicle,' and as Mr. Weatherbee is a seafaring man resident in Nova Scotia he explains the situation perhaps clearer than I could.

To the Editor of the 'Chronicle.'

Sir,—Kindly allow me space in your valuable paper to express my views *re* the coasting trade and the Norwegian question or foreign shipping monopolizing our coasting trade. It is a difficult question to solve or bring to a satisfactory settlement and I believe if not settled it will lead to anarchy and rebellion in the end, as it is a terrible grievance for our vessels to lay at coal piers and steamers load and go away and return and load again and our vessels laying without cargoes or any recompense for their lost time as I have had the experience of it a number of times. Now I am aware that the companies have to have steamers to carry their coal. Also, do I know they have a right to charter wherever they can make the best bargain. I am opposed to unions and monopolies as they tend to coerce the freedom and rights of individual citizens, and my idea of bringing this vexed question to a satisfactory settlement is for the government to compel all coal companies to load all vessels in turn, no preference to steam over sailing tonnage, as all have equal rights. I have loaded coal a number of times for the last twenty years in American ports and never had to wait long for my cargo as everything was loaded in turn, steamer, barge or sailing vessel and no reasonable man will complain when he gets his turn or rights. This is my view for a satisfactory settlement of the trouble or grievance.

ALEX. WEATHERBEE.

Tatamagouche, Dec. 21, 1907.

You will observe in the recent issues of newspapers in the maritime provinces editorials and letters from correspondents calling attention to this matter. Sea captains and sailing vessel owners are to-day withdrawing their vessels from this trade because they cannot afford to continue in the trade as they cannot get compensation for the great loss of time which they are subjected at the collieries in loading. I hold in my hand a petition signed by the principal sailing vessel owners and captains in the province of Prince Edward Island, in reference to this matter, which reads as follows:

Whereas the system of coal mining companies in Nova Scotia and Cape Breton give a loading preference to steamers over sailing vessels at their respective piers and that said discrimination militates against the owners and charterers of sailing vessels;

And whereas the greater part of the coal imported to this province is freighted in sailing vessels, and owing to the condition of the harbours, must continue to be freighted by vessels of shallow draught;

And whereas such systems may compel sailing vessels to abandon the coal carrying trade, to the great detriment of this city and province;

Therefore resolved, that our representatives respectfully request the federal government to pass such legislation as will give to sailing vessels and steamers equal rights in their proper loading turns at the coal ports in Nova Scotia and Cape Breton, steamers when taking in bunker coal to have preference only.

Captains and shipowners—

John Gilles,
G. H. Day,
Donald McRae,
P. J. Cahill,
Alex. Roberts,
John McLean,
Richard Moran,
David Anderson,
William Davis,
Frederick Cormier,
William Burke,
Garret Hubley,
Kenneth Finlayson,
John J. Murchison,
A. E. Hogan,
Clarkin Brothers,
Chas. Lyons & Company,
A. Pickard & Company,
Wright Brothers,
Edward Boswell,
Wesley Myers,
Johnston Lord,
Allan McLean,
Allen McLean,
W. M. Snow,
C. J. Stright,
W. C. Lea,
Angus Brine,
Jabez Hudson,
J. H. Myrich & Company,
Frank Gallant,
F. Smith,
John Ireland,
Chas. Bennett,
Paul Costain,
Daniel S. Miller,
Ellis Brothers,
John Agnew,
George McDiarmid,
F. H. Lemon,
Harry Bruhm,
John T. Dewar,
Amos J. Robertson,
W. A. Johnston,
Frank Murphy,
Peter Porior,
M. McKinnon,
Alex. McLeod,
Hugh McLeod,
George Whightman,
Lester B. Mellish,
D. J. McLean,
A. E. Smith,
William Murphy,
Daniel McGregor,
Patrick Kelley,
J. D. Bell,
M. F. McDonald,
John Beck,
William Horton,
S. Bowdridge,
Hirman Hyde,
James H. C. Beck,
John A. Munn,
George B. Dunn,
Louis Herring,
Louis Herring,
James Lanigan,
Patrick McCarthy,
Lawrence Lanigan,
Sterns & Son & Company,
H. H. Sterns,
Allen Jos. McDonald & Co.,
Thomas Kichman,

John McLean,
H. H. Acorn,
Matthew & McLean,
William McDonald,
D. A. McDonald,
Sterns Brothers,
Capt. C. E. Myers,
Secretary for Captains.

These are the signatures of practically all the owners and captains of sailing vessels in the province. But this matter affects not only the province of Prince Edward Island, but also the province of New Brunswick and the province of Nova Scotia, in which these companies are incorporated. It also applies to vessels from the province of Quebec. I do not know whether any vessels from the province of Ontario coal there or not. This matter was referred to the Legislative Assembly of the province of Prince Edward Island at its last sitting, and I received a few days ago a letter from the clerk of the Legislative Assembly to the following effect:

The Legislative Assembly of Prince Edward Island,
Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island,
March 27, 1908.

A. A. McLean, Esq.,
House of Commons.

Dear Sir,—Acting under instructions of the legislative assembly of this province, I beg to inclose a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by this House, and am requested to ask that the matter referred to receive your most earnest and immediate attention.

Yours respectfully,
R. H. MONTGOMERY,
Clerk Legislative Assembly, Prince Edward Island.

The resolution referred to in that letter reads as follows:

Resolution passed unanimously by the legislative assembly, Prince Edward Island, March, 1908.

Resolved, that this legislature, recognizing the difficulties and loss entailed to the owners and charterers of sailing vessels, also to the consumers of coal in this province on account of the preference habitually given to steam tonnage as distinguished from sailing vessels, at the piers of the leading collieries in Nova Scotia, in the matter of loading coal cargoes, respectfully request the government of Nova Scotia to exercise such powers as may be within its rights to secure fair and equitable treatment for the sailing vessels at such piers, and if those powers be inadequate to the end proposed, recommend that said government shall have recourse to the federal authorities, with a view to securing the rights and privileges in question.

Further resolved, that this legislative assembly respectfully request the federal government to pass such legislation, if necessary, as will give to sailing and steam tonnage equal rights in their proper loading turns at the coal ports in Nova Scotia.

I understand that a copy of these resolutions has been sent to the government at Ottawa, and is now in the hands of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I understand that it is a moot question whether the federal authorities have power to deal with this matter or whether the power rests with the legislature of the province of Nova Scotia. But I think this matter is one which peculiarly lies within the powers of the parliament of Canada to deal with. This is not a matter of purely local importance, because vessels from various provinces of Canada habitually load at these piers. It is true, these companies, or most of them, are chartered by the legislature of the province of Nova Scotia; but notwithstanding that fact, I think this parliament has power to regulate the manner in which vessels shall be loaded and unloaded at these piers. Under the shipping laws of the Dominion of Canada all the regulations for the unloading of vessels are subject to the parliament of Canada. If this parliament has power to regulate the unloading of vessels, I do not see why it should not equally have power to regulate the loading of vessels. It has power under the federal shipping law to say what space shall be allotted for cattle on vessels, how many bushels of grain a vessel may carry, how much draft it may draw, etc. Why, then, should it not have power to regulate the manner in which vessels from Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec shall be loaded at these piers? It may be and probably will be said that these concerns are private concerns, and can make contracts to load as they please. Vessels from all parts of Canada come to these places for coal. Under the circumstances, this is a matter of federal importance which may come under the head of regulation of trade and commerce, subsection 2 of section 91 British North America Act. Why should not this parliament have the power, under that section, to regulate the manner in which vessels shall be loaded, the same as they regulate, under subsection 10, which deals with navigation and shipping, the manner in which vessels shall lie in the harbour or conduct themselves at a pier. Under these regulations, no vessel is permitted to carry any spars clear of her hull because that might interfere with other vessels coming in.

Mr. BRODEUR. Does my hon. friend think that if the coal dealers were refusing to sell their coal we would have the power to interfere, or would we have the power to interfere when coal dealers deliver at their own piers?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I suppose every one can refuse to sell his own goods, but when he does sell them and when he advertises that he has goods for sale, the parliament of Canada may pass regulations governing the conduct of his trade.

Mr. BRODEUR. Under what clause of the British North America Act?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Under clause 2 of section 91 dealing with the regulation of trade and commerce. Take, for instance, section 92 which defines what matters come within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature. Under that section, shop, saloon, tavern and auctioneer and other licenses, in order to the raising of revenue for provincial, local or municipal purposes come under the exclusive powers of the provincial legislature. Yet, notwithstanding that section, it has been held by the Privy Council that this parliament had power to pass the Canada Temperance Act and to decree that that Act could come into force in any district at the instance of its people and thus take away vested rights from men previously engaged in the liquor trade. That Act of this parliament was upheld by the Privy Council in the case of Russel vs. the Queen. What did the Privy Council say in that matter ?

Sir Montague E. Smith, in delivering the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, intimated that their Lordships—

Must not be understood as intimating any dissent from the opinion of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada and the other judges who held that the Act, as a general regulation of the traffic in intoxicating liquors throughout the Dominion, fell within the class of subjects, 'The regulation of Trade and Commerce' enumerated in that section and was on that ground a valid exercise of the legislative power of the parliament of Canada.

Our Supreme Court had decided that the federal parliament had power to legislate on that matter because it came within subsection 2 of section 91 of the British North America Act, covering the regulations of trade and commerce. That was the ground upon which the Supreme Court gave its decision, and the Privy Council said that they did not dissent from that opinion. Here, therefore, we have the decision of the highest court in the land that although the provincial legislatures have exclusive power over saloon and other licenses, still this parliament can step in and pass a Temperance Act and, as was argued before the Privy Council, take away the vested rights of liquor dealers. Then the judgment of the Privy Council proceeds :

The judgment of the Privy Council proceeds upon the grounds that the subject was not falling within any of the subsections of section 92 and was therefore within the power of the Dominion parliament as a matter pertaining to the peace, order and good government of Canada.

But if this matter of the regulation of coaling vessels would not come under the head of 'the regulation of trade and commerce' or 'navigation and shipping,' still it might come under the head of 'peace, order and good government.' Why not? Here is a conflict every day at these collieries between the company and the steamship owners and the sailing vessels, so that this government should have the power to make some kind of regulation that would do justice to the owners of the sailing vessels. The subject is, of course, a difficult one, but all these matters are difficult to deal with. Frequently in such matters we have the Supreme Court of Canada giving one opinion and the Privy Council another, but on the whole I think that our Supreme Court has passed upon them very fairly. If the government have any doubts, I would suggest that a test case be made and sent to the Supreme Court. The matter is one of great concern to a great number of people who have large sums invested in sailing vessels. It is of importance not only to these men, but to every man who consumes coal in Canada. To-day it is agitating the people in the maritime provinces. To-morrow it may become a live question in Saskatchewan or Alberta or British Columbia. I think, therefore, that the government should take it up at once and deal with it. Let them submit the question to the Supreme Court, if they have doubts of their jurisdiction, and if not satisfied with the decision of the Supreme Court let them appeal it to the Privy Council.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. What solution by way of legislation, provided this parliament has power, would the hon. gentleman suggest?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I understand from shipping men that in the coal ports of the United States there is a regulation providing that every vessel shall receive its cargo in turn.

Mr. BRODEUR. On private property?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Yes. There is one exception, and that is bunker coal for steamers which are leaving port—these steamers have the preference, and I believe they are the only vessels in American ports that have the preference.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). This is a difficulty which occasions great hardship in the maritime provinces. It was a special grievance last year. I asked a question about this in April and the minister told me that it was 'under consideration.' I hope this question is not to be kept under consideration indefinitely. I also asked for the correspondence, but the correspondence has not been brought down. Now, the session is drawing to a close, and this is a very important matter, and should be attended to. I called the attention of the government to a resolution of the Board of Trade of Charlottetown, which had been sent me. I also received a copy of a resolution from the legislature of Prince Edward Island. In view of these representations and of the very serious importance of the matter to the people of the maritime

provinces of this question, I sincerely hope the government will find some way of overcoming the difficulty. I have here letters and petitions to show the very grave nature of this grievance to shipowners and masters and to the people generally. First, let me read a letter signed by Charles Reid:

Sir,—The system of loading vessels at coal piers is as tyrannical and out of date as the feudal system. Canadian vessels are not allowed coals as a rule, while a Norwegian steamer is at the same pier, and in many cases, coal is kept from Canadian vessels until the 'Norman' arrives.

Schooners sometimes have been known to wait until the Norwegian steamer has made two voyages to Montreal. Captain Fred. Peters, of Summerside, can testify, as he is one of the captains who has had this experience.

That is, the steamer loaded, went to Montreal, came back and got a second cargo before the sailing vessel could get a pound of coal:

Why should Canadians be driven from Canadian waters?——

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. At what colliery did that occur?

Mr. A. MARTIN. This is dated Brulé Shore, Tatamagouche, Colchester County, N.S., November 29, 1907.

Mr. JOHNSTON. What colliery?

Mr. A. MARTIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Johnston) will hunt up some information that will suit him and will help him to speak, as he is generally ready to do in season and out of season.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I will hunt up the facts.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Your facts are often very doubtful. The letter proceeds:

Are we an inferior race or are we not a law-abiding people? What is the cause of such treatment? During the days of wooden ships we had as fine a fleet and as brave and noble a class of seamen as ever ploughed a sea. Why should all this wealth have passed away? Is it merely because wooden ships are a thing of the past? Nay, but on account of our 'shipping laws.'

Again, are not our home vessels a benefit to Canadians generally? As soon as they all disappear, the consequences will be experienced. Notice the towns situated away from the coast pay a higher rate of freight than freight sent past that inland town to one on the coast. What is the cause? Because places situated on the coast have their own vessels and water competition. Why should we be deprived of our birthright for the benefit of a few moneyed people not resident in Canada? We Canadian seamen have no desire to leave our Canadian homes, although we would be welcomed and could hold property in the United States ships. But what we want is our rights, and not until then will we be a contented and happy people.

Mr. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.)

And here is a letter signed by fourteen captains at Port Hastings—I suppose the hon. gentleman is familiar with that place:

The following letter known as the 'captains' protest,' which might be regarded as the first gun in the campaign for the protection of Canadian shipping, like the shot 'at Lexington which was heard around the world,' was published in the Halifax 'Morning Chronicle,' Halifax 'Herald,' Lunenburg 'Daily News,' Sydney 'Post,' Sydney 'Record,' the 'Coast Guard' (edited by M. H. Nickerson, M.P.P.), and other maritime province and Quebec journals.

To the Editor—

Sir,—As your paper has always taken a deep interest in the shipping of our country, kindly publish this letter to show to the people of Canada how our coasting sailing vessels and owners are being ruined and our flag driven from our waters, and a foreign flag and shipping encouraged in our ports.

We, the undersigned captains of fourteen schooners have been at Port Hastings waiting for cargoes of coal. Some of us have waited for twelve days, and some were promised coal this week. Superintendent McGillivray, of the Inverness Railway and Coal Company, was at Port Hastings Thursday, the 19th instant. We waited on him, and all the satisfaction we got from him was that we would get no coal until navigation closed up the St. Lawrence. One captain wanted to buy a barrel of coal for his vessel's use, and was told by the superintendent that he would not get a barrel or pound of coal until the St. Lawrence was frozen up.

That must have been very cheering to the hon. member for Cape Breton, who champions this injustice. I think it is very cruel treatment that a sailing vessel cannot get a barrel of coal to keep the fire going in the forecastle. Letter goes on to say:

While we have been treated in this manner, a Norwegian steamer, manned by Norwegians, and flying the Norwegian flag, hauled into the dock, and was loaded with over 3,000 tons of coal, and left Tuesday evening, and another Norwegian steamer hauled into the dock the following day and is being loaded.

A good many of us are in the coal carrying trade, and some of us buy cargoes and have regular customers waiting for coal, and as we cannot afford to wait until the St. Lawrence freezes up, we are compelled to leave the port of Hastings to-day.

We trust that the members of the Dominion and local parliaments as well as the Halifax and other boards of trade and the newspapers, will come to our assistance.

On receiving such shabby treatment from the superintendent of the Inverness Railway and Coal Company, we wired to C. W. Spencer, general manager, Montreal, on the 19th instant.

Have booked here ten days for coal, wire it in ten load schooners or not. Have been promised coal Monday.

(Sgd.) L. GERRIOR,
and thirteen other schooner masters.

Not receiving any reply to this, we wired again to C. W. Spencer at Montreal, on the 20th instant, as follows:

Superintendent McGillivray advises no coal to schooners until St. Lawrence closes. Please answer yesterday's telegram. Must we apply Toronto office.

(Sgd.) L. GERRIOR,
and thirteen other schooner masters.

The above is signed by the following named captains: S. Boutillier, Jef. Forgeron, J. White, C. Chasson, A. Biott, C. S. Sangster, E. Sampson, B. Davis, L. Hubley, L. Rafuse, H. Deong, Mr. Boudrot, Mr. Landry, P. McCarthy. I think that letter from the owners and captains of vessels shows that they have suffered great hardship in the treatment they have received, and I think the government owes it to these people to provide some redress. It is not enough to say that the matter is under consideration. The minister asked my colleague what he was going to do about it. Now I have taken some pains to study this question, and I have consulted the Shipping Act in the revised statutes. I think that if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will not give the matter his attention, the Minister of Justice will acknowledge on reading this Shipping Act that there is a remedy, and that the remedy is in the hands of the government, whether they choose to exercise it or not. I have taken pains to prepare a summary of the provisions of the several sections of chapter 113 of the revised statutes known as the Shipping Act, which I will read:

Section 857. Harbour master appointed by Governor in Council.

Section 853. Governor in Council by regulation defines powers and duties of harbour master.

Section 854. Governor in Council may make regulations for government of any harbour (at ports of Quebec, Montreal, Three Rivers, Toronto, Halifax, Pictou and St. John, New Brunswick, application must be made by local authorities to Governor in Council for rules and regulations.)

I presume from reading this section that the government has the power to make regulations. Of course the application must be made.

Section 871. Governor in Council may determine at what ports wardens are required.

Section 875. Defines duties of port warden.

Section 900. Port warden should perform all duties assigned to him by Governor in Council.

Section 909. Defines duties of masters and port wardens.

There is nothing in the Shipping Act to regulate the rotation of loading or discharging of cargoes; but that comes under the rules and regulations made by the Governor in Council for the guidance of the port warden or harbour master, as the case may be, in each port. Consequently, in the case in point, the port warden is at fault if he has received regulations. He either violated the rules and regulations, in which case he is answerable to the Minister of Marine, or else the government failed to set down rules and regulations for his guidance. Now, I leave the minister on either horn of the dilemma. If he has not set down the rules, the department is to blame; if he has, the port warden or the harbour master has failed to carry out these regulations. This is a very important question, inasmuch as it has occasioned great loss to many people. The season is now far advanced, and if there is next season a recurrence of these tyrannical proceedings in those ports, there will be trouble. I think it devolves upon the government to solve the difficulty in order to prevent threatened trouble.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). This trouble of the detention of vessels at piers at the various mines is an old grievance in the coal trade. I remember some years ago when there were a good many sailing vessels in the business, that frequently at the larger coal piers and shipping points there was a detention to some sailing vessels sometimes of five or six weeks, occasioned by other sailing vessels and larger ships getting a preference in obtaining cargoes of coal for larger ports of consumption. At a certain time of the year large sailing ships took cargoes for the St. Lawrence, and as the period of navigation closed at a certain time, it was necessary to give them despatch in order that they might reach their destination on the St. Lawrence in time. Undoubtedly a grievance existed. In my opinion a remedy might be found in two ways.

Mr. A. MARTIN. What does the hon. gentleman make of this statement I have read?

Mr. WM. ROCHE. I will come to that in a moment. I am now speaking of the conditions which existed twenty or thirty years or more ago. There was also more or less detention at coal piers owing to the circumstances I have mentioned. The great grievance which existed then was that when steamers began to ply in the coal trade and came to a pier, the master of the pier, or dock master, prevented the sailing vessels which had taken part of a cargo from taking the rest of it. Frequently when a vessel was partially loaded, steamers came in and the vessel had to haul away from under the coal chute without obtaining her cargo. Now if a certain number of chutes at these larger piers were devoted to serving small vessels, a great part of the grievance would be removed.

Another regulation might be made that no steamer ought to return and take on a second cargo until the vessels which were present at the pier before she loaded are loaded. As has been observed by my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. A. A. McLean), it is a great vexation and annoyance to the masters of vessels lying at piers for them

to observe one of these steamers being filled with a cargo, perhaps ten times as much as these vessels hold, take her cargo up the St. Lawrence and come back again before these vessels have been loaded. The advent of the big cargo steamers has made a great change in the coal trade. The requirements of the St. Lawrence, no doubt, demanded vessels of a larger size. Formerly the largest cargo was probably 1,000 tons, but to-day, there are these Norwegian steamers that carry 6,000 tons. Some of the mines have so arranged that they shall have a steamer under the chutes all the time and that means that vessels that intervene can get no loads, because, when one steamer is loaded and moves away, another one takes her place ; this goes on in rotation and the result is that these smaller vessels are not loaded. It is true that these vessels carrying large cargoes are under foreign flags, largely the Norwegian flag, but how this government is to intervene and prevent the owners of the mines from transporting their own products in their own way, I do not know. I do not know that the remedy is in the hands of the government. But, there is a question in regard to the supply of the St. Lawrence —the supply of Montreal and Quebec— and that is that these large centres require large quantities of coal and as a result a difficulty arises in connection with supplying the smaller ports in Nova Scotia. Before the period of navigation closes these large centres must obtain their coal and, notwithstanding that they have a large supply of tonnage, there are ports in the maritime provinces that receive no coal. Not only is there a grievance on the part of the owners of the small vessels but there is a grievance on the part of the smaller ports because the consumers of coal in these places do not receive the product that they require. They are practically the owners of the coal themselves as being resident in the province of Nova Scotia which is blessed by having a large supply and they naturally feel that they have a grievance because, as owners of the product under the ground, they are not in a position to receive the supply which they require and because they have to pay a larger price for that commodity. I do not intend to enter into the legal question or to discuss the point as to whether this government can provide a remedy for this grievance. The grievance undoubtedly does exist. It may partly remedy it to provide that no steamer shall receive her second cargo until the vessels that are at the piers at the time of her loading receive the quantity they require. Whether this government can enforce a regulation of that kind or whether it is the prerogative of the local government, I do not know. But, there is a very strong objection urged : Why should not the proprietor of the coal mine be able to sell and provide for the conveyance of the product to the place of destination ? Certainly the demands of the sellers of the product are first to be provided for. In olden times, when there was too great an accumulation of vessels at the mines, the mine owners themselves stopped the delivery to vessels going foreign. Newfoundland sealers and vessels that made sea voyages came over to North Sydney and no other vessels could obtain cargo. The owners of the mines intervened and saw to it that the smaller vessels accumulated around the piers should be loaded before the Newfoundlanders came upon the scene. Something of that kind could be done by the voluntary action of the mine owners provided the government made representations to them that the wants of the vessels in the country and the wants of the small places consuming coal should first be satisfied.

Mr. ANGUS McLENNAN (Inverness). Port Hastings, that very important coaling station, happening to be in the county I have the honour to represent, I wish to say a few words in connection with the complaint mentioned in the letters and other papers referred to by the hon. member for Queens, Prince Edward Island (Mr. A. A. McLean), It seemed to me as if these gentlemen had exhausted the grievances of Prince Edward Island and, like Alexander, had gone abroad for other worlds to conquer. It would seem to me also that a certain gentleman has called perhaps, undue attention to any trouble in regard to the shipping of coal at Port Hastings. There is one particular point in connection with the agitation which has been set on foot that I would like to mention. A Mr. Alexander G. Bailey has been very much in evidence in the press for a number of months past and I may say, in order that the House may understand the matter, that there is something back of Mr. Bailey's agitation and it is this : Mr. Bailey was sales agent for the Inverness Coal Company, and, for some reason, the Inverness Coal Company dispensed with the services of that gentleman. From that day on every thing has gone wrong at Port Hastings with the shipping pier of the Inverness Coal Company. Nothing, in fact, in the eyes of Mr. Bailey, has been right since then. But, it must be conceded that there are occasions when there is a considerable congestion of shipping at the various shipping piers of the coal companies, and I may say, in passing, that the shipping and selling of coal have always been held, and rightly so, to be a private enterprise. What the government of the province or of this Dominion can have to do with a private enterprise of that character I fail to see. If there were any means by which the Dominion government or any of the provincial governments could do anything to rectify any grievance that might exist in this

connection no person would be better pleased than myself, but, like all other lines of business I think that this mining business will adjust itself. There are occasions, particularly in the fall of the year, when coal is very much in demand, and when there is, consequently, great congestion at the shipping piers. It is something like the shipping of wheat in the west. All the lines of railway are pressed into the service and while they are not equal to the task of shipping the grain out of that part of the country just as speedily as the producers would like them to do, no person would say that the railways are not doing the best they can. So are the coal mining companies. There is one feature in connection with the selling and shipping of coal and that is that there are two markets—the local market and the distant, or foreign market. There was hitherto considerable competition among the Nova Scotia coal companies for the St. Lawrence market but fortunately for the coal trade and for the owners of sailing vessels the growth and extent of the local market which is supplied by the sailing vessels, is convincing the coal producers that it is fast becoming a very valuable market and that it requires recognition from them. Only the other day I was speaking with Mr. D. D. Mann, of the Inverness Coal Company, and he assured me that so profitable was the local market becoming that his company had made up their mind that it would be a case of first come first served as regards sailing vessels or steamrs at their shipping ports. The Mabou mine, another valuable mine in Inverness county, has vigorously started out to produce coal, and they advertise that as between the sailing vessel and the steamer it will also be a case of first come first served. There is another feature in connection with this congestion of shipping at Port Hastings and other Inverness coal ports which I might call the attention of the House to, and that is the very great superiority of the coal produced there.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). This question has been frequently discussed in the press of the maritime provinces and in the legislatures as well. The hon. gentleman who brought the matter to the attention of the House has not seen fit to suggest to the minister—that is providing this parliament has any power to deal with the question—any remedy. It has been said that in the United States certain customs exist at the coal loading ports, but as to that we have no evidence, and it does seem as if, before the subject was brought forward as it has been, the hon. gentlemen from Prince Edward Island should have been able to suggest some remedy for the grievance. For various reasons, last year was a peculiar year in the coal trade of Nova Scotia. Owing to the lateness of the opening of navigation on the St. Lawrence the coal companies could not begin to fill their contracts until late in June, and as the trade with the St. Lawrence has been increasing greatly during the past ten years, and as there were very large orders last year, the time for the delivery of the coal was more limited than in previous years. Again, in the Springhill mines in Cumberland county, one of the largest coal producing mines in Nova Scotia outside of the island of Cape Breton, there was a strike, and in consequence there was a tremendous demand on the capacity of the mines in Pictou county, Inverness county, and Cape Breton county. While these gentlemen who have written in the press so vigorously had doubtless a grievance, yet it is only fair to remember the conditions under which the coal trade of the province was conducted last year. In conjunction with the causes I have mentioned, there is the further cause that the small consumers in the various provinces locally, did not attempt to get their supply of coal until late in the season, and having waited with their orders until the last minute there was more difficulty in supplying them. I do not think any one has the right to assume that the coal companies deliberately intend to discriminate in this matter. Under ordinary conditions and if the opportunities for shipping were normal in each year, there is no doubt that the coal companies would do all in their power to supply anybody and everybody who might come along. We have had a great development in the coal trade of Nova Scotia in recent years, a developuent which did not take place during the time our friends opposite were in power although they claimed to be the friends of the coal industry ; a development which awaited the coming into power of the present government. Then coal areas which for many years remained untouched were brought into operation, and as a consequence new companies were pressing for business and making contracts to sell coal here and there so as to dispose of the immensely increased production. I might point out that the complaints which my hon. friends have given vent to to-day have no bearing against the coal companies in the county I have the honour to represent, or in the county of Cape Breton, but were confined to the county of Inverness. In proof of the fact that there was some discrimination there a letter was produced from the manager of one of the mines to the effect that it was impossible for them to supply coal locally until the St. Lawrence was frozen over, which meant that this Inverness Coal and Railway Company had taken large contracts in Montreal which under the conditions of the shortened season of navigation it was encumbent on them to fill. Taking into account the abnormal season of last year and the deferring until the last minute of local coal orders, the natural result was that vessel owners might expect some difficulty in getting supplies. But they were not the only

people who experienced this difficulty because those who got supplies by rail throughout the province met with the same experience. If there was any evidence of a determined discrimination on the part of the coal companies against the small dealers a remedy would have to be found in some way, but I do not think there is evidence of any such thing. As a matter of fact, I can tell my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island that I will undertake to be answerable for any coal companies in Pictou county, that they will supply all the schooners that can be sent over this summer.

Hon. R. LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). My constituents in the Magdalen Islands are making the same complaints that have been voiced here this afternoon, and I would like to ask my hon. friend (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) if he will give a guarantee that the people of the Magdalen Islands will be supplied with coal, just as he has promised that the people of Prince Edward Island will get a supply.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I have the greatest pleasure in assuring the Postmaster General that the only mistake his constituents have made in the past has been that they have not come to the right place for coal, and that if they come to the county of Pictou they will get their coal without any delay or difficulty. Complaints have been made in regard to Norwegian vessels engaging in this trade. I am sure that my hon. friend who mentioned these vessels failed to apprehend that there is not the slightest connection between the usual supply of coal to schooners and the participation of the Norwegian vessels in the St. Lawrence trade. Unfortunately we have not in the mercantile marine of the maritime provinces or of Canada to-day, one-fourth the number of vessels registered under the British flag that are necessary to carry the quantity of coal which we send up the St. Lawrence from the province of Nova Scotia every year, and perforce we have to go abroad in order to get the necessary vessels. We would of course prefer to get those sailing under the British flag, but our people have to get them wherever they can get them; and as we send up the St. Lawrence between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000 tons of coal every year, and as this has to be moved within the space of three or four months, I would like to ask the hon. gentlemen who suggest too quick a method of removing from our Canadian waters the vessels sailing under a foreign flag which are engaged in this coal trade, to take into consideration the question where the vessels are going to come from to supply the deficiency, so as to make sure that that coal will be sent up the St. Lawrence every year; because that trade is absolutely essential to the development of the coal mining industry of Nova Scotia. The difficulty to which my hon. friend referred is one which has no relation to any other province, and it must be worked out with the greatest possible care, realizing that, until we have in Canada a sufficient supply of vessels for the purpose, it will be imperilling the coal industry of Nova Scotia to take too drastic measures with regard to the vessels at present engaged in that trade. I only rose, as representing a coal producing county, to point out to the House and the country generally, that, so far as the county that I have the honour to represent is concerned, there has always been fair treatment accorded to schooners carrying coal. I will not express any opinion as to the right of this parliament to deal with this question. It is a grave and somewhat unique question. It is a matter of uncertainty whether this parliament can deal with the rights of lessees in the province of Nova Scotia in regard to the disposition of their products in the ordinary way, because, after all, that is the problem. It seems to me, however, that this discussion must elicit the fact that the difficulty which occurred last year is not one that is general or is likely to continue, but has been due to the peculiar conditions of last year, which I hope will not be found to arise in this or in any future year.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, this is an important question, particularly to the maritime provinces, where it is a more live question than it is in other parts of the country. But the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) has been a little too serious in complaining that neither of our hon. friends from Prince Edward Island suggested a remedy, because it was not a remedy which these hon. gentlemen wanted.

Mr. A. MARTIN. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I suggested a remedy. I do not think the hon. gentleman has a right to attribute motives to me in taking up this question. If his motives are not correct, it is not for him to say that mine are not correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON. My hon. friend is quite astray; he has not suggested any remedy at all. If my hon. friend had desired a remedy, he would have moved in an altogether different channel. There are certain people who could have remedied this matter; there are people who as a matter of fact have remedied it as far as it can be remedied, but not as a result of any representation from Prince Edward Island.

Mr. A. MARTIN. If you have a remedy, tell us what it is.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I certainly have a remedy, and I will tell it to my hon. friend; but I shall disappoint him—I shall spoil his little game. Now, I understand that re-

presentations were made to my hon. friend in regard to this matter some time ago. Am I not correct ?

Mr. A. MARTIN. What representations do you refer to ?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Were there no representations made to my hon. friend ?

Mr. A. MARTIN. If you know what the representations were, tell it.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I have an idea.

Mr. A. MARTIN. An idea ? You have no idea in your head.

Mr. JOHNSTON. It is getting a little too warm for my hon. friend ; but he must not complain if he is told the truth, occasionally.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. So far as I am concerned, I want to tell the hon. gentleman that no representations were made to me except those which come from the legislature of Prince Edward Island and from the captains whose petition I read to the House.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I can say the same thing, and I would like to know now what representations the hon. gentleman refers to.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I understood that my hon. friends from Prince Edward Island were speaking this afternoon as a result of certain representations which had been made to them. If no representations have been made to them, I can quite understand their position. I take it, then, that the fact that no representations have been made to them accounts for the extraordinary position they take.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I do not want the hon. gentleman to put words into my mouth. I told him distinctly that no representations were made to me except what I referred to when I spoke.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Then I am to assume that representations were made to my hon. friend in regard to this matter. If representations had been made to my hon. friend, as I am bound to assume they were——

Mr. A. MARTIN. Your representations don't fit.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I was right, it is evident, when I assumed earlier that the facts were the last thing my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Martin) desired with regard to this question. It was not a remedy for this alleged grievance that my hon. friend desired.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. What representations does the hon. gentleman refer to ? I do not know what he means.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am satisfied now none were made to my hon. friend. Alter he had finished his operations a little while ago, I came to the conclusion that none had been made to him. His remarks showed such an absolute want of knowledge on the question, that I cannot imagine he had received any representations. As my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has pointed out, the immediate question arose in connection with the difficulty at Port Hastings last fall. As my hon. friend has pointed out, the Dominion Coal Company have made special provisions for attending to the class of shipping referred to this afternoon. Some years ago a question arose of alleged discrimination against sailing vessels, but steps were taken by those interested to provide a remedy. Representations, for instance, had been made to myself, but when they were, I did not take the course followed by my hon. friend. I did not conceal the representations in my pocket, but went with them to the people who could remedy the grievance. I went to the operators of the mines in Nova Scotia and Cape Breton, who are reasonable people ; and I may tell my hon. friend something perhaps he does not know, and that is that every coal operator in Nova Scotia is anxious to accommodate this particular trade of which he speaks. It is a profitable trade for them. There is not a coal operator who would not be pleased to be in a position to deal with it. I made representations some three or four years ago to the Dominion Coal Company, and that company took steps to provide specially for the accommodation of this particular class of traffic about which my hon. friend is so much concerned. I can tell him that the Dominion Coal Company all last year were advertising in the newspapers for schooners to come to the coal pier which the company had constructed specially for the accommodation of this class of shipping, and a large number of these schooners did come. The company were prepared to accommodate more than they were able to get. At the other piers of the company there were from time to time people who represented that they had not been properly treated. I made representations to the company, and they assured me that during the coming season they will, at least three days in the week, give preference to the particular class of craft referred to. If my hon. friend had been interested in this question in any other respect than as a grievance, he would have sought some information from the people engaged in the trade, and he would have found out that they are making provision to the best of their ability for the accommodation of this traffic. My hon. friend ought to know that the coal companies in Nova Scotia have, in order to keep their men about them, to go into the markets in advance and sell their coal. They

go out months in advance in order to find a market and enter into contracts for the supply of coal. and if they fail to deliver according to contract they are under a forfeit. And it might well happen that when a schooner arrives on a certain day, there is no coal available on that particular day because the company has already sold that day's supply and is under contract to deliver it to a buyer who bought it perhaps months in advance. These are some of the difficulties. They were correctly outlined by my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Roche) a short time ago, when he pointed out that it is somewhat difficult to say to any company engaged in coal mining that it cannot make provision for the sale and transportation of its own coal. The coal companies charter their own fleets of steamers, sell their own coal, and carry it on those steamers. In no other way can they successfully conduct their operations. The St. Lawrence market is the one upon which, in the main, the collieries of Nova Scotia depend, and the main portion of the coal mined in Nova Scotia must be marketed in the St. Lawrence, and marketed not by the particular class of craft referred to, but by large steamers. So far as the grievances of the schooners are concerned, they have been removed as far as possible. I have consulted not alone the Dominion Coal Company but other proprietors in Nova Scotia, and they all assure me that they were willing to go to the extent to accommodate this particular class of vessels. During the coming season they are going to lay themselves out still further to meet the demands made upon them. I would say to my hon. friend, the Postmaster General, who wrote me a short time ago, that I have directed the attention of the Dominion Coal Company in my county to the representations made by him. The general sales agent of the company assured me not later than last night, that if schooners from the constituency of the Postmaster General were in need of coal, he would be prepared to accommodate them during the coming season. Any impartial observer who takes the trouble to ascertain the facts, must admit that reasonable efforts are being made by the coal companies to meet the demands upon them.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I do not wish to interfere in the debate except to say that a few days ago I received a letter from the local member for the Magdalen Islands complaining of the trouble experienced in the last few years in getting coal from the collieries in Cape Breton, and he wanted me to see my hon. friend who represents Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) and endeavour to have satisfactory provisions made for the future. After talking the matter over with my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) and my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), I was glad to learn that they will do their best with the collieries so as to have the people from Magdalen Island accommodated. I have the fullest confidence in my hon. friend's judgment and good intentions, and the electors of Magdalen Island will be glad to know that in the future they will get their coal at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P. E. I.). There is no doubt that the owners and masters of small sailing vessels who were detained for weeks last autumn at Port Hastings and some other places where they were accustomed to get coal, and finally had to leave without cargoes, while they saw steamers arriving long after they had arrived, get cargoes and leave—there is no doubt that these men were subjected to loss and hardship and annoyance. They lost a trip of their vessels; they had to disappoint the customers to whom they expected to supply coal; and they had the annoyance of waiting there for some weeks and leaving, in many cases, without coal. This is a somewhat difficult thing to remedy. It appears that the demand for coal last year, at some of the coal ports was unusually large. This is one of the signs of the 'growing time.' I suppose that, in a growing country like this, where the demand for coal is increasing rapidly every year, some inconvenience will be experienced, particularly when vessels leave it somewhat late in the year before applying for their usual coal supply. The masters of these vessels did a reasonable thing, a natural thing, in applying where they thought they might find a remedy, in making their grievances known, in applying to the legislatures, and to the members of parliament. And the knowledge obtained in that way has perhaps resulted, or will result, in bringing about a remedy. For my own part, I have received several representations from captains on this subject. I have also received a resolution passed by the legislature of Prince Edward Island, and a resolution passed by the Board of Trade of Charlottetown. I have brought these resolutions to the notice of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and to the notice of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), because he is one of the ministers from the maritime provinces. But it appears to me that there was great difficulty in the government interfering in private business of that kind, and saying when and how and to whom the coal mine owners should sell coal, and in what way they should sell it. I am not learned in the law, but still I could see a difficulty in any government interfering in private business. Of course, I can imagine a condition of things arising that would be so important to the country that the government would be obliged to interfere for the greatest good of the people. But that condition, I am satisfied, has not yet arisen.

Now, in order to arrive at something practical in the way of a settlement of this difficulty during the present year, I made it my business to meet some of the directers of the coal companies from which the people of Prince Edward Island get their supplies. Mr. McLean, a director of the Port Hood mines was one of the directors I met. I represented this matter to him, and found that he had been considering it himself and with his co-directors. He told me that he was very much impressed with the representations that I and others made on the subject. He said that he believed his company in the future, would pay more attention to the supply of domestic consumers. They were looking at it from a business standpoint, and realizing that the domestic consumption of coal was increasing every year and would continue to increase, and that it would be a permanent demand, whereas by industrial concerns consumption of coal at Montreal or some of the other great points might be large one year and might fall off another year for causes, perhaps, general in their operations, he considered that it would be better for his company, which was supplying a good quality of coal, to cater first to the local domestic consumption, and then give the surplus, whatever it might be, to the industrial corporations in the large centres. He told me that, so far as his company was concerned, he believed it would pursue that course next year, and probably in the years to come. I also had occasion to speak to Mr. Mann, of the firm of Mackenzie & Mann, the owners of the Inverness mines. The Inverness coal, I may say, has an excellent reputation as a coal for domestic consumption; the people like to get it wherever it is possible to do so. And this was the colliery that caused the greatest congestion of sailing vessels last year. I pointed out the case to Mr. Mann. He told me that the company had had large orders for coal from the great consuming centres, such as Montreal and others; but he, too, recognized the importance of the domestic demand, and informed me that his company were taking steps to meet this domestic demand during the coming season. He thought that all reasonable objections would be removed, and intimated that, as far as possible, the local men should apply for their coal as early as possible in the season. Now, I think this was a practical way of going to work and a practical way of finding a remedy. I do not, of course, object to hon. gentlemen bringing up the matter in their own way and taking up a good deal of the time of parliament, but I really think the good work was all done before this afternoon and before the matter was brought up in the House. I am convinced that the grievance—a real grievance —that we complained of last year will be largely removed this year by the action of the coalmine owners themselves. And, if that can be brought about, that is a practical way and the best way of doing it. If that cannot be brought about, and if there is great hardship inflicted upon the people for the want of coal, I presume that parliament would have to interfere. But I hope and trust—and I believe—that such a condition will not arise.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Lunenburg). I have heard complaints in my constituency similar to that made by the two hon. members for Prince Edward Island this afternoon. But, whatever be the justification for these complaints, I submit that it is not a fair matter for discussion in this House and I suspect very strongly that the hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken regarding the alleged discrimination, against sailing vessels are rather interested in votes than in coal. I cannot imagine what authority this parliament would have to deal with the subject. It is clearly a case which would come within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature. I assume that this might very easily be done by an amendment of the charter of the various coal companies operating in Nova Scotia.

Now, this matter was discussed in the Nova Scotia provincial assembly just a few weeks ago. One of the chief promoters of the agitation against certain of the collieries of Nova Scotia was Mr. Moses H. Nickerson, who moved a resolution asking the Nova Scotia legislature to inquire into this grievance and as to the facts alleged against the collieries. In moving his resolution, he expressly stated that, upon investigation, the charges related only to the Inverness Coal and Railway Company. That resolution was supported by the legislature of Nova Scotia unanimously. It was accepted by the premier of Nova Scotia. The resolution asked that the government take steps to ascertain the facts, and then, after learning all the facts, to deal with it if the facts seemed to justify intervention. The Premier of Nova Scotia, in closing his remarks, states :

> However the situation might be in that particular, he was personally only too pleased to endorse the resolution calling upon the government to take steps to ascertain the facts, and after they obtained the facts they could determine the remedy, if any there was, under the powers of the provincial government.

Now, I submit that it is the provincial government of Nova Scotia alone which can deal with an issue of this kind, and that seems to be the opinion of the members of the legislature of that province, on both sides. In looking at the discussion upon this question I was impressed with a statement made by the member for Inverness, who I think put the matter very well, and along the same lines as was done this after-

noon by the member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan):

Hon. Mr. Macdonald said he was in full sympathy with the owners of schooners employed in carrying coal, and when this agitation was coming on he thought the coal companies were at fault, and in order to satisfy himself he made a private investigation into the matter. One thing he found was that owing to the lateness of the spring last year the coal companies—he referred particularly to the Inverness and Richmond Company—notified their customers in the maritime provinces that they were prepared to load any class of vessels with despatch in the month of May and up to the time that navigation opened in the St. Lawrence, but they met with no response. As a matter of fact, up to the middle of June, very little shipping was done. It must be remembered that in order to keep their mines in operation they had to make contracts for the delivery of coal up the St. Lawrence, as had all the companies in the island of Cape Breton, and they sent that notification out for the purpose of relieving the pressure when navigation opened in the St. Lawrence so that they would be that much ahead. But there was no response to the notice, and the schooners did not appear in any numbers, and as the result when the St. Lawrence cleared, they at once went to work filling there contracts for shipment up the St. Lawrence with as much despatch as possible. It must be remembered that as the result of the operation of these mines our people enjoyed good markets and steady employment, but the mines could not be operated if the company were prevented from filling their contracts.

Further on he says:

There had been accusations made against this particular company, but he maintained they were not well founded. He knew how this crusade started, and he could give some explanation of the motives behind it, but he would omit that for the present. Referring to the matter of the refusal of the company to supply a schooner with a barrel of coal——

Which alleged charge was referred to by the hon. member for Queens (Mr. A. Martin) this afternoon. The speaker said:

—he had investigated that, and the manager explained that he considered the request a joke. He was explaining the matter to the captains and trying to show them how impossible it was for him at that time to do any better than he was doing. He was up against a large contract that he was bound to fulfil or pay the penalty. If he had any choice in the matter he would prefer the market in the maritime provinces, for one reason because the prices were better and it was in the interests of the company to sell as much coal in the maritime provinces as possible, but the contracts for delivery up the St. Lawrence were necessary to keep the mine in operation and they had to be filled.

Now, I think that statement is a clear explanation on behalf of the Inverness Coal and Railway Company, which seems to have been the only colliery complained of during the last season. Since this matter has been brought to the attention of the Nova Scotia legislature, the only body authorized or competent to deal with it, I think we had better leave it with them, and because it is a matter with which this House has nothing to do either one way or the other.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). This question was brought some time ago to the attention of the department. I believe it was in the beginning of February that complaints reached the department to the effect that sailing vessels were discriminated against in loading coal at the collieries. At first we thought it was not possible for us to deal with this question except in cases where the wharfs or piers at which these vessels were loading, were under the control of the department. I caused some inquiries to be made from one of the complainants, who informed the department that the piers where they had been delayed belonged to the Dominion Coal Company, the Nova Scotia Steel Company, and also the Inverness Coal Company and the Acadian Coal Company at Pictou. He did not give, however, a statement of the dates when the delays occurred, he only mentioned those collieries as being those at which some delays occurred, without giving those other particulars. I thought it proper to communicate with our agent in Halifax, Mr. Parsons, in order to ascertain the nature of the complaints and whether it was possible to do anything in the matter. I received an answer from Mr. Parsons to the effect that these piers were all private property, that they were in no sense under the control of this government. If these piers at which sailing vessels were calling were government property, of course we might adopt some regulation that would meet the situation. But they all belong to the coal companies, and consequently the owners can do as they like. Now my hon. friend wants this government to regulate the way in which these mine owners shall sell and deliver their coal. That would be a very serious step to take; I do not know whether my hon. friend has given the matter all the consideration it deserves, I suppose he has done so. But once we undertake to interfere with the civil rights of any citizen in this country under the pretext of regulating trade, we enter upon a very serious undertaking. A citizen of the hon. gentleman's province is raising wheat, or oats, or potatoes, and he is certainly free to sell his produce in any way he likes; and what would my hon. friend think if this government were to frame a law by which a citizen of that province was obliged to deliver his grain or vegetables in such manner as this government thought best?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Does not this government undertake to regulate trade in canned meats, for instance hogs and pork?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is true that we are regulating the sale of these things, we are regulating what should constitute the weight of a bushel of corn, or a bushel of potatoes, and what shall constitute a ton of coal. But what would he think of a law by which farmers were obliged to deliver their oats or potatoes in the quantity or to the person designated by this government. I am afraid that would be a dangerous step to take.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Is it not a fact that at Fort William and Port Arthur where the Canadian Pacific Railway and other private companies have elevators, the steamers have the privilege of loading in their regular turn, under a regulation of this government?

Mr. BRODEUR. Those harbours are public property.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Are not the elevators public property?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, the elevators are not public property.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Has not the Governor in Council power to regulate the way in which business is done at these harbours?

Mr. BRODEUR. Where it is a public harbour or a public wharf well and good ; we have the right to interfere and to see that every one is treated in the same way, that vessels can load or unload in their turn, but where it is a private property, as is the case here, it is another matter.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Are the Canadian Pacific Railway elevators private elevators ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think so, but they are in a public harbour. Take the case of these private wharfs, my hon. friend wants to force these collieries by legislation, to deliver coal to anybody who will go to one of their wharfs.

Mr. A. MARTIN. In their turn.

Mr. BRODEUR. Not only in their turn, but absolutely. Suppose my hon. friend were the owner of a vessel there and they would not do any business with him, how could he force them to ?

Mr. A. MARTIN. They are there to do business with any person who pays the price of the coal. If he pays the price of the coal the government, as I read the Act, have the power to make regulations in regard to this as they have made them in regard to it at Montreal and some other points. If they have done it at these other points then I claim it is right they should do so here.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am only pointing out the difficulties that are in the way. Suppose my hon. friend is a farmer, and a merchant comes to him and says : I want to purchase five bushels of oats or potatoes. My hon. friend would say : No, I do not want to sell five bushels ; I want to sell a larger quantity.

Mr. A. MARTIN. It is not a case at all of refusing to sell. They advertise to sell and they are ready to sell, but they say : We are ready to sell to you but we will keep your vessels here until some other vessels which have come after you are loaded.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is not the point that I intended to make. Perhaps, when I have made it, the hon. gentleman will see the serious difficulties that are in the way. I do not say that I do not sympathize with the situation made to these smaller vessels, but I am trying to point out some of the difficulties. Returning to this illustration that I was going to give about the oats and potatoes, suppose that a merchant comes to my hon. friend and says : I want to purchase five bushels of potatoes, and my hon. friend says : No, I want to sell 100 bushels, or 200 bushels, or 1,000 bushels ; my hon. friend would be perfectly right in saying that. Potatoes and oats are just as much a necessity of life as coal is. Well then, my hon. friend sees the difficulties there are in the way of trying to force a private company to do business with a certain class of people in the way in which the government and parliament would like to have them do it. I am simply pointing out that difficulty. This is a question of property and civil rights. I think that the question has been dealt with in a proper manner by my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean) and that, as he has pointed out, this is a question to be dealt with, not by this parliament, but by the province. The question is in the hands of the province. If it had been possible for us to have dealt with that question, if it had been a public wharf, I would have dealt with it immediately. When the correspondence is brought down my hon. friend will see that I took steps immediately to ascertain whether these were public wharfs or not. I wrote to the agent in Halifax in order to find out the situation and he says in his report that the situation which at present exists has existed for thirty years. Now, coming to the question which has been raised by the hon. member for Queen's, as to why we should not give the port wardens authority in the matter, I think that perhaps he has not given to that question the consideration which it deserves. Did I understand my hon. friend to say that we should pass regulations giving to the port wardens authority in the matter ?

Mr. A. MARTIN. I said that we have given authority to the port wardens at certain large ports, such as Quebec, Montreal, St. John and Halifax, and if we have done so at these ports I do not see why we should not give the same authority to the port wardens at other ports. The question I raised

has not been answered by the minister because he refers to these as private wharves. I referred him to several private elevators where they are subjected to rules and regulations which compel them to permit the loading of vessels in turn and if such a regulation applies to elevators and if the Governor in Council has power to make such regulations I do not see why the government could not do the same with reference to vessels at these coal loading ports.

Mr. BRODEUR. As to this question of the port wardens, I see by section 875 of the Shipping Act, defining the duties and powers of port wardens, that the business which they have to perform does not at all relate to the point which my hon. friend wants to make:

> The port wardens shall, at the request of any person interested proceed in person on board of any vessel for the purpose of examining the condition and stowage of her cargo, and if there are any goods damaged on board of such vessel, he shall enquire, examine and ascertain the cause of such damage and make a memorandum thereof, and enter the same in full on the books of his office.

If my hon. friend reads the definition of the duties and powers of port wardens, in this Act, he will find that the duties of port wardens have absolutely nothing to do with the placing and loading of vessels in a harbour. All they have to do is to see that a vessel is properly loaded.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Does the minister pretend to tell me that the harbour master or port warden has not the power to say where a vessel shall lie in the harbour, what wharf she shall lie at or what position she shall take?

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend was referring to the port wardens. I am trying to show him that the duties of the port warden, under the Act, do not cover the point which he was trying to make. His duties are absolutely different.

Mr. A. MARTIN. The minister is not answering my question.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am going to answer it. My hon. friend has been interrupting me and I am trying to make my points as quickly as possible, but, unfortunately, he goes faster than I do. He must see that the duties of the port warden have absolutely nothing to do with the question of whether we can force mine owners to load a sailing vessel or to discriminate between a sailing vessel and a steam vessel. As to the harbour masters, while they have the right to place vessels at public wharfs I do not think they have any jurisdiction over wharfs which are owned by private parties.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. They have the right to regulate any wharf whether it is public or private.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think my hon. friend is mistaken.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I am not mistaken because I have had experience with it as a lawyer and have had cases. They have the power to regulate a private wharf.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend says he has experience in the matter and I do not say he is wrong, but I always understood that it was only at public wharfs the harbour master has the right to determine the berthing of vessels. For instance, at Montreal harbour the harbour master there has a right to locate a vessel, but have we the right to say to the owner of a private wharf that a sailing vessel shall be loaded at such an hour and a steam vessel at such another hour? I do not think so.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. The hon. minister is begging the question. I never said that. I said that under the regulations passed by the Marine and Fisheries Department the harbour master had the power to regulate how a vessel shall conduct itself at any pier whether it is private or public.

Mr. BRODEUR. As to our constitutional right to deal with this question I fear it would be a serious step for us to undertake to regulate when and to whom a person shall sell his coal. I understand that the legislature of Nova Scotia is dealing with the question and I think it is much better to leave it in the hands of the provincial legislature than for this parliament to interfere, as it is a question of property and civil rights which falls under section 92 of the British North America Act rather than under section 91. I understand that some hon. members of the House have made representations to the coal companies about the matter and that is perhaps the proper way to deal with the question. In recent years there has been a great development of the coal trade. I remember that some years ago the industrial establishments of Montreal were using United States coal, but now I think that nearly all of it comes from Nova Scotia, and I should be sorry to see anything done which would restrict this trade and give opportunities to the Americans to take it up again. It is our duty to make every effort to encourage interprovincial trade and I am sure that the province of Prince Edward Island would be the first to manifest its desire in that direction. I have had the opportunity of discussing this matter with some of the coal mine owners and they have informed me that the conditions of the coal trade last year were exceptional and that there would be no grievance this year. In view of all this I think the complaint of the hon. gentleman is hardly a live grievance to-day.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). The reply of the hon. minister is very unsatisfactory——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman having once spoken is out of order in rising to speak again.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens P.E.I.). I am not going to speak. I was about to say that the reply of the hon. minister——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is proceeding to make a speech.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). I am not.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman says he is not, but he is proceeding to do so.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). I desire to ask a question.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman desires to ask a question that is another matter.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). I am going to ask the question if the minister thinks seriously that we should put these people in the hands of the coal owners who have dealt very tyrannically with them before. It may be something like the Japanese immigration ; you put yourselves in the hands of the Japanese——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman is proceeding to make a speech.

Mr. BLAIN. Before the House goes into Committee of Supply I have a matter to bring to the attention of the government, but it is now six o'clock.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

CUSTODY OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel). Mr. Speaker, on Friday last my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) directed the attention of the House to the fact that a large number of fire extinguishers had been purchased by this government during the past few years. Later on in the afternoon the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries took up the question in a personal explanation, and during the course of his remarks, which will be found on page 7901 of 'Hansard,' stated :

I sent over to the department for the file and I find that on July 20, 1906, Mr. Perreault applied to the depatment to sell some fire extinguishers, and on July 27, 1906, the letter which I have just quoted was written and signed by the deputy minister.

Further on in the discussion, after the hon. minister had quoted from the original file, Mr. Blain said :

I suppose the hon. gentleman would have no objection to lay the file on the table?

Some further discussion took place which ended in the hon. minister laying the file on the table of the House. Immediately the House adjourned for six o'clock, and I applied to the clerk for the file, which was courteously given to me, with the understanding that I would return it before the close of that evening's sitting, so that the clerk, having the custody of the file, could lock it up in his vault. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), on the following morning, Saturday morning, applied for the file. and was told that immediately after it had been returned to the clerk on Friday night, the minister had come for it and had taken it away. This morning I made application to the clerk for the file, and the clerk immediately corresponded with the minister, with the result that at three o'clock, when the House opened, the file was not here. It is only fair to say that the minister sent for me and said that he was quite willing to have the whole file copied and the copies laid on the table of the House. I said to my hon. friend that was not the point, but that the point was as to whether the hon. minister, having quoted extensively from an original file, and having laid that file upon the table of the House, and while it was in the custody of the clerk for the use of members, would have the right to make application to the clerk and take the file away, and refuse to return it to the custody of the clerk. If any minister of the Crown has the right to do that, it will be impossible for the members of this House on the opposition side to make any thorough examination of any file or of any great public question. The hon. minister had no right to take that file away otherwise than to use it as any other member of the House would use it, and with the distinct understanding that he would return it to the clerk so that other members of the House could have an opportunity to use it. I cannot understand why the hon. minister should not have been quite willing to leave the file with the clerk. Is there anything in it which the members of this House should not see? We have had a good deal of discussion recently in regard to original documents. We have been told that copies were as valuable for the discussion of public questions as originals; but we have found that that was not the case, because when the originals were brought down, after a contest in the House, they told a very different story from the copies. As to whether the originals will tell a different story from the copies in this case, I do not know, because I have had no opportunity as a private member to go fully over the file. I scanned it in the short time at my disposal. The file is a rather large one. The hon. minister has the original before him now. I take the ground that the minister has no

more right to these public documents after they are placed on the table of the House and in the custody of the clerk than any other member of this House.

Mr. TALBOT. Will the hon. member allow me a question ? Suppose some business were to be transacted in the department in connection with some matters to which a part of this file referred, would not the minister be justified in calling that file back in order that he might transact that business?

Mr. BLAIN. I want to be courteous towards my hon. friend. There is a way of getting the file. There certainly is the way laid down by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior a few days ago in a discussion on this important question. In answer to my hon. friend I may say that if any great public investigation were going on, and the hon. minister required the original file, he could bring the matter up in the House, and I am sure that the House would unanimously say that the original documents should be used. But to say that after a document has been laid on the table of the House, any minister of the Crown has the right to go to the clerk and take it away, and to suggest that he would put a copy in place of it, is something which I am sure neither this House nor the people of Canada will tolerate. I have before me 'Bourinot's Parliamentary Procedure,' which at page 461 says :

It has been laid down by the highest authorities that when a minister of the Crown quotes a public document in the House, and founds upon it an argument or an assertion, that document, if called for, ought to be produced. But it is allowable to repeat to the House information which is contained in a private communication. When such private papers are quoted in the House there is no rule requiring them to be laid on the table. The rule respecting the production of public papers, quoted by a minister of the Crown, is necessary to give the House the same information he possesses and enable it to come to a correct conclusion on a question.

That is the opinion of a gentleman whose authority of course is accepted by the right hon. the First Minister and every member of this House. I do not wish to detain the House at any length. This fire extinguisher question has created considerable excitement among the people. They are very much aroused at the idea that any man should sell fire extinguishers in so large a number to this government simply to be stored away in the city of Montreal. And, according to the correspondence, while they were stored away in Montreal, the department purchased other fire extinguishers. Mr. Charles Patton sold 600 at $15 each during 1903-4 and was paid $9,000. In 1907-8 he sold 100 more to this government at $15 each and received $1,500. And a new firm styled Patton & Crowe, sold 95 more at $15 a piece, and were paid $1,425. As to whether the Patton of Patton & Crowe is the original Charles Patton I do not know. I have had no opportunity of examining the file to ascertain if that be the case, but I presume that he is. However on that point I may be wrong. What explanation can the minister give why he should have stepped in and taken away the original documents, and then, in answer to myself, promise to bring down in a day or two, when the opportunity presented itself, copies of these original documents. I presume he will do so, but I repeat I am not aware that any minister of the Crown has the right, after having laid a file on the table and after having quoted extensively from it, to go to the clerk and take it away from him and say that he will replace it by copies. Let me just give one extract from the file, which will no doubt create some interest among members of this House and the people in general, as a sample of what the file held:

Ottawa, July 8, 1903.

Copy of an agreement.

For and in consideration of $1 and other good and valuable considerations, receipt acknowledged, the undersigned hereby agrees to and binds himself to pay C. S. Cameron the sum of $2,000 in the following manner: $1,000 on receipt of an order from the Department of Marine and Fisheries for 500 of my Star Glass-lined Chemical Fire Extinguishers, and a further $1,000 three months after date of the receipt of said order and pro rata thereof for any order.

CHARLES PATTON.

So we have reached the point in connection with these fire extinguishers when Mr. Patton is able, out of his payment of $15 for fire extinguishers to pay Mr. Cameron the handsome sum of $4 apiece for securing an order from the government.

Mr. TAYLOR. To whom does he agree to pay it?

Mr. BLAIN. To C. S. Cameron.

The above is a true copy of the agreement between Charles Patton and the undersigned.

C. S. CAMERON.

What happened ? Did Mr. Patton sell any fire extinguishers to the government ? Of course he did. An order was secured and $9,000 was paid. That is what the original document told us. I do not wish to take up the time of the House quoting any further extracts or copies from the letters on the file; but I say that, in fairness to the House and the country, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should place with the clerk the original file, so that every member of this House may have the opportunity of looking into it. It is no excuse for him to say he will give a copy. He might have had the right in the discussion to say that he would only lay on the table the letters he quoted—on which point I offer no opinion—but of his own free will

he placed the whole file on the table and as I understood, put it in charge of the clerk of the House. Under the circumstances, I do not see that he has the right to take away again that file from the clerk. If after having laid the file on the table, he made application to the clerk before any other member had the opportunity of doing so, and carried away the file, he would thus deprive any other member of the right to look at it at all. After we have had so much discussion over the retention of public documents by this government, over their secrecy, and over their efforts to keep back original documents from the inspection of the House, and in view of the suspicions that have been aroused among hon. members on this side and the people owing to that secretive method, one would hardly expect that the hon. minister would think for a moment of keeping away this original file from inspection by the members of this House ; and I submit we have the right to expect that he will stand up in his place and agree to return the original file to the clerk, which he laid on the table in the discussion on Friday last.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I may say at the outset that I am extremely surprised at the unfairness which has just been exhibited by my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain). I have never seen such an unfair presentation of a case. Let me state the facts and we shall then see whether my hon. friend was in the slightest degree justified in the statement he has just made and whether I have not shown, since this incident has occurred, the best good will possible to furnish to my hon. friend what information he wanted. What has occurred? Let me give you a sample of the manner in which my hon. friends opposite are disposed to carry out discussion in this House or outside, so far as the Department of Marine and Fisheries and myself are concerned. Insinuations—low, base insinuations——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The language is unparliamentary.

Mr. BRODEUR. I withdraw the word.

Mr. FOSTER. Two words.

Mr. BRODEUR. I withdraw the expression. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat knows very well that all my conduct with regard to this file has been most honourable. On Friday last the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), without having had the courtesy to give me notice, brought up this question of fire extinguishers which were bought from a Mr. Perreault, of Quebec, in 1906. He quoted from the report of the Civil Service Commission and the appendix to that report. And here is what he said:

Let me draw attention to a letter which he wrote——

He was speaking of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. But I might read the whole reference :

Last evening we listened to the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) eulogizing himself for the course he has pursued since he became minister of that department. Let me draw attention to a letter which he wrote, following the lines on which his predecessor had worked. It will be found in the report of the commissioners on page 79. It was written by the minister to Mr. Gregory at Quebec and was dated July 27, 1906:

So, you see, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Leeds stated that I had written the letter.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) read the whole of the letter ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, I shall be very glad to do so. The letter reads as follows :

I have to inform you that if you consider that chemical fire extinguishers are necessary on board the vessels of the Quebec agency you are to purchase them from P. E. Perreault, 312 St. John street, Quebec. Mr. Perreault has been advised to call upon you in connection with this matter.

And, later on, we have the following :

Mr. BRODEUR. Where does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) find that I ever signed such a letter?

Here is a man who had not the courtesy to tell me that he was going to bring up this question, and yet he took the opportunity to make the assertion that I had signed this letter.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) cannot find in 'Hansard' that I said he had signed it.

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly. Here it is.

Mr TAYLOR. Let him read it.

Mr. BRODEUR (reading) :

Last evening we listened to the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) eulogizing himself for the course he has pursued since he became minister of that department. Let me draw attention to a letter which he wrote. . . . It will be found in the report of the commssioners on page 79. It was written by the minister.

Here is a man who had not the courtesy to state that he was going to bring forward this subject, and then he makes a statement of that kind. But that isn't all. For later on we find the following :

Mr. BRODEUR. Where does the hon. gen. tleman (Mr. Taylor) find that I ever signed such a letter?

Mr. TAYLOR. If the minister will bring down the files, I will point out the letter.

He found the letter on the file and quotes it.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tavlor) says he has seen the file and knows there is a letter written by me? Does he assert that I have signed it?

Mr. TAYLOR. The commissioners have gone through the files and have given the House their report stating what they found. They found this statement on the files.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no statement that I signed this letter.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the minister will produce the letter, no doubt his signature will be found at the bottom of it.

So, the hon. gentleman's memory is bad.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, it is not.

Mr. BRODEUR (reading) :

Mr. BRODEUR. Does the hon. gentleman assert that I signed that letter?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am making no assertions. The hon. minister appointed a Royal Commission, and I am quoting what the Royal Commission said.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, that does not say that I signed the letter. Does the hon. gentleman say that I signed it?

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister will make his own speech. He made one last night—and of all the speeches I ever listened to since I came into this House over twenty years ago, that speech, as coming from a gentleman who ought to be a statesman, was the most extraordiary I ever heard.

That is a good answer.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) has stated that I signed that letter.

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not make the statement.

Mr. BRODEUR. I deny that I signed it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Go on.

Mr. BRODEUR. Something more ?

Mr. TAYLOR Yes.

Mr. BRODEUR (reading):

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to make my speech. The minister is not going to put me down. I am reading from the report of the Royal Commission. And I will give him the page —page 79. And any gentleman who reads that will say that it comes from the department to the agents at Quebec, and from the head of the department.

Mr. TAYLOR. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman said I signed the letter.

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not. The hon. gentleman cannot find that.

Mr BRODEUR. I find it here in 'Hansard.'

Mr. TAYLOR. No, you do not. I stated that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) wrote the letter. There is nothing in what I said about him signing it. He may have authorized his deputy to sign it, no doubt he did. It would not emanate from the department, however, without his authority.

Mr. BRODEUR. What did the hon. gentleman (Mr Taylor) mean when he said that 'it was written by the minister to Mr. Gregory at Quebec' ?

Mr. TAYLOR. That does not say that the hon. gentleman signed it.

Mr. BRODEUR. Then, I am satisfied.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the minister for? His authority given to his deputy is the same as his own act.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am satisfied with the explanation of my hon. friend (Mr Taylor), that I did not sign the letter—he admits that now.

Mr. BARKER. Will the hon. minister allow me to ask a question ? Will he say that he personally signs one-tenth of the letters from his department that are issued by his authority ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, on the contrary, many letters are sent out that I never see and do not sign.

Mr. TAYLOR. But the minister is responsible all the same.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, let it go at that. Perhaps if the hon. gentleman had not intended to say more than that, he would not have put it as he did. Now, he was kind enough, after making that charge, to leave the House before I had an opportunity to answer.

Mr. TAYLOR. I never run away. I had to catch the train to get home.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, let me repeat for the benefit of the hon. gentleman what I said on this subject. Perhaps, the next time he opens his mouth to speak against me he will be a little more careful. The hon. gentleman states that this letter was sent by my instruction——

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend must not take everything said against his department as said personally against himself. I was speaking of the department, as the commissioners spoke of the department.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman said that the letter was written by me.

Mr. TAYLOR. I consider that you are the department.

Mr. BRODEUR. When I saw the statement the hon. gentleman made against me, I thought I would send to the department for the file. Perhaps I would have been able to asnwer him immediately if he had been kind enough to let me know that he was going to bring up this question. The letter is as follows :

The Department of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa, July 27, 1906.

Sir,—I have to inform you that if you consider that chemical fire extinguishers are necessary on board the vessels of the Quebec agency, you are to purchase them from Mr. P. E. Perreault, of 312 St. John street, Quebec. Mr. Perreault has been advised to call upon you in connection with this matter.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
F. GOURDEAU,
Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

J. U. Gregory, Esq.,
Agent Marine and Fisheries,
Quebec, Quebec.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does the hon. minister mean that the deputy minister took the responsibility of writing such a letter without being advised by the head of the department ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am stating what happened. He seemed to be very much surprised at the reading of the letter, and seemed not to take my word, but wanted to have the file produced. I appreciate very much what these hon. gentlemen did, and I handed the file over that it might be seen by them. Now, my hon. friend states that the letter has been sent by my authority. I may say that he will find in the report of the Civil Service Commissioners, letters from the department stating that they did not give any such instructions to purchase these fire extinguishers. More than that, I quoted the other day a letter which was sent to me by the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Lachance).

The letter was sent by Mr. Lachance on the 27th of October, 1906, of which the following is the translation:

Quebec, October 27, 1906.

Hon. L. P. Brodeur,
Minister of Marine, Ottawa.

Could you not authorize Mr. Gregory to purchase them for the service of the lighthouses as well as in the steamers. Their efficacy has been several times shown by various experiments made at Quebec and elsewhere.

Yours truly,
ARTHUR LACHANCE.

On the 6th March, 1907, he received this letter from me:

My Dear Member,—I received your letter of the 27th of October last concerning the extinguishers that Mr. Perreault desires to sell to the department. I have had Mr. Gregory written to on the subject and when his reply reaches the department I will communicate my decision.

I did not decide then, and there has never been any decision on my part to purchase fire extinguishers. What happened then ? Mr. Perreault applied de novo to sell fire extinguishers to the department and he received in reply this letter from the department:

I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 6th instant with reference to fire extinguishers and have to advise you that none are required by the department.

First, there was a letter in July, 1906, asking for some fire extinguishers; then the deputy minister writes to the agent in Quebec on the 6th of May that if he requires fire extinguishers to take them from Mr. Perreault.

Mr. SPROULE. That is hardly what the language would convey, 'I have to inform you.' Why do I have to inform you ? Presumably he was writing for somebody else.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, the deputy wrote, I have to inform you that if you require some fire extinguishers you may purchase them from Mr. So and So. Now that was in July. Some months later Mr. Lachance, the member for Quebec centre, writes to me and asks whether I would purchase fire extinguishers from Mr. Perreault. I said, I will write to the agent to find out what he says about it, and when I get his report I will communicate my decision to you. Later Mr. Perreault writes again, asking us to purchase fire extinguishers, and then he gets a letter from the department that we do not require any. That is the whole story, just as it happened. Now the hon. member for North Toronto and the hon. member for Peel did not seem to take my word when I read these letters, they wanted to see the originals.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the minister is quite right in saying that because we wanted to see the originals we did not take his word. If we could only ask for the originals when we had the word of a minister, we would be in a pretty pass.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well I accept the hon. gentleman's statement, but that is the meaning I took from his request to see the original file. When he wanted to see the original I deduced that he did not accept my word for what I read.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister show from the 'Hansard' during the discussion where I refused to accept his word ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I simply say that the hon. member for North Toronto and the hon. member for Peel wanted to see those originals, and I deduced from their request that they doubted my word. More than that, when I saw that my word was not accepted with regard to these copies——

Mr. BLAIN. Would my hon. friend state to the House now where I refused to accept his word in the discussion that took place last week ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I quoted from the file, I read the documents on file, and I offered to furnish the copies, because I know that a minister has no right to refer to any written document unless he produces the copy of

that document before the House. But the member for North Toronto and the member for Peel were not satisfied with my offer and asked for the originals. That is what happened, and I deduced from it that they did not accept my word.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a mistake.

Mr. BRODEUR. Now the hon. gentleman says that he did accept my word, and I am satisfied. I do not know why he wanted to see the originals. At all events, I then stated that I did not like to part with the file for several reasons, and especially for this reason, that a document of great importance had some years ago been brought into the House from the department and handed over to an hon. member on the other side of the House, and was lost. It has never been returned to the department.

Mr. FOSTER. If I remember rightly, after my hon. friend had made that statement he laid this file on the table.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, I laid the file on the table to be inspected, but I did not wish to part with it.

Mr. FOSTER. But you did.

Mr. BRODEUR. I put it on the table there for the inspection of hon. gentlemen.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

Mr. BRODEUR. There was absolutely nothing to conceal. More than that, Mr. Speaker, I went with my hon. friend from Peel into the 'Hansard' room. I pointed out to him the documents which I had read in the House and I said: Here is a letter of the 20th of July, here is the answer and you see that it is signed by the deputy; here is a letter which was afterwards written by myself and here is the letter of Mr. Lachance, the member for Quebec centre. The hon. member for Peel was absolutely satisfied that what I had said was correct. These things did not happen in the House, but, as my conduct has been impugned to a certain extent and as I have been reproached with trying to prevent the House from knowing what is contained in this file, I think I am justified in reporting the conversation which we had.

Mr. BLAIN. I am quite willing that the hon. gentleman should state everything I said in the House or out of it in connection with the whole matter, and I will have the same right too when he is through.

Mr. BRODEUR. After the hon. member saw this file he said: Perhaps I will see it at eight o'clock again. At eight o'clock he got the file and he kept it the whole evening, or during the whole sitting of the House. At the end of the sitting I thought he would be through. He had not only read the documents which I had put before the House concerning these purchases from Mr. Perreault but he read others. The documents concerning the purchases from Mr. Perreault were the documents which were before the House, they were the documents which had been read and the documents which hon. gentlemen had the right to see. I do not want to say that the hon. gentleman's conduct was irregular, but when he is given a file bearing upon a certain point what he has to do is simply to examine the file in regard to that point alone.

Mr. BLAIN. That is another new doctrine.

Mr. BRODEUR. But, he wanted to see whether the file would be interesting perhaps.

Mr. HENDERSON. It would be interesting.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, it would be very interesting. We see that hon. gentlemen opposite are somewhat incensed by the fact that we have purchased fire extinguishers at a certain figure. I could quote a letter written in 1891, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power—I do not think that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was Minister of Marine and Fisheries at that time—to show that these hon. gentlemen also purchased fire extinguishers. We paid $14 apiece for these fire extinguishers. It is an exorbitant price, said the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) the other day. What do I see? I find the following dated the 17th June, 1891:

I beg to inform you that I have two large sized Babcock fire extinguishers in perfect order originally costing $45 each which I am willing to dispose of to the department at $30 each.

The offer was accepted and they were purchased at $30 each. I see that an order was given for these fire extinguishers by the minister:

I recommend the purchase of two fire extinguishers at the price named, namely $30, and that they be placed in two of our principal stations now without them.

This is signed 'C. H. T.' That shows that hon. gentlemen opposite were paying $30 for an article for which we are paying $14.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, no.

Mr. BRODEUR. No? The fire extinguishers that we have been buying are just as good as those. The Babcock fire extinguishers are not better than the others.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, they are.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend cannot say that.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. And they were second hand at that.

Mr. BRODEUR. And they were second hand. Coming to what my hon. friend has

stated, he thought that he was justified in going over all of the file to see what was in it and just to think that he has discovered a big scandal in the form of the document which was signed by Mr. Cameron which he has read. But, my hon. friend should have stated the whole thing in regard to that. Since he wanted to make out a new scandal against the Department of Marine and Fisheries I think he would have been justified in quoting the whole document. If he had quoted it he would have found that an order was given to Mr. Cameron on the 9th March by the department and that the minister, Mr. Prefontaine, hearing of it, gave instructions to cancel the order. So, the order, based upon the agreement which my hon. friend has read, was cancelled by the order of Mr. Prefontaine himself. That shows, Mr. Speaker, that, if my hon. friend wanted to give all the information with regard to the purchase of fire extinguishers he should have quoted the whole thing and stated that the department would not recognize that transfer, that it would not give an order and that it cancelled the order which had been given to that man Cameron. That man Cameron complained to the department and the department said that they would not recognize such a thing. That shows that they have not been able to substantiate one of the hundreds of scandals that they tried to unearth in the department.

The hon. gentleman says that it is very unfortunate that I did not leave this file in his possession on Saturday. Does he not know that this matter is being investigated now before Mr. Justice Cassels ? All the facts which are mentioned in the report of the Civil Service Commission are being inquired into and this question of fire extinguishers is a very important subject in the report of the Civil Service Commission. Yet, my hon. friend says that we should have kept that file here instead of placing it before the commission.

Mr. SPROULE. That commission is not sitting now.

Mr. BRODEUR. It was sitting on Saturday. My hon. friend was making a great scandal because I took that file in order to place it before the commission. The officers of the department are working at the present time in order to put before the commission next Monday every contract and everything connected with all the purchases that have been made there during the last few years, including these documents, and still hon. gentlemen say : No. Let us be fair for a moment to the officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Let us be fair for a moment to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, let us be fair to the men who are now brought before their judges on very serious charges. Let us give an opportunity to these men to defend themselves against these charges. That is what I am asking before the House. I am ready to have copies made in order to get all the documents before the House. We will copy all this file and, if you want it we will copy the previous file concerning fire extinguishers. We may go back still further probably and copy the file of the time when the Conservatives were in power and we will bring all these documents before the House, but we want to have these documents copied and we do not want these documents to remain here in order that we shall be deprived of the opportunity of putting them before Mr. Justice Cassels.

Mr. SPROULE. All the ministers need do is to have a motion made in the House at any time for their return and they would be returned.

Mr. BRODEUR. We need the papers just now, and if my hon. friend goes to the department to-night he will find the clerks working making copies of these contracts during the last four years in order to present them to the commission. The copies of the documents on this file have to be submitted to the commission also.

Mr. SPROULE. These documents were in possession of the House and it is only by motion that they can be disposed of. Were they required before the commission on Saturday or were they asked for by the solicitors or any one connected with the commission? The commission has adjourned until next Monday.

Mr. BRODEUR. The lawyers are working in the preparation of these documents and the clerks are busy copying them. I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) in all fairness if we should not have an opportunity to get them copied. I will have two copies made, one for the commission and one for the House, and I will bring the original afterwards if necessary.

Mr. SPROULE. What I am concerned about is that the papers have been laid on the table of the House and are in the possession of the House, and it is only on motion that they can properly be given back. When we get the evidence in a divorce case and other documents from the Senate we do not return them except by motion, and properly speaking we can only dispose of papers in possession of the House in the same way. The minister himself took the liberty to demand these papers from the clerk of the House when other members could not pretend to exercise that authority.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman is mistaken ; these papers have not been laid before the House in the ordinary sense.

Mr. SPROULE. They were laid on the table.

Mr. BRODEUR. They were simply put there to be inspected.

Mr. BLAIN. You read them.

Mr. BRODEUR. They were to remain in my possession.

Mr. BLAIN. No. There is no use making that statement for the reason that when I applied for the original file which was laid on the table the clerk of the House said that I could have it on the distinct understanding that I would return it to him before the House closed in order that he would lock it up in his safe.

Mr. BRODEUR. There was no motion made and no order of the House granted for the bringing down of these papers and consequently they have never been formally in possession of the House, but were simply placed there for inspection. I have not seen the votes and proceedings but I think I am correct in saying that there was no entry with respect to these papers being brought down, and so they were not before the House in the legal sense of the word. I told the clerk of the House that I wanted to have these papers for the next sitting of the commission and he gave them to me, and I suppose all will admit that it is necessary to bring these papers before the royal commission. I know that my hon. friends opposite are going to state in their newspapers to-morrow that we are trying to hide every thing, but I can tell them that there is nothing to hide. I simply ask to have an opportunity of having copies made of the documents on this file. I do not want to have the file lost as was the Markey lease which was given to an hon. gentleman opposite and which has never since been returned.

Mr. BARKER. Does the minister state of his own knowledge or does he merely deduce it from certain circumstances ?

Mr. BRODEUR. That lease was brought down by the minister as was this document; it was laid on the table, it was taken by an hon. gentleman opposite and read by him in the House ; it was sent by him to the 'Hansard' reporters and the 'Hansard' reporters gave it back to him and it never since has come back to the department. Later on we were asked to produce that original document and of course we did not have it.

Mr. LAKE. It was probably lost in the hon. gentleman's department.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, it was last seen in the hands of a member of the opposition.

Mr. BARKER. The evidence so far is that only one copy of that lease existed and that that is in possession of Mr. Markey.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman is absolutely mistaken as to that.

Mr. BARKER. That is the evidence.

Mr. BRODEUR. No. I presume I may be pardoned for referring to what has taken place in the committee; if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) had followed the evidence he would have seen that one day Mr. Venning stated before the committee——

Mr. SPEAKER. The report of the commission has not yet been submitted to the House and until then no reference can be made to the proceedings in the committee.

Mr. BRODEUI. I was about to refer to it only by way of explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can only do so with the consent of the House.

Mr. BARKER. Let the hon. gentleman explain.

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Venning stated before the committee at the first sitting that the original lease was not on the file and that he had not seen it. Then, on making inquiry I found that in 1904 Mr. Préfontaine placed that document before the House as was stated in the 'Hansard' and the document was read in the House by Mr. Boyd, a member of the opposition, and was handed to the 'Hansard' reporters and according to the usual custom the reporters gave that document back to Mr. Boyd, and we have never seen that document since.

Mr. BARKER. It was proven before the Public Accounts Committee that the department had sent one copy to the lessee ; that they had no copy themselves, and the hon. gentleman did not attempt to state in the committee what he says to-day.

Mr. BRODEUR. Neither Mr. Venning nor myself knew any thing about it when the question first came up in the committee. Mr. Venning was simply speaking from the file he had before him and he said he did not find the lease on the file. Later on search was made and Mr. Venning came before the Public Accounts Committee again and stated exactly what I am saying now with regard to that document. We will have copies made of this entire file if that is what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) wants.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister having placed the original file on the table of the House, what I want the hon. gentleman to do is to put it back where it was.

Mr. BRODEUR. The file was never placed before the House on any order of the House.

Mr. HENDERSON. That won't do.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is nothing before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the House had better not assume without consideration that the practice in the one case is the same as in the other. If a minister of the Crown quotes from a public document, and

a demand is made it is necessary to produce it and lay it upon the table of the House for the purpose of inspection and for use in the debate which is then in progress. But, the House is not to assume that the rule in that case is the same as when a document is laid before the House by order of the House on motion. I am not now laying down any particular rule except to ask that the House may not assume that the rule is the same in the one case as in the other. In the ordinary course of laying documents upon the table of the House there must be some parliamentary authority for that purpose and that is expressly laid down in Bourinot's work—from which the hon. member for Peel has quoted—at page 357 :

No documents can be regularly laid before the House unless in pursuance of some parliamentary authority.

Hon. members can easily see what would happen if a different rule were to be assumed and followed. In the midst of a debate a minister might quote from a public document, and at the request of a member produce it and lay it on the table of the House, as he would be obliged to do, having quoted from it or having based an argument upon its contents. But without an order of the House it would not be regularly laid on the table of the House; and it would hardly be a regular proceeding to interrupt a debate for the purpose of moving that an order of the House be made to lay it on the table. Without desiring to lay down any hard and fast rule at the moment, but only gathering from the discussion as it has been going on that it was assumed that the proceeding would necessarily be the same in the one case as in the other, I thought I should call the attention of the House to this distinction. The chair would assume that in this instance the proceeding would be that the minister, when called on to produce the document, should produce it for the purpose of inspection, though it would not go formally into the possession of the House and become a part of its archives, as in the case of a document laid on the table, by motion; and that will appear from the fact that in the present instance there is no record in the Votes and Proceedings of the matter, as is customary in the case of documents laid on the table of the House by order of the House itself.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend expressed to me this afternoon his desire to see the whole file, and I have no objection to letting him see it. If he comes to my department I shall be glad to show it to him. and as soon as the copies are made—I am having it copied—if he wants a copy brought to the House, I will bring it. I shall be glad to have all the facts contained in this file made known; I have nothing to hide, and have no intention to hide anything. In conclusion, I think the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) will bear testimony to my strong desire to meet his wishes in every respect. He knows that I showed him all the papers in connection with this matter, and that he expressed to me his satisfaction that the documents had been signed as I stated. He found, however, that it would be advisable for him to go over the whole file and see if he could not discover something else. He seems to have discovered a document which shows that a man wanted to sell some fire extinguishers to the department and did not succeed. So that it is shown conclusively that there is absolutely nothing against the department, and I am sorry that we have lost so much time on this incident.

Mr. SAML. BARKER (East Hamilton). However much time has been occupied in the discussion of this question, I think it is so important that nobody will object to time being so occupied.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will permit me to interrupt him, I would like the minister to put this file on the table so that I may inspect it. He has been quoting from it and making his case anew.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will do so, subject to inspection.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman, starting out with what I suppose he thought was an answer to the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), immediately began as a diversion with an attack on the hon. memmer for Leeds (Mr. Taylor). He sought to represent that the hon. member for Leeds had misstated the facts with regard to letters sent by the hon. gentleman's department, that is by the hon. gentleman, to persons having dealings with the department. Now, I have before me 'Hansard' unrevised of May 1, page 7877, and we will there see exactly what the hon. member for Leeds said, and precisely what line the hon. minister took in answer to him. The hon. member for Leeds said :

Let me draw attention to a letter which he (the minister) wrote, following the lines on which his predecessor had worked. It will be found in the report of the commissioners on page 79. It was written by the minister to Mr. Gregory at Quebec, and was dated July 27, 1906.

I do not propose to occupy the time of the House in entering into the question that was raised by that correspondence. The sole question here is, as to whether the member for Leeds quoted honestly and properly as a member of this House, and whether the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was correct in his repudiation of the letter, because it amounted to that. If he did not repudiate the letter or his responsibility for the letter, there was no need for his intervention. We all know in these days that a business man does not sign one

letter out of twenty with his own hand, and yet they are all his letters. We all know that a business man writes hundreds of letters in a day; but he does not sign them all; he dictates them, and they are issued by his authority, and he is responsible for them. A lawyer will write hundreds of letters in the course of a day; he does not sign one of them, but they are all his letters. Above all the head of a department, with hundreds of letters going out every day, would never undertake to sign all the letters; he makes no pretension of doing so; and yet every letter is his letter, and he is responsible for it. Now, the hon. member for Leeds said that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries wrote a letter on a certain subject, and he went on to say :

If Mr. Gregory could get a letter that indicated more clearly to him that he should purchase a number of these fire extinguishers than that letter written by the minister on the 27th of July, 1906, I do not know what better authority he could have. This is the letter from the minister.

Then the hon. gentleman went on to quote the letter. Now, let us see how this ingenuous, straightforward minister dealt with that question:

Mr. BRODEUR. Where does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) find that I ever——

Did he say wrote ?

—signed such a letter?

Was that an equivocation ? I would say it was. Then the hon. member for Leeds went on:

Mr. TAYLOR. If the minister will bring down the files, I will point out the letter.
Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman says he has seen the file and knows there is a letter written by me. Does he assert that I have signed it?

Signed it. That is the point which this minister of the Crown is making—the minister of a great department, who knows that he seldom ever signs a letter unless it be one marked 'private and confidential.' What did the minister mean this House to understand by that? Did he mean that the House was to understand merely that it was signed by his authority but not by himself? No, it was intended to convey the idea that he repudiated the letter entirely; but he used the word 'signed' to convey the impression that he had not written the letter. The hon. member for Leeds went on to say :

The commissioners have gone through the file and have given the House their report stating what they found.

The minister then replied:

There is no statement that I signed the letter.

Note how he sticks to that word 'signed.' Did he not know the distinction between putting his own name with his own hand to a letter and the writing of a letter by his authority? Then the member for Leeds went on:

If the minister will produce the letter, no doubt his signature will be found at the bottom of it.

Mr. BRODEUR. Hear, hear. What does that mean?

Mr. BARKER. It did not mean that the signature was written by the hon. gentleman himself. The hon. minister is again resorting to a quibble.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know what a quibble is then.

Mr. BARKER. Let me tell him. Did any man ever find a business firm, a railway company, a large corporation, a law firm or anybody repudiating their letters because a member of the firm did not put his own signature to it? The letter was signed by the minister's authority and he knew it.

Mr. BRODEUR. But the hon. member for Leeds said that if I would produce the letter, no doubt my signature would be found at the bottom of it.

Mr. BARKER. It was signed by the minister's authority, just as 90 per cent of the letters to-day are written and signed. No honourable man, no honourable firm, no honourable corporation, repudiates its signature when put to a document by its authority. The hon. minister goes on. He sticks to his point. He knows the distinction between a letter written by authority and a letter signed by the minister himself, but he goes on and asks again:

Does the hon. gentleman assert that I signed that letter?

He sticks to that quibble carefully, absolutely, knowing the distinction. The hon. member for Leeds says :

I am making no assertion. The hon. minister appointed a royal commission, and I am quoting what the royal commission said.

The miniser then replies.

No, that does not say that I signed the letter. Does the hon. gentleman say that I signed it?

Again sticking to the quibble—a little trumpery distinction between the man writing his signature himself and that signature and letter being written by his authority. Then he says again :

The hon. member for Leeds has stated that I signed that letter.

The hon. member for Leeds replies:

I did not make that statement.

Then we have the minister again saying:

I deny that I signed it.

Now the hon. minister in a certain sense says truthfully that he himself did not sign that letter, but did the use he made of that word 'sign' from the beginning of this discussion to the end, convey the impression of truth? No honourable man in this Dominion will doubt that the hon. gentleman was seeking to convey a mis-statement to the country. He was trying to convey to the country the idea that he was not responsible for that letter by repeating that he never signed it, although it was signed by his authority. My hon. friend from Leeds went on to say:

I want to make my speech. I am reading from the report of the royal commission.

What does the minister repeat?

The hon. gentleman said I had signed the letter.

He was holding him to the word 'signed,' and he construed that word. The hon. member for Leeds repeated:

I say this is from the head of the department, from the minister, for further down there is one from the deputy and they quote his name.

The first, on page 78 and 79, he says was from the minister, but the second letter purported to come from the deputy. From whom did the first purport to come? From the hon. the minister, and it was signed by his authority; yet again, after all this was asserted and re-asserted before the House, the minister gets up again and asks: Does the hon. gentleman assert that I signed it? What a pitiful, wretched, miserable attempt at an explanation. Why, Mr. Speaker, such conduct is worthy alone of a political police court shyster. It was a mere sham, a pretense, and the hon. minister knew it—an absolute sham and pretense intended to convey to this country that that was an unauthorized letter and that the minister was not responsible, when the absolute contrary was the fact. I now come to the question raised by my hon. feirnd from Peel. He asked why he, a member of this House, had not every right which the minister had. Inside these four walls of this chamber what distinction is there, as a matter of right, between he member for Peel and the minister? Have the people of Britain been fighting for centuries for popular rights and are we now to be told that the Crown, through its minister, can claim rights the people do not enjoy? Is that to be the case to-day? Is it to be the case that a minister can take away from the clerk of the House of Commons certain public papers and that that clerk cannot give these papers to the humblest member of this House? Is that what we are to be told by a Liberal government under the ægis of the right hon. gentleman? Are we to be told that a member of this House cannot see an original paper, which is in the possession of the clerk of this House, but that a minister of the Crown—or in other words the Crown itself—can take that paper and say to the House: Oh, you can have a copy but you shall not see the original. Is that the position to-day? Will the hon. gentleman contend for a moment that a minister can take from the custody of the clerk of the House papers which that clerk has in his possession —original papers—and prevent other members having access to them? Has a minister the right to say to the members of this House: You shall no see the original paper, but if you like I will, by my grace and courtesy, give you a copy ? Has it come to that point in a British parliament that we are to be told that that is the sum of our rights—that an hon. gentleman, a minister, can stand up and say: Oh, there is a commission sitting, and I took these papers because that commission might want them. Why, the hon. minister does not dare tell the House that he took these papers for the commission. Did he give them to the commission? Did the commission ask for them? A member of the House wanted to see them, but the minister had taken them from the possession of the clerk. Why, we had a week's discussion not long since upon papers put into the possession of the House, and we were then told by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver)—and I think by the right hon. gentleman himself and other ministers—that they could not allow original papers to go into possession of the clerk because they oculd not be got back again by the department, for the use of the department, without an order of the House. When, however, it suits the minister, when it is convenient, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries can go to the clerk and take the papers out of his possession without our order. That is the point my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) has raised; and the hon. minister has not uttered one solitary excuse, not a word in answer to the charge made against him that he took papers out of the possession of the clerk of this House and thus prevented other members of this House having access to them.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (Leeds). The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) has seen fit to refer to a discussion which took place here on Friday night last and to repudiate altogether a certain letter that was written to Mr. Gregory, agent of the department at Quebec, on the 27th July, 1906. Let me quote that letter again. It is dated July 27th, 1906:

I have to inform you that if you consider that chemical fire extinguishers are necessary on board the vessels of the Quebec agency, you are to purchase them from P. E. Perreault, 312 St. John street, Quebec. Mr. Perreault has been advised to call upon you in connection with this matter.

That was a letter from the department of which the hon. minister is the head, author-

izing Mr. Gregory, if he required any fire extinguishers, to purchase them from Mr. Perreault and stating that Mr. Perreault had been written to.

Then, he quotes here to-night a letter of his own, dated March 12, 1907, and saying that they did not want any fire extinguishers. But before this, the letter of July 27, 1906, had been acted upon and the department had been loaded up with these fire extinguishers. If the minister will turn to the Auditor General's Report, he will find a record, page P—19, showing that Mr. Perreault had sent in an account for eight of these fire extinguishers at $112. Then, at page P—23, 8; page P—36, 8; page P—57, 16; page P—100, 8; page P—104, 4—altogether 52 fire extinguishers bought on the strength of that letter of July 27, 1906, and before the minister wrote his further letter. Then, there was the letter written to Mr. Gregory to know by what authority he purchased these articles, and Mr. Gregory wrote back that he had purchased them 'by authority of your letter of July 27.' If the minister repudiated that letter of July 27, why did he pay the accounts? Why did he not repudiate the accounts also? But the accounts were certified correct, and the Auditor General paid the money. And now the minister gets up and tells us that when the matter came to his notice he wrote this letter of March 12, 1907. But was not this purchase authorized by him? When I speak of the minister, I speak of the department.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) is getting more cautious.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not getting more cautious. Has a Minister of the Crown no responsibility? Why, let the president of a bank say of any act of the bank: This was done by one of the clerks; let the president of any mercantile company say: I did not authorize this, it was the act of one of the clerks or superintendents, and what would be thought of him? Why, we might as well have a sack of wool in the minister's chair if that is all the responsibility he is going to assume. We might as well have a man of putty as a man if he is allowed to repudiate what his deputy does. He kept his deputy there even after this came to his knowledge. I am surprised at the minister saying that he did not write this letter of July 27, 1906. I am satisfied that there is not a deputy in any department who would take it upon himself to write such a letter, for it is a political letter. It simply says: If you consider that chemical fire extinguishers are necessary, you are to purchase them from my friend P. E. Perreault, who has been advised to call upon you. And, of course, the man thus instructed did buy them to the amount of $792. And the minister tells us in his speech that the late government purchased two Babcock engines. Why a Babcock is worth a dozen of these. Everybody knows what a Babcock is. But these little glass-lined things that were sold at $14 to the Department of Marine and $15 to the Department of Public Works are not in the same class at all. They were sold to the Public Works Department through my friend Lemieux, agent for the firm of Patton & Crowe, which was really the firm of Patton & Grant, with no Crowe in it at all. I know something about it, and I received a letter from my friend Lemieux, published in the 'Free Press,' saying that his 'honoured name' should not be dragged in. His 'honoured name!' I will not refer further to this matter, though, if he provokes me much more I will. And the idea of the minister saying that I ran away and was not here when he spoke in answer to me. I never ran away from anybody in this House. There is enough Irish in me that if I am knocked down I will get up and fight again. No minister can bluff me, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries tries to do. And the minister pleads the baby act. He goes to the province of Quebec and says: It is because I am a Frenchman that they attack me.' No one but a baby would make such a plea. And hear him yelping here to-night, and read the speech he made on Friday night. I am surprised that any man professing to be a statesman should resort to such conduct in this House. I will say no more about this at present, but I wanted to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the letter written on July 27, is borne out by the facts in the Auditor General's return, showing that the minister himself purchased 792 of these machines after he wrote that letter to Perreault, and before he wrote the other letter in March, 1907. I say he was responsible for the purchase. No matter who did it in his department or in his agency, it was done with his consent and his knowledge.

Mr. BRODEUR. Does the hon. member mean to say that this purchase was made on my authority and with my consent?

Mr. TAYLOR. I say that this letter was never written by the deputy without his having been authorized to do so by the minister. If a deputy of mine would do it, he would not write a second one. The facts are there. Gregory went on and bought these machines knowing that that letter was authorized by the minister. Besides, Gregory had a private letter, because this letter says, Gregory had been advised of the fact. There is no jury in the world who would acquit the minister and convict the deputy on a statement such as his.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). The matter that has occupied the time of the House to-night, and that some might say has been wasted, might well not have

been wasted if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had been a little more reasonable. He knows that the Prime Minister said that he was anxious to see the truth and the whole truth spread before the House. Why then should he object to the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) and myself looking over that file? If there was nothing to conceal why did the minister take up the time of the House and cause all this hubbub by taking away the papers which the member for Peel thought he should not have done? Why could he not this morning have given this file to the member for Peel?—and I venture to say that in three or four hours the member for Peel would have got all he wanted out of them, and could have handed back the papers to the clerk, and nobody would have suffered from any delay. It seems to me to be childish for the minister to try to avoid showing these papers for a few hours on the pretext that the commission is sitting and his department is preparing papers. If we are to believe the minister that all the contracts are being prepared to go before this commission, does he mean to say that any great delay would have occurred, that anything would have been broken, if for a few hours to-day he had handed these papers over to my hon. friend from Peel and allowed him to look at them?

Mr. BRODEUR. At noon to-day while I was sitting in a committee of this House, I received a letter from the clerk asking me whether I had the file in my possession. I was busy until one o'clock or a quarter past one, in the committee, and as soon as I came into the House at three o'clock, I showed the file to my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. I came up about half-past eight or nine o'clock on Saturday morning and went to the clerk's office thinking I would find the file there, and if I could have seen it for an hour or two, I would have been satisfied. The minister could have avoided all this row if he had furnished us at the proper time the file for inspection. What is meant by inspection? It is sufficient when a minister quotes from a large file, that he shall lay it on the table and then take it off the next minute, or after five minutes, or after half an hour? Inspection means that the member who wishes to see it shall have reasonable time to look over it and familiarize himself with it. The minister comes to-day and makes the matter still worse by taking hold of that file and quoting from still other documents that are in it. For what purpose is the file requested to be placed on the table? That you may see some letter that he quotes? Of course not. What we are discussing is the question of fire extinguishers, this whole file refers to fire extinguishers, and you are not at all in possession of the information when you simply see one, or two, or three letters that the minister chooses to read. What you have a right to do is to look over the file to see whether there is anything that sheds light, and may be gives a contradiction to the gloss the minister himself puts upon it. Is it sufficient to take up a scientific work and read ten lines out of a book of two hundred pages, and then, when any one questions whether you have correctly stated the essence of the book, for you to hand it over to him and say, Well, you can read these ten lines; there they are. That does not satisfy the conditions at all. What he needs to do is to take the sense of the whole document, and to do so he must examine the whole file. After what the House has heard to night it has come to the conclusion that my hon. friend from Peel struck a mare's nest when he read something about an agreement between Mr. Cameron and Mr. Patton with reference to 600 fire extinguishers, and the minister thought he had set it all at rest by declaring that that order was cancelled. I think there is a little more history in this affair than the minister has shown us. I have only had three or four minutes to look over the file, but I find in it a little bit of history that will put a different gloss upon the matter. I find that on December 14, 1901, Mr. A. W. Fraser interests himself in this matter of fire extinguishers. Is there anything in which Mr. Fraser has not interested himself in connection with all these departments? Here we find him and there we find him. Here is what he says:

Hon. James Sutherland,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I am informed that many of the lighthouses under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries are not supplied with any appliances for extinguishing fire, should such occur, and that some of the officers have under consideration the fire extinguisher being sold by Mr. Patton of this city.

That is Ottawa.

As I mentioned to you the other day, Mr. Patton has been a very good friend of the Liberal party——

And here is where it comes in.

——and a liberal one.

Does that mean liberal in the way of political or party doctrine? I will read it again.

Mr. Patton has been a very good friend of the Liberal party and a liberal one.

I take it that that is to be interpreted not in the party sense but in the financial sense. Here is the old principle coming out again—you scratch my back and I will scratch yours; you put money into my pocket and I will give you a little money back for yourself; you give me patronage and I will whack up when it comes to the election.

Therefore I hope you will be able to give him an order——

Because he is a very good Liberal and a very liberal Liberal.

Therefore I hope you will be able to give him an order for at least 100 of these extinguishers. Mr. Patton is quite willing to wait for payment until after your estimates have been voted providing he receives an order, as he can arrange the matter in the meantime.

There is again the old virus. There is again the well known principle which actuates this government. It does not make any difference as to parliamentary appropriations. You give the order, sign the contract, make everything fast as far as the government is concerned, and by and by when you come to the House you will get your money because your men will stand behind you. Mr. Fraser knew that.

I have just learned also that some time ago he supplied some of these extinguishers to the Public Works department and that the order was given during the time Mr. Mulock was acting minister of the department. After you have looked into the matter will you kindly let me know what prospects there are of doing anything for him?

Yours sincerely,
A. W. FRASER.

So much for that, away back in 1901. And then it goes on until we come to the incident that was mentioned by my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) in which it appears that Mr. Patton and Mr. Cameron joined forces. Mr. Cameron was to get an order for 500 or 600 extinguishers and he was to get $2,000 paid to him for getting the order. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is well to inquire who loses by the payment of that $2,000. We know who would pay the $2.000 for getting a proper person to sell to the department. We know who would make the loss. It is so much more that the country has to pay for this go-between. And, who was the go-between? So, that went on and an order was absolutely given to Mr. Cameron. Here it is :

March 9, 1904.

I am to inform you that the department has made a careful examination of the Patton fire extinguisher, and considers that it is suited for the lighthouse service of Canada inasmuch as it will not freeze and being glass lined will not corrode, the acid being hermetically sealed in a bulb.

The department will require six hundred of these extinguishers with materials sufficient to recharge twice, at a cost of $15 each which I am to request you to supply, it being understood that they are to be furnished ready to act and boxed as per sample. No payment to be made until after July 1.

I am sir, your obedient servant.
(Sgd.) F. GOURDEAU,
Deputy Minister Marine and Fisheries.

C. S. Cameron, Esq.,
Manager Patton Fire Extinguisher,
Ottawa.

Mr. FOSTER.

That was the letter issued by the department. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says : Oh. that does not amount to anything, the minister never signed it. But, the department or the minister, who is the head of the department, is absolutely responsible for the order. Well, but the minister says, that order was caught up on the way. That is true ; it was caught up on the way. Shortly after that we have a letter from Charles Patton to one O. E. Culbert, solicitor for the Montreal Fire Extinguisher Company :

Dear Sir,—I hereby agree that in consideration of your organizing a company in the province of Quebec to manufacture and sell my machines to give to such company the right to manufacture and sell my machines and I appoint such company as my attorney and agent in that behalf.

Yours truly,
CHARLES PATTON.

That goes. Then we find on March 22, 1904, this very peculiar letter :

C. S. Cameron, Esq.,
54 Sparks street, Ottawa.

A departmental letter dated 9th March, instant, purporting to order from you some fire extinguishers which the department had decided to order from the Montreal Fire Extinguisher Company, on instructions received by me to that effect, through error, was addressed to you instead of Mr. O E. Culbert representing said company. As the error has come to my knowledge and might create some misunderstanding I hereby make you acquainted with the facts so that you may not consider said letter as an order.

Believe me, yours truly
(Sgd.) R. PREFONTAINE.

The deputy minister was instructed to send out that letter and he did send out that letter to Mr. Cameron. Shortly afterwards there is the following letter :

Ottawa, April 16, 1904.

The Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries,

Dear Sir,—I would like the order for fire extinguishers to be made out to Charles Patton and Mr. Cameron has agreed to this. As we are making our arrangements to-day I would be very greatly obliged if the order could issue this morning. With your permission I shall send a messenger for it.

Faithfuly yours,
O. E. CULBERT.

Then there is this other letter:

April 14 1904.

The Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of the letter from your department dated March 28, 1894, cancelling the order from said department for 600 Patton fire extinguishers dated March 9, 1904, and I agree to the cancellation of the said order. I am also willing that an order should be issued to O. E. Culbert for the said fire extinguishers he having entered into an agreement with me

bearing even date herewith in regard to the same.

Yours truly,
C. S. CAMERON.

April 15, 1904.

To the Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Sir,—I am willing that the order for fire extinguishers should be made out to Charles Patton or to O. E. Culbert, and as these gentlemen would rather have it issued to Mr. Patton I would make it out in his name he having signed the agreement to me with Mr. Culbert.

Yours truly,
C. S. CAMERON.

There is an agreement, first signed by Mr. Culbert, and second, signed by Mr. Patton with Mr. Culbert. Mr. Cameron says: I have made my agreement with these gentlemen and you may send the order to them if you please. The agreement made between these gentlemen, is, as far as I have seen, not on the file. What was that agreement? It is plain enough to me, I think it is plain enough to any one, that by the change Cameron's interest has not been sacrificed, and that, although he did not get the contract himself, there is every probability that his interest has not been sacrificed but that it has been taken care of by these other gentlemen getting it and that the country has paid the amount of the remuneration received by the go-betweens. Well that order was absolutely issued; it was not only issued but here is an acknowledgement of it.

F. Gourdeau, Esq., Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your favour of the 20th instant ordering from me 600 fire extinguishers. I shall fill the order at the earliest date possible. Thanking you for the same, I remain yours,
CHARLES PATTON.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the date of that?

Mr. FOSTER. April 25, 1904. Then we find that Wm. Alexander Cameron and Robert George Cameron doing business under the name of Cameron & Company give a power of attorney to a certain bank and that the bank notifies the department of the power of attorney being given authorizing the payment to the bank of any moneys which are coming on this contract, and so it goes on and on. What else there is I do not know because I have not had time to look into it. Now, I say that puts a different face upon this transaction to what it carried when the Minister of Marine read the partial correspondence. I say that if this laying on the table a document from which you quote is going to be any thing but a farce, you must not only lay the simple quotation but you must lay the whole document upon the table and you must lay it sufficiently long for a person to look into it and become acquainted with all its contents. It looks to me as if this is absolutely as much a document as if it were all printed and put within covers and laid upon the table of this House and used by any man in the House. That it is in manuscript does not prevent its being considered one document for it is the whole history of the fire extinguisher business, and you have got to go into this case as far as 1901 and maybe further in order to show the beginnings which afterwards resulted in this 600 extinguisher order with this very large amount of bonus or of commission which was paid. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, while I quite agree that there is a difference between this and a document coming down by an order of the House, yet it is the property of the House the moment it is put here and no man can take it away and keep another member from having it for a reasonable time to satisfy his own curiosity or desire for information. It seems to me that if there is any virtue at all in the rule which makes a minister put upon the table of the House a document from which he quotes, the virtue must be in it for the reason that it gives the other person to the argument a chance to test the argument, and test the conclusion which was come to by the first gentleman who uses it—the minister in this case. If that had been done there need be no row about it at all. It could have been done if the minister had conceded this paper to my friend (Mr. Blain) and if he wanted to take it back when no one else was using it and use it in his department I think that would not be going much beyond what was right. When it was asked again for the very purpose for which it was in the first place put upon the table of the House I think it would have been well for the minister courteously to have conceded and said: Yes, Mr. Blain, look this over and send it back.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is what I have done. I told the hon. member for Peel that he could see the file as long as he liked.

Mr. FOSTER. Where could he see it?

Mr. BRODEUR. In my room this afternoon.

Mr. BLAIN. At three o'clock?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has no right to dictate where a man is going to peruse these papers. When a paper is laid upon the table of the House the member who wishes to use it uses it where he thinks proper, takes his notes, and when he has done with it he puts it back. If these papers are left on the table of the House my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) would be able to satisfy himself without any very great length of time, and if it were necessary to have them back in the Department of Mar-

ine he would be only too glad to let the minister have them when they were required. But it is pretty perilous to allow a minister any more than any other member to take a paper which was put upon the table of the House in accordance with the rules and allow the minister to come and take it away and refuse to give it back again. I think that is not courteous to the House and I do not believe it comes within the rule of the House which if it means anything must mean that it gives reasonable time for a member to look into a document from which quotations have been made. With reference to the letters; looking at page 79 of the report I would have done exactly as my hon. friend from Leeds did. There are five letters referred to on that page, the first one is :

July 27, 1906.

I have to inform you that if you consider that chemical fire extinguishers are necessary on board the vessels of the Quebec agency, you are to purchase them from P. E. Perreault, 312 St. John street, Quebec. Mr. P. has been advised to call upon you in connection with this matter.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is there a copy of that advice on the file.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I saw that letter on the file.

Mr. BRODEUR. You had better quote it because the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) does not believe it yet.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not an assertion which comes very gracefully from my hon. friend. I think he had better treat his fellow members a little differently.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) did not seem to believe it.

Mr. FOSTER. To-night I noticed that the minister referred to my hon. friend from Leeds as 'that man' and 'the man.' You might as well call him the hon. member for so and so.

Mr. PATERSON. Do you always remember these little courtesies ?

Mr. FOSTER. I am generally very courteous to the members of this House.

Mr. PATERSON. Sometimes.

Mr. FOSTER. I try to be. Then, under date October 8, 1906, Gregory writes about fire extinguishers bought from Perreault, and on October 12, there is another letter from the deputy. I would have done the same thing as my friend from Leeds did ; I would have thought that the first letter was a letter from the minister himself or written by the minister's authority and I could not have come to any other conclusion. The second letter shows it was from Gregory, the third letter shows it was a letter from the deputy, the next one shows it is a letter from Gregory and the next one is a quotation from Gregory's letter. Maybe the fault was that the commissioner was not explicit enough or he would have said that that first letter was a letter from the deputy but on the face of it it appears to be a letter from the minister himself or written by authority of the minister. Anyway the contention is absolutely good that where orders are made in a case of this kind if they are made by the deputy minister they are made with the authority of the minister.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I do not profess to be an authority on this matter, but I wish to say a word as to how it strikes me in view of what Mr. Speaker has laid down, not as a ruling but in a general way. It does seem to me that what he says must commend itself to the good sense of the House. Complaint was made that a document which had been laid on the table had been taken away by the hon. gentleman who had laid it on the table.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will allow me just there. I do submit to him that that would have no force in the argument at all. You might have an original paper brought down by the order of the House, and it might be lost ; but that would be no argument that thereafter no original paper should be brought down. Now, this might be lost. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is a lawyer, and I will venture to say that if any advocate would endeavour to prove before a court of law on the evidence which he has adduced tonight, that an original paper in the Markey case was lost by a member of the opposition, no one would depreciate that argument more quickly than the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The evidence does not form a perfect chain. Has he proved that the 'Hansard' reporter put that original back again, after it was read by a member of the opposition, into the hands of the opposition ? He does not prove it ; he assumes that it was done. But I myself have lost documents between my handing them over to the 'Hansard' and their not getting them back to me. They are very careful, and in the main I get them all back ; but instance after instance has occurred of their having unaccountably gone astray.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is not the point of the objection. The point of the objection was that it was lost anyway, however it was lost.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose a dozen papers are lost, do you found on that fact an argument that thereafter neither the government nor a minister shall bring down original papers ?

Mr. PATERSON. The file from which quotations were made is in the custody of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; it being in his custody, he is entitled to take care of it. The House has power to order that that file be produced, and if the House so orders, it comes down in obedience to that order, becomes a matter of record, and goes into the charge of Mr. Clark, who becomes responsible for it. Going into his possession in that formal, constitutional way, it would require an order of the House to release it. Has that file come into the possession of the member who has it now or of the hon. member for Peel in that constitutional way? They will not say that it has. It came into their possession for this reason, that the Minister of Marine had quoted from one or two documents in it. If I understand it, the hon. member for Peel or the hon. member for North Toronto might demand, and would be entitled under the rules of the House, that the Minister of Marine should take from that file the documents which he had quoted from and lay them on the table.

Mr. FOSTER. These are not documents upon documents; they are pages of one document.

Mr. PATERSON. Precisely; but the hon. gentleman will not say that because one letter has been used as an argument, in a file containing the papers of years, and because as a matter of courtesy, at the personal request of a member, the minister allows him to have the whole of the file to look at, there is any power that would compel him to do it? The fact that he handed that file as a matter of courtesy to a member did not impose upon the clerk of the House the necessity of guarding it, as would have been the case had it been brought down in response to a formal order of the House.

Mr. BLAIN. The clerk of the House understood it as such, because I was only able to obtain the document from him on the understanding that I would return it so that he might lock it up after the House adjourned.

Mr. PATERSON. I can understand that the clerk, finding a valuable file on the table, would be anxious that it should be taken care of. But the hon. member for Peel claims that the clerk was permitted to give that file back to the minister who laid it on the table only on a formal order of the House to do so. If that is so, it seems to me that it could only come into the constitutional possession of the clerk as the result of a formal motion to lay it on the table. Surely if the action of the House is requisite in the one case it is in the other. If the minister in an informal manner lays a document on the table, can he not in the same informal manner withdraw it?

Mr. BARKER. After quoting part of the papers?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes. I grant that he would be required to leave on the table the papers which he quoted from out of that file. That would not be a matter of courtesy, but a matter of right; but he would not be bound to lay the whole file on the table.

Mr. BLAIN. But he did lay it on the table.

Mr. PATERSON. He laid it on the table in an informal way, retaining his right of control over it. Is the Minister of Marine not at liberty to take that file away to-night?

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman want my answer? If I ask the minister, not as a matter of courtesy to me, but as a matter of right, after he has exercised his own right of quoting from that document and basing his argument upon it, to lay it on the table of the House, I have a perfect right to take the document and keep it for the reasonable time that is necessary for me to look up that which he quoted and everything cognate to it within the file.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not suppose that Mr. Speaker is to be asked for his decision on that point; but I would be pleased to know whether that is the rule or not. I admit that papers quoted from must go into the possession of the House as a matter of course; but the whole file, which was laid on the table in an informal way, and at the request of a member, must not go into the posession of the House unless with the consent of the hon. gentleman who places it before the House, and does so with the understanding that it is to be looked at, but is not to leave his possession. He certainly has a right to take it back, if he sees fit to do so.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). If the hon. minister's contention be correct, that all that is necessary to be laid on the table is the letter the minister quoted from, how would the House be informed of the fact that an order of the minister had been cancelled?

Mr. PATERSON. Is there any rule for more?

Mr. SPROULE. I think so.

Mr. PATERSON. Read it.

Mr. SPROULE. I was going to submit this. If the point made by the Minister of Customs be correct, suppose an order had been given and then cancelled, and afterwards renewed, the House would be then misled into the supposition that that order had never been given. In this instance, one portion of a state document said the order had been cancelled; but afterwards, as the

hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has pointed out, that same order had been given to another individual, of the same interested parties. By not producing the whole file, the House would then be misled into the belief that the order had never been given. You see therefore, if you give only one letter and not all the documents, how inconvenient that would be and how the House might be deceived. Does the hon. minister not think that in pursuance of our undoubted practice—and that I regard as authority—when a minister quotes a document that document has to be laid on the table, and it has to be laid there for a purpose. What purpose ? It is not that every member shall have an opportunity of informing himself with regard to it, and does that not imply that a reasonable time must be allowed members to examine that paper ? Can that opportunity be given when the paper is laid on the table a few minutes and before the discussion is through it is taken away, or before those who desire to see it have an opportunity of doing so. Does not the rule imply that there shall be a reasonable time given to allow the whole House to examine the document ?

Mr. PATERSON. I think not.

Mr. SPROULE. If not, then I do not know what rights this parliament has.

Mr. PATERSON. I am not questioning the right of parliament to ask for public documents and to get them. If the hon member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was not satisfied, if he thought there were more papers on that file which he would like to see, he would move for them. I am simply speaking on the point of putting the documents in the possession of the House in the proper way.

Mr. SPROULE. The rule and the practice, as I take it, is that when public papers which are quoted by a minister of the Crown, are required to be produced for the information of the House—not the information of any individual member—in order to come to a correct conclusion upon the question, they must be laid on the table so that all can examine them.

Mr. PATERSON. Precisely.

Mr. SPROULE. And not one portion of the papers but the whole of them.

Mr. PATERSON. The document quoted from, which the minister has in his possession, has to be laid on the table, so that all the other members may have the same knowledge of it that the minister has. Might I ask the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) now? There were one or two letters quoted from a file the other day by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Suppose, instead of having the file before him, he had simply the two letters, could you require the whole file to be laid on the table or just the two letters?

Mr. FOSTER. The minister might read the two letters, but if any hon. member came to the conclusion that it would be well to know whether those were the only two letters with reference to the subject, he could put the question. And if the minister replied that there were other letters. any hon. member would have the right to insist on his bringing down the whole correspondence.

Mr. PATERSON. Would the minister have to lay the whole file on the table without a motion being made ordering it to be produced?

Mr. FOSTER. He could not lay anything on the table that he did not have in his immediate possession.

Mr. PATERSON. But would an individual member have a right, on his mere request, to have the original file laid on the table?

Mr. FOSTER. Under those circumstances?

Mr. PATERSON. Under any circumstances. If the minster had brought to the House simply the two letters from which he quoted, is there any rule which would compel him to lay on the table, not only those two letters, but any others? The letters he quoted, any hon. member might insist on his laying them on the table. But suppose the file were not here and a member would say there must be other letters which the minister has not read, would he not require to make a motion in order to have the file produced?

Mr. FOSTER. What I would do first would be to ask the minister to bring them down.

Mr. PATERSON. Would he be bound to bring them down?

Mr. FOSTER. Not unless he had an order of the House. But if he only read two letters out of the whole correspondence, any member could ask him to be kind enough to bring down the rest, and in nine cases out of ten the minister would consent. Of course he might refuse, and in that case I would make a motion.

Mr. PATERSON. The minister might do as an act of courtesy, just what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries did. The file was in his possession and could be taken away by him, with the exception of the documents he quoted from which must be laid on the table.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Minister of Customs has probably been as long here as any hon. member in this House. Under ordinary circumstances, I would be inclined to accept his opinion, but I am afraid I can-

not do so in this instance. He does not seem to realize that once documents have been laid on the table of this House, they are in the possession of the House. Let me read what I understand is an authority on the matter we are discussing:

It has been laid down by the highest authority that when a minister of the Crown quotes a public document in the House and founds upon it an argument or assertion, that document, if called for, ought to be produced.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is the document?

Mr. PATERSON. The document that is quoted.

Mr. HENDERSON. Suppose the Minister of Marine and Fisheries read half a letter, would he only be obliged to produce that half?

Mr. PATERSON. He would be obliged to produce that half certainly.

Mr. HENDERSON. Nothing more. according to my hon. friend the Minister of Customs.

Mr. PATERSON. He would put the whole document from which he quoted.

Mr. HENDERSON. If my hon. friend is right, he would have the right to cut that document in two and just place one-half on the table. He must be consistent. Surely the meaning of the rule is that, in a case of this kind, the whole file must be produced from which the minister quoted, just as he would have to produce the whole of a letter, and not merely the portion he read.

Mr. BRODEUR. Even if the file should refer to a subject absolutely different from the one under discussion? The other night a document was quoted relating to the purchase of some fire extinguishers from Mr. Perreault. Because that document was quoted, was the minister obliged to bring down the whole file containing the dealings of the department with reference to fire extinguishers?

Mr. BLAIN. Is there any other correspondence on the file except that relating to the purchase and sale of fire extinguishers?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is a file concerning fire extinguishers but the point brought up by the hon. member for Leeds was whether a certain letter had been signed by me or not, and that letter had to be produced.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think we have drifted entirely away from the question as to who signed the letter before the controversy came up about placing on the table the file in question. From my experience in this parliament, I would have no hesitation in saying that the ordinary rule is that when a file of papers is quoted from, even if only one letter in it be quoted, the whole file must be produced in order that the House may be able to judge whether there are any other letters to throw light on the subject. What is the object of placing a document on the table after it has been read? After an hon. member has heard a document read he knows all about that particular document. But he asks that the file be laid on the table in order that he may ascertain whether there is anything else in it bearing upon the question or not. That, to my mind, is what occurred in this instance.

Mr. PATERSON. But if the file was not in the House at all?

Mr. HENDERSON. But the hon. gentleman quoted from the file, and I maintain that the file itself is the 'document' referred to in the rule of Dr. Bourinot. Certainly, I cannot put any other construction upon it. I look upon it, as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has said, the same as if it were a bound volume. Suppose that these letters had been printed and bound in a book, and suppose the hon. gentleman had read from that book, would not he be obliged to lay the whole book on the table? And what is the difference, whether it is printed in a book and bound, or fastened together in the ordinary way of a file of letters in one of the departments? The minister asks: How if there are other subjects referred to in that file? But I understand that the practice in every department is to have a file for each subject. Certainly, that is what must be done if the business of the department is to be properly looked after; and that, I assume, is the case here. I understand that these letters refer to the one matter which we have been speaking about, and, if so, I can see no good reason for disconnecting one from the other. What right would even the minister have to open that file and take out a letter? I question very much the propriety of it. To my mind, a file is sacred, and, if this government went out of power today that file should be left in its entirety, no single document being taken from it. Therefore, it would be impossible for the minister to lay one letter on the table without laying the whole on the table. If we apply reason and common sense to this question, we shall come to a better conclusion than by treating it in a technical way—and the treatment suggested is very technical to my mind. I express my opinion candidly, and I am perfectly serious in this matter. I think that the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) was quite entitled to have possession of the file on Saturday morning, or at such time as he desired. I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made a mistake in going to the clerk, and asking, or demanding that the file should be handed over to him.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am sure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) wishes to be fair

to me. Therefore, will he permit me a word at this point? The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) had that file for the whole evening, and was asked if he would be through with it that evening, and he said he would.

Mr. BLAIN. No.

Mr. BRODEUR. I sent some one to him, and I certainly understood that he had said so.

Mr. BLAIN. No.

Mr. BRODEUR. Will the hon. gentleman state what he did say?

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister must not put words in my mouth. I asked the clerk for the file and it was given me with the understanding that I should return it to him before the close of the sitting, he saying that he must have it to lock it up in his safe.

Mr. BRODEUR. Will the hon. gentleman deny that he told me, in the 'Hansard' reporters' room, that he would probably need the file after eight o'clock, and would give it back to me. Does he deny that?

Mr. BLAIN. I am not here either to state or deny——

Mr. BRODEUR. Does the hon. gentleman deny it?

Mr. BLAIN. I do deny it emphatically; I never made such a statement. I never had such a thought in my mind, and the minister knows that very well.

Mr. BRODEUR. Let us make this clear: The hon. gentleman denies formally that, after six o'clock, in the 'Hansard' reporters' room, after I showed him the letters on the file, he said he would require it after eight o'clock, but he would give it to me after he was through.

Mr. BLAIN. That is an entirely different story. I told the clerk——

Mr. BRODEUR. No, I am speaking of what happened in the 'Hansard' reporters' room——

Mr. SPEAKER. It is impossible to allow the discussion to go on in this way. An hon. member has the floor and unless he gives way——

Mr. HENDERSON. I am perfectly willing to give way, Mr. Speaker; but I do not wish to be deprived of my right.

Mr. BLAIN. What I say is this: The minister laid the file upon the table at my request. When I applied to the clerk for the file, the clerk said I could have it with the distinct understanding that I was to return it to him so that he could lock it up in his safe, as it was in his custody—that was the understanding he had. I took the file and went over it for an hour or two and returned it with the expectation that I should have an opportunity to get it again on Monday morning. But when I applied to the clerk for it, he told me that the minister had taken it away. He kept it all the rest of Friday, Saturday and Sunday and had not returned it up to three o'clock to-day. I said to the clerk that I would expect him to get it back from the minister, as it was in the custody of the House, and he said he would communicate with the hon. gentleman. He tried to get the minister by telephone, but was unable to do so. He then wrote a letter, asking the minister to return the file, but the minister had not returned it up to three o'clock. I asked the clerk if the file had been placed on the table at three o'clock, and he told me it had not. A few minutes after, the minister sent for me to go to his room. He said, 'Here is the file; what do you want from it?' I said that I did not know exactly, but I wanted him to return it to the clerk——

Mr. BRODEUR. Is that all the hon. gentleman said?

Mr. BLAIN. I said to the minister then that if he would bring the original file back to the clerk, I would not mention it in the House. That was my position. I wished to deal fairly with the minister, which I have done. But I may say the minister has not dealt fairly with me, and I will take another opportunity to refer to the matter.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have very little more to add on this question. If any further evidence is required to show that the rule applies to the whole file and not to one particular letter that may happen to have been read, it is the fact brought out by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that letter after letter, a continuation of letters, relating to this same matter is contained in the file. Surely, we cannot dissociate these other letters from the one read by the minister. They all go to constitute one document, and in no way can I understand the rule laid down by Bourinot unless it be applied as I have indicated.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask the indulgence of the House for a moment, to correct in the same 'Hansard' that it will appear in what appears to have been a mis-statement or not a full statement by the minister concerning these fire extinguishers bought in 1891. He stated that the old government, in 1891, bought two Babcock extinguishers at $30 each. He made other comments, that I will not allude to. What he did not state was this, that before these were bought, communication was had, both with Great Britain and the United States, and there is on file here a statement from F. A. Mahan, captain of engineers of the United States artillery, saying that they had called for competition and got the prices of some Babcock machines, and that as a result of

the competition they had taken six machines at $31.40 each. The price paid by the Marine Department here for these, after that report of the engineer, was $25 each.

DOKIS INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. GEO. H. PERLEY (Argenteuil). Before you leave the chair I would like to say a few words with reference to an advertisement that has appeared lately with regard to a sale of the timber on a certain reserve on the French river known as the Dokis Indian reserve in the province of Ontario. I will read the first part of it :

There will be offered for sale by public auction, at an upset price, in the Russell House, in the city of Ottawa, on Wednesday, the 24th day of June, 1908, at the hour of ten o'clock in the forenoon, timber berths numbered 1 to 8 inclusive, covering the pine timber of nine inches diameter and over at the stump, and no other, on the whole of the Dokis Indian reserve, situate on the French river in the province of Ontario.

Each limit will be offered separately at a bonus, ten per cent of which to be paid in cash on day of sale, and notes to be given for the remainder, payable in three, six and nine months, at the Bank of Montreal, in the city of Ottawa, with interest at six per cent.

And there are other conditions of sale. With regard to this matter I asked a question, which was answered in the House last Thursday, on page 7735 of the 'Hansard.' In this answer it is stated that the notice regarding this sale was sent out from the department to certain newspapers, beginning in the 9th of April, and the list of newspapers is given. I may say that although the notice was said to be inserted in the newspapers at that date, I received a notice from the deparment only on the 23rd of April. The list of newspapers is quite large ; of course they all appear to be Liberal newspapers. I do not know why this should be a matter of patronage to newspapers supporting the government, because it is a matter of business, and I fancy that every man in this House will agree that Conservatives are just as likely to buy these limits as Liberals. I think it would have been wiser for the government to advertise this sale in some Conservative newspapers, because some Conservatives do not take Liberal newspapers. I notice by this advertisement that the government propose to put an upset price on these limits. I desire to say that I think a reserve bid is much more effective in the selling of such a property than an upset price. Naturally many bidders, when they reach the upset price which has been made known before the sale, will not go any further ; whereas with a reserve bid, which is not made known to the bidders, there have been many instances in which limits have been sold for a great deal more money than the reserve bid. A reserve bid tends to bring a higher price from the bidders, because the limit purchasers naturally will be affected when they reach the upset price. With regard to the terms of payment, I find they have been made very easy in that only ten per cent of the bonus is to be paid in cash. This is a most unusual provision, because it is customary that from one-quarter to one-third of the bonus shall be paid in cash at the time of the sale, or within a few days afterwards. With regard to the notice of the sale of these limits, I may say frankly that at the proper season of the year the time allowed between the notice of sale and the auction would be sufficient, provided the lines between the different berths had been already surveyed. In the province of Ontario more notice is given than two months and a half. It is better to make the notice too long than too short. But this particular notice has been given at a most unfortunate time of the year. Frome the 9th of April when this notice was sent out, up to the present moment, it has been practically impossible for any person to go and examine that country. We all know that when spring comes on no one can get about in these woods, because there is still a good deal of snow on the land and ice on many of the lakes, and a person cannot go about either on snowshoes or by canoe. Therefore this notice is of no avail whatever up to the present time. The latter part of the month of May is usually a good time to travel in the country, but the Prime Minister will realize another objection when I say that there is no season of the year when there is as much danger of fire from prospectors as in the month of May. As soon as the snow is gone and the leaves get dry, there is more danger of fire than at any other season. For that reason also an unfortunate time has been selected for the sale of these limits. Then when the month of June comes on the flies get bad, and it is almost impossible for anybody to make a proper survey of the limit on account of the flies. Why the government should have chosen this particular time to give this notice I cannot understand, because it is the most unfortunate period in the whole year.

Now, the picking out of this time seems most peculiar for many reasons. I notice that the surrender by the Indians of their rights to this timber and the authorization of the notice of sale were dated January 7, 1908. The Minister of the Interior recommended to council on February 20, 1908, that this surrender should be accepted and that the limits should be sold. The copies which I have do not show whether the order in council passed at that time for that purpose. But, if the sale could have been advertised in February then the number of weeks' notice given would have been amply sufficient. This timber is most valuable. It has been talked about by all the lumbermen

in this part of the country, to my certain knowledge for twenty five years. The old chief of these Indians who died, I think last year, always refused absolutely to agree to the sale of this timber, but, at certain times, the rumor would get about, that this timber was going to be sold. Therefore, it is not a new thing, it is something which has been in the eye of the lumbermen, at any rate, if not in the public eye, for twenty-five years at least. The Indians, having at last signed the surrender of their rights and having permitted the sale of this property, I submit that it is most extraordinary that after all these years of discussion, such a short notice should be given of the sale of this valuable property which, I am informed, will bring many hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Mr. FOSTER. If they get the proper price.

Mr. PERLEY. If they give a proper chance to the people to examine it and bid upon it. On Thursday last I put a series of questions to the government and I desire particularly to call attention to No. 4 :

Have the lines been run on the ground dividing the said reserve into the different timber berths which are advertised to be sold separately?

There are eight different berths within this Dokis reserve. I think there are about fifty miles of country altogether and it is proposed by the government to divide it up into eight berths. The answer which I received is as follows :

No, but a surveyor has been instructed to do the work, and it is expected that he will be on the ground this week.

That is the part of this proposed sale to which I most strongly object and for which I think there is no justification whatever. The department sends out a blue print of this reserve showing it divided into eight berths which they propose to sell separately, but these lines have not been surveyed on the ground and any one knows that it is impossible for any cruiser or bush ranger to go there and make a proper estimate of each one of these berths unless there is a line for him to go by so that he may know what he is doing. In a property of this kind which is worth such a lot of money, a very small variation in these lines would make a very great difference in the value of berths as compared with what it might be before and after the lines were actually run. With reference to the manner in which the advertisement was sent out, this was what was sent out to me from the department—a little clipping from a newspaper and a blueprint. Nothing is said to show that these lines have not been run. I do not happen to be personally interested in this matter. I have no intention of bidding on or buying in this property, but a person who received this notice from the department would naturally take it for granted that these lines were run, he would send his men to examine that timber and if he did so they could not make a report on which he could bid for these different berths when they came up for sale.

Mr. McCOOL. Does not that blue-print state that it is a proposed sketch of the survey ?

Mr. PERLEY. It says 'sketch showing timber berths in the Dokis Indian reserve, French river, Ontario, scale 3 miles to the inch.' At the bottom it says 'approximate areas.' It says nothing as to whether the lines are run or not.

Mr. McCOOL. That would show that they are not surveyed.

Mr. PERLEY. The hon. member for Nipissing knows full well that no one selling a limit guarantees the areas. Here it says 'Approximate areas.' If the ordinary expression had been used, it would say 'more or less.'

Mr. McCOOL. Yes, but that is not the approximate area.

Mr. PERLEY. I submit that the words 'approximate area' and 'so many miles, more or less' mean the same thing. Under these conditions a man who did not know that these lines had not been run would send his men up there to examine this country and they would be unable to present such a report as would enable him to bid on these different berths. The government, in this matter, are trustees for the Indians ; they should give every opportunity for the proper examination of this country in order that it may bring all that it is worth and I submit that no person selling this property for himself would give a notice at this time of year and without having the lines run. The government themselves cannot put an upset price on these limits without having the lines run, but perhaps they can do that later on themselves if they get anybody who will undertake to do the work in the month of June and I presume that they cannot have it done before that.

In regard to the circumstances connected with the surrender of this reserve, which certainly, from the papers, seem to have been very peculiar, I do not propose to speak this evening, but probably they will be brought up later on in the session. I simply rose at this time, before it is too late, to call the attention of the government to this matter. I regret very much that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) is not here this evening. I gave him notice today that I was going to speak on this but I have been unable to get a chance until this late hour. I want to urge upon the government——

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) waited

until nearly eleven o'clock when, thinking that it would not come up, he went home.

Mr. PERLEY. I quite understand, it is unfortunate, but I want to urge upon the Minister of the Interior and the government, before it is too late, to extend the time for this auction sale in order to give people who wish to bid a proper and reasonable chance to go and examine that country after the lines have been run on the field dividing these valuable berths one from the other. I thought that if it were brought to the attention of the government now they might act in the matter and as this property has been talked about and known for so many years, why should not the government be willing to wait a reasonable time before putting it up for auction sale and thus give every person, who might think that he would like to bid on these limits, a chance to know their full value in order that they may bring all that they are worth. In that conection I would like to ask that the copies of the balance of the file to this date be brought down. This is reference No. 233 and the papers were asked for by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). As the Minister of the Interior is not here I would like to ask that copies of the balance of the papers in connection with this matter may be brought down promptly in order that we may have a chance to discuss the question a little more fully at some other time.

Mr. C. A. McCOOL (Nipissing). I am rather surprised to hear the hon. member for Argenteuil, than whom there is probably no more practical lumberman in this country, take exception to the method of advertising this limit. I may say in the first place that the surrender was obtained from the Indians on the distinct understanding that they would not have to bear the fire risk during next season. That was the reason why a longer time was not given for the sale. However, there cannot possibly be any injury done to anybody, neither to the Indians nor to prospective buyers by reason of the length of time that will be available for exploring after the lines are run, because there are only altogether about 12 miles of line to run to divide the berths. Even from the blue print, anyone looking at No. 1 and No. 2 berths will see there is almost a natural line as there are two bays there one almost directly opposite the other. I think the line is only about a quarter of a mile across and it would only make a difference of a few trees anyway. I have been informed that a number of lumbermen are already on the ground. This reserve is well known and its value as a timber limit is well known also. The lumbermen have been trying to get a surrender from the late chief for years, but he always objected. There is not much wonder that he did object because he could look back at a time when an almost equally valuable timber limit was sold by our friends on the other side of the House for the sum of three hundred and some odd dollars, to prominent politicians in this city. The chief naturally feared that something similar would happen had he consented to surrender the timber on this reserve. The lines will be completed and there will still be six weeks time to travel that country. It is not 100 miles out from civilization; a man can leave here on the midnight train and be on the reserve the next evening. The Indians were given a positive pledge by the Indian agent who got the surrender, that they would not have to bear the fire risk this season.

Mr. PERLEY. There is nothing in the agreement with the Indians to that effect.

Mr. McCOOL. There was an understanding which is just as binding as an agreement. There was a pledge given and were it not that the Indians have confidence in the agent that surrender could not have been obtained. There have been deputations of lumbermen as well as officers sent by the department, both by this government and previous governments, to that reserve to try and get a surrender not only in the interests of the lumber trade but in the interests of the Indians themselves because of the danger of that country being swept by fire, but hitherto the Indians refused to sell. There is no question at all about it but that that country will bring a very large amount of money. I would not like to risk an opinion because I have not examined the timber and know nothing about it except from hearsay, but the general expectation is that it will realize something in the neighbourhood of $1,000,000. I believe that when the sale comes on the day mentioned, it will be found that no mistake has been made as to the time and the competition will prove whether people have had time to explore it or not. There is only about 43 miles in it altogether and about one-third of the whole territory in which the line is almost marked out now. This is an island and it narrows down by two bays opposite each other to about a quarter of a mile in width, so that there is no trouble in any bushman travelling that part of it even without a line. A man could not make a mistake of $500 worth in the difference between where the line will be and where he would plant it himself by looking at a blue print sketch.

Mr. PERLEY. What about the other six berths.

Mr. McCOOL. It means 10 or 12 miles of a line at the outside which would mean 10 or 12 days of a surveyor. The surveyor, who has been ordered to go there is well accustomed to that kind of work; he has been doing it all his lifetime and is a very capable man. He certainly will run all

these lines in 12 days, so that there will be six weeks time to travel 43 miles.

Mr. PERLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. McCOOL. Oh, yes, and even if there was only one month it is ample time. Having regard to the pledge given the Indians there was no possibility of extending the time and keeping faith with them. I happen to know about that, because I was instrumental in getting the agent appointed as I had every confidence in him and one of the reasons why I wanted him appointed was in order to get the surrender of this and another reserve. I felt that it would be for the benefit of the Indians as well as for the benefit of the whole country, because the timber surrounding has been cut and the limit was in very great danger from fire and of course if it was burned it would be no good to the Indians or any one else. As to the terms, they are exactly the terms given by the Ontario government in all their large sales. That is, with the exception that the present Ontario government have lately been selling by the thousand feet instead of by the mile, and they take the risk of fire. The purchaser may leave that timber standing until a year before the term of the lease expires, and then he can go in and cut and in the meantime they put up a small deposit and the government takes all risk. There was the sale of a township at the head of Garden river a short time ago where $10.52 per 1,000 feet board measure was obtained for the limit and $2 dues making $12.52, and it was held up as being a tremendous sale. But you must take into consideration that the government carried the fire risk for 15 years, or rather for 14 years because the timber could be cut in the last year. In the present instance the intention is that the Indians will not have to take the fire risk but that the purchaser of the timber will. With regard to an upset price or a reserve bid, I do not know that there is very much difference between the two. I do not know that the up-set price means that the price is to be made public. I doubt very much if it is. It does not necessarily have to be told to the auctioneer until the sale is in progress. I do not quite understand why the hon. member (Mr. Perley) said the upset price was to be made public for I am quite sure such is not the intention of the Minister of Indian Affairs. If I understand it aright an upset price means the same thing as a reserve bid. You can rest satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that there is no such thing as the upset price being made public at all ; the upset price is to be made known to the auctioneer at the time of the sale and not before.

Mr. PERLEY. If the hon. gentleman bought the right from the Indians on the 7th of January, and would probably sell, would he have had those lines run before this time, or would he have waited to have them run within a month of the sale ?

Mr. McCOOL. Does the hon. gentleman sate that the government were in a position to advertise it in January ? My information is that they were not. My information is that there was not one minute lost from the time of the surrender until it was advertised. There were some conditions put in the surrender which were not satisfactory, and these were only arranged later. That is my information. I am quite sure that the government were not in a position to advertise the sale in January.

SPRING FLOODS.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Mr. Speaker, before we go into Supply, I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to a very serious matter. I have been notified this evening by telephone that a dam belonging to the government at Valleyfield has broken and the waters of Lake St. Francis are overflowing to such an extent that barns, stables and even dwellings are threatened to be carried away, and the people are fleeing from the place. I would ask the hon. Minister to send an engineer to-morrow morning to see what can be done. Lake St. Francis is a part of the St. Lawrence river.

Mr. R. N. WALSH (Huntingdon). Mr. Speaker, in this connection I would like to bring up the matter that I spoke of the other day, namely, the breaking away of a portion of the same embankment at Ste. Barbe in the county of Huntingdon. After the embankment broke this year I addressed a letter to the minister in regard to the matter. The land there is splendid farming land, and the people bought it and cultivated it believing that the government would protect the embankment. This break occurred at a time when the farmers were ready to put in their grain. I would urge the minister to get a report from his engineer in regard to making the embankment secure so that the people will not be drowned out every year.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The question raised by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) is a very serious one. The difficulty this year is that the water in the St. Lawrence is higher by several feet than it has been in the memory of the oldest residents along the river. We have been notified that thousands of dollars of damage has been done in the Thousand Islands owing to the water having risen above high-water mark. I will act on the suggestion of my hon. friend and send a man down to-morrow morning to see what can be done. With regard to the matter mentioned by the hon. member for Huntingdon,

it is difficult to say what can be done in this exceptional year; but in an ordinary year protection ought to be afforded.

CUSTODY OF ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the Prime Minister if after hearing the somewhat lengthy discussion on the fire extinguisher matter to-night, he will consult his Minister of Marine, and have all the original documents laid on the table, so that the members may examine them at a later day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I thought that after all that had been said on the subject it had been exhausted, and that there was nothing more to be said.

THE NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, before we go into Supply, I beg to call attention to a dispatch which I find to-day in the Toronto 'World' and which is also published in the Toronto 'Mail.' It purports to come from Montreal and reads as follows:

Will the government come down to parliament and admit that a mistake has been made in the location of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway hundreds of miles north of the big cities, instead of starting from North Bay or thereabouts, thus easily tapping Montreal and Toronto?

This is a question a good many wise men are asking here to-day. One thing is certain, there is a big 'something' in the wind.

The Grand Trunk noon train to-day brought down Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Hon. Sydney Fisher and Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, and it was soon evident that the mission was an important one.

Of course the matter of an interview with Premier Gouin was readily admitted, and as a matter of fact this interview took place, but the meeting between Mr. Hays and the Prime Minister was of another kind.

Those who are familiar with the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific officials declare that a grievous apprehension of coming difficulties has settled down upon both for some reason or other, and the statement is made that the trouble is all over what is said to have been the awful blunder made in the location of the transcontinental away from the freight and passenger producing centres of the country.

It has now become painfully evident to the ministers and company alike—so the story goes—that Fitzpatrick and Parent must have intentionally or no, pulled the wool over their colleagues' eyes, and to-day the latter are committed to what one man styled 'the most stupendous blunder ever perpetrated in this or any other country.'

A prominent railway man said to-day that he had never yet understood why Toronto and Montreal looked on with so much apathy and indifference while the matter was before parliament.

'But,' he said (and his name if divulged would carry tremendous weight, both in parliament and the country), 'even at this late hour Sir Wilfrid should face the situation, admit the error and put the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific right before the country and posterity.'

It is a well-known fact here that all concerned are greatly worried, and it only remains to be seen if the proper parties will have the courage to grapple with the question of the modified route in the way that it should be grappled with.

I have to say that whoever penned that paragraph for the press had not even a shadow of reason for so writing. That there has been any hesitation or doubt as to the proper location of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway has never come to my knowledge or even been hinted to me or expressed in any way. When it is said that 'all concerned are greatly worried,' I have to say that we are not worried at all, and that the matter referred to has not engaged the attention of any one so far as I know. The statement that I went to Montreal for the purpose of interviewing somebody in respect to this matter is also another fallacy. I do not know for what purpose this statement is published—evidently to create suspicion in the minds of somebody and to arouse Toronto and Montreal, which are not on the line of the railway. If that is not the object of the dispatch, I know not what the object is. But I have to repeat that there is not a shadow of foundation for the statements made.

CUSTODY OF ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS.

Mr. BLAIN. My right hon. friend has no doubt overlooked the question that I put to him in respect to the original documents.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, I have not overlooked it. I thought my hon. friend had exhausted all he had to say on the matter and that the House had also.

Mr. BLAIN. I asked the right hon. gentleman if after hearing this long discussion he would instruct the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay the original documents on the table of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that in accordance with your ruling the minister has laid the papers on the table of the House for the reasonable inspection of members, the same to be returned to him afterwards.

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

Public buildings, Ontario—North Bay public buildings, $17,500.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Petitions were received for the erection of this building from the municipal association, the board of trade, the mayor and some two hundred people. Up-

wards of a dozen properties were submitted to the government's agent, Mr. P. McCool. After examination, he secured options on eight. The department then sent an expert, Mr. Hewitt, to make an examination, and he selected four with the purpose of getting offers. The site finally approved of cost 92 cents per square foot. The next most eligible site was offered at $2.31 per foot. The other sites were low lying, required expensive draining and were not central. The agent reported the price of 62 cents per foot as fair and reasonable. My hon. friend from Nipissing (Mr. McCool) will corroborate my statement when I say that the property acquired by the department for $8,100 was valued by many people at as much as $10,000 and could have been sold afterwards for that sum. It was bought from Mr. William Doran. The site is 66 feet on Queen street and 132 feet on Fraser street.

Mr. FOWLER. Any buildings ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some old buildings.

Mr. FOWLER. It is a large price ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. North Bay is growing rapidly. The next eligible lot was offered at $11,000 or $2.31 per foot.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the population?

Mr. PUGSLEY. At present between 5,000 and 6,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this for post office and custom house?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and an armoury as well. All in one building.

Mr. BERGERON. What will be the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $61,373 including site, heating, electric wiring, fittings, &c.

Mr. FOWLER. Who has the contract ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. W. H. McGillivray and P. Lebel of Ottawa. The contract price is $33,879.

Mr. BERGERON. Were there many tenders?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nine, and the lowest was accepted.

Mr. FOWLER. How much has been done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the 15th December, $33,511.03.

Mr. FOWLER. Who is the inspector?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The clerk of works is Mr. William Martin.

Mr. McCOOL. He is a builder and a practical man.

Mr. FOWLER. That is a departure from the ordinary rule.

Mr. McCOOL. When it was decided to erect a public building there I was asked with regard to the site. I went to North Bay and placed the selection in the hands of the mayor at that time, who is now custom house officer, Mr. William Mackenzie, and the president of the board of trade. The president of the board is a very prominent Conservative politician as well as one of the leading citizens of the place. I asked them to select a number of sites and mark them Nos. 1, 2 and 3 and so on, in order of preference, and I handed them over to a namesake and a cousin of mine in the real estate business. And if any one should inquire as to his fitness for that kind of work, he will find that it was given into proper hands. They handed a list of the sites to Mr. McCool who got options on them and sent them down to the department. The minister sent up a representative and he made a selection. I had nothing whatever to do with it and had no preference for one property over another. The site chosen is considered the most suitable. Mrs. Doran was offered $10,000 for the property for commercial purposes, but she had sufficient interest in the town to give her preference to the department. Her interest was perhaps not altogether unselfish because her son was running one of the large hotels at the time and this site was within reasonable distance of it, and no doubt it would add to the value of his business to have this public building in its immediate vicinity. Otherwise she would not have been justified in taking $1,500 less than other people offered her. $8,500 was the original price but there was a building on it which sold for $400, making the net price $8,100. At that price, the property was the best bargain in North Bay for years. The town is very prosperous. It has a population of not less than 6,000 people at present. When the census was taken, its population was only 2,500, but the country north has increased since the census from 1,300 to 40,000. When this question was up here Friday, I think some hon. member on the other side said that North Bay would not be much after the Toronto-Sudbury line was running. But North Bay will still be North Bay even after that line is built, because there is a tremendous country for which it is the distributing point.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I understand the minister to say that the total contract for the building is $33,000. Does that include heating and lighting ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, that is for the building only.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. With $33,000 for the building and $8,000 for the site, how does the minister make up this $60,000 ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The site cost $8,100; survey of site, legal expenses and clerk of works' salary, 1901-3, paid the contractor to 15th December, 1907, $22,510 ; total pay-

ments, $32,511.03. Amount due on contract, $11,369 ; heating and boilers, $4,500 ; electric wiring and fixtures, $1,500 ; fittings, furniture and lock boxes, $6,000 ; sidewalks, and fencing, $500 ; contingencies and superintendence, $4,993—total, $61,373.03.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is the contractor to receive more than this $33,000 ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There appear to be no extras.

Mr. FOWLER. Is the electric light to be put up by contract ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is not a contract, but an estimate.

Mr. McCOOL. I may state, for the information of the committee—and I am very sory to say it—that the contractor has lost money. The excavation was of very hard rock.

Mr. BERGERON. We ought to get his picture.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister is increasing the wages of the clerk of works to $4 a day. In the discussion we had last week, I did not notice any case in which the pay was over $3 a day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The further we go west the higher wages we have to pay to gentlemen in these positions. In British Columbia we have to pay considerable more.

Mr. BERGERON. You only pay $4 a day in British Columbia, do you not ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, more. I am advised by the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. McCool) that the services of a competent man for this work could not be had for less than $4 a day. In British Columbia we are paying $5.50 and even more.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you pay these men for Sundays ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume so. But I intend to try to make an arrangement in future under which they will not be paid for Sundays. Of course, if you figure it on a monthly basis, it will come to the same thing.

Mr. FOWLER. No, figuring by the day they will not claim wages for Sundays.

Mr. BLAIN. This clerk of works has already received over $600. What does the minister expect the total pay of the clerk of works to be ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am told that the building is about completed, with the exception of the fittings.

Mr. FOWLER. You do not need the services of a clerk of works for the fittings, do you ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think we would require somebody to see to it that the work is done according to the plans and specifications. At all events, we shall soon be able to dispense with his services.

Mr. BLAIN. Was he a contractor or builder ?

Mr. GRAHAM. A builder.

Mr. McCOOL. Yes, and he took contracts occasionally.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will ask to take up again some of these Kingston items. I would ask for a reconsideration of the item for a new gun-shed, with a view to striking it out. A new plan is under consideration by the Militia Department for the erection of a barracks. If that is carried out, the gun-shed would form part of the new building. I move the reconsideration and striking out of the following items :

Kingston—new gun shed, $10,000.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Now, I move the reconsideration and striking out of the following item :

Kingston Artillery park—new guard house, including offices, &c., $8,000.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the object of striking it out?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This would come into the scheme of the new barracks, for which the Department of Militia is going to ask an appropriation, which appropriation, perhaps, will appear in the supplementary estimates of this year.

Mr. FOWLER. I take this opportunity of congratulating the minister on his economy. It appears that the result is to be a very much larger expense.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I move the reconsideration and striking out of the following item:

Kingston—new hospital for 'A' and 'B' batteries, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Now, the following item was allowed to stand:

Kingston, Royal Military College—new servants' quarters, $10,000.

I have some information as to that. The information I have from the deputy minister is that these quarters are for the civil subordinates as well as for the riding school attachment. The building is for four non-commisioned officers and for 12 civil subordinates.

Mr. FOWLER. That doesn't explain anything.

Mr. PUGSLEY. These are for the married men's quarters.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It would be better to leave all the military buildings, because I have not got full information.

Leamington public building, $7,000.

Mr. MARSHALL. How much is going to be spent at Leamington?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is expected that the building will cost about $20,000. This estimate is to purchase land and make a commencement.

Mr. LALOR. Leamington is a small place in the county of Essex. What peculiar claims has the town of Leamington for a post office?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To begin with, the census of 1901 shows a population of 2,451. Then the town of Leamington is second only to Windsor, in the county of Essex, in the extent of its population, and it stands next to Windsor and Walkerville in the amount of revenue derived from the post office, customs and inland revenue. These three services will be accommodated in the new building. In some years the inland revenue has amounted to $14,000. It has a number of factories, and does a large trade in lumber. It is being supplied with natural gas.

Mr. LALOR. I concede that Leamington is a thriving town, but I would like to know what rule is adopted by the department according to which post offices are supplied. It strikes me from the public buildings that I see being voted, that the chief qualification must be that the county shall be represented by a supporter of the government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman had been here when we discussed this matter last, he would have heard that in Sherbrooke, London and Brantford, which places are represented by Conservatives, the government are putting up public buildings. I think the hon. gentleman will find evidence that we are endeavouring as far as possible to meet the requirements of the people in respect to public buildings, irrespective of political considerations. It is also just possible that our friends may be a little more insistent in asking for public buildings than our opponents.

Mr. LALOR. I have been begging for a long time for a drill hall for the town of Dunnville in which I live. We have a fine militia company there, and we cannot get accommodation for them. We are also in great need of a post office. I think there is no town in the province of Ontario that is worse off than we are, when the size of the place is considered. I think it is a far more important town than Leamington. I notice in the next county the town of Welland, which has not only a new drill hall but also a fine post office and customs house.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the population of your town?

Mr. LALOR. I think 2,800. We have no public building of any kind whatever, either drill hall or post office. I think in the disbursement of public money for these purposes some consideration should be given to other counties than those sending Liberals to this House. I hope the Minister of Public Works will give my county a little more consideration than it has received in the past.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall certainly give the matter careful consideration.

Mr. BLAIN. The present minister is new to his office, but if he will look up the records of his department he will find that one of his predecessors sent out a circular asking members and defeated candidates to send in requests for public buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have enough requests without sending out circulars inviting more.

Ottawa departmental buildings—renewal of skylights, $6,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is asked for by the chief architect for renewal of the present skylights in the new departmental buildings. It is for the purpose of providing metal skylights including flashings. There was an appropriation in 1907-8 which was not used. We are asking for a re-vote.

Mr. FOWLER. What departmental buildings are these—the eastern and western blocks ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that under contract ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not yet.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is it going to be done by contract ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not understand how the work can be done for that amount ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If it cannot be done we will do as much as we can.

Mr. FOWLER. That seems a large price for simply putting in these metal windows.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are skylights, and the work will be somewhat extensive.

Mr. J. D. REID. The department know exactly how many skylights have to be renewed and there should be no difficulty in asking for tenders.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have a carpentering and glazier's department in connection with the Public Works Department.

Mr. J. D. REID. If it is to be done by the regular officials of the department that is all right, but if outsiders are to be employed I think the department should advertise and get tenders.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If it can be done by tender, I will certainly have it done in that way.

Ottawa Printing Bureau—electric motor machinery, $6,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a vote of $6,000 to provide for electric motors for the new machines that are being installed at the Printing Bureau The total probable cost is $20,504. There was a vote previously and we are asking now for $6,000. The assumed expenditure of $11,176 to the end of the fiscal year added to the $6,000 which we are now voting and $2,000 which was expended to December 31, 1907, makes a total of about $20,000.

Owen Sound public building, $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a vote which is asked to make provision for completing, during the present fiscal year, the public building which is under contruction at Owen Sound.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the total cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total probable cost including site is $90,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Owen Sound is not a large town ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. This building is to be 82 by 52, with two storeys and basement.

Mr. FOWLER. Why do you provide such a large building ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to be used for the post office, customs and inland revenue.

Mr. FOWLER. We have the same in my town and the building there only cost $14,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Your town, of course, is very much smaller than Owen Sound.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the population ?

Mr. MILLER. About 12,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1901 the population was 8,776. Owen Sound, I believe, is one of the best harbours if not the best natural harbour upon the Georgian bay.

Mr. FOWLER. What rent have you been paying for the post office and customs house ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The postal revenue is $16,865, customs duties, $45,000 ; excise, $40,000 ; money orders issued, $40,000 and money orders paid, $65,000.

Mr. BLAIN. What did the site cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give my hon. friend from Kings and Albert the rental that was paid. The site cost $10,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Pretty high, is it not ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a very finely situated lot with 70 feet frontage on Baker street and 95 on Scope street. My hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Telford) is not here.

Mr. BLAIN. He would be in favour of it.

Mr. FOWLER. Perhaps it may be the same with him as with the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Zimmerman) whose speech appeared in the Hamilton 'Herald' or 'Times' although that hon. gentleman was not here to deliver it.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I was not responsible for it.

Mr. FOWLER. I am not saying that the hon. gentleman was responsible, but it shows a strong imagination on the part of the reporter of the 'Times.'

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the newspaper should be excused. I made the statement just as the hon. member for Hamilton was going out that the item would be passed and by mistake, they have reported the speech as having been delivered by Mr. Zimmerman instead of Mr. Henderson.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the minister what newspapers the advertisement appeared, when tenders were asked for the Owen Sound building ? I notice that $353 was paid for advertising. Does not my hon. friend think that is a large amount ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would take in the Toronto daily papers and my deputy tells me that it was advertised in about thirty different papers.

Mr. BLAIN. Does my hon. friend think any of these would be Liberal-Conservative papers ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would hardly suppose so, unless I had information to that effect.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend was, the other evening endeavouring to lay down the policy that there was no politics in advertising for tenders.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, what I told my hon. friend was that if I anticipated that the circumstances should arise that the advertising could not be widely circulated by the insertion of the advertisement in Liberal papers, I would not hesitate to avail myself of Conservative papers.

Mr. BLAIN. I may say that I think the newspaper having the largest circulation in the town is the Liberal-Conservative paper.

Mr. MILLER. Owen Sound is the county town of my county. It has a population of 12,000 and almost adjoining it is the village of Brook with a population of

about 2,000. The nearest large towns to Owen Sound are Durham, 28 miles to the south, Meaford, 18 to 20 miles east, and Wiarton, 25 miles northwest, so that Owen Sound does business with a very large territory. It has one of the finest harbours on the lakes and during last winter there was tied up in that harbour a larger amount of shipping than in perhaps any other harbour in Ontario? The site chosen for the post office met with the approval of all the people of the town, and it is considered a very fine one. As to the circulation of the newspapers referred to by the hon. member for Peel, I do not know which of the three papers has the largest circulation but I should say it was between the Owen Sound 'Times' the Conservative paper, and the Owen Sound 'Sun' one of the Liberal papers. The Owen Sound 'Sun' is published twice a week and the Owen Sound 'Times' once a week.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister lay on the table a list of the papers in which this advertisement was published.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will be glad to.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. member for East Kent (Mr. Gordon) stated the other night that the 'London Advertiser' had about the same circulation as the London 'Free Press.' I have here a certified statement which gives the daily average circulation of the London 'Free Press' as 19,589 and the daily average circulation of the 'Advertiser' at 11,827. I again ask the minister if he will publish advertisement with reference to the Glencoe building in the London 'Free Press' which has the largest circulation in that section of the province.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot promise the hon. gentleman, but I should think that the 'Advertiser' with a circulation of 12,000 (if that figure is correct) would afford sufficient publicity. It must be remembered that the advertisement is published in several Toronto papers one of which is the 'Globe', and I think my hon. friend will admit that the Toronto 'Globe' has a much larger circulation in Ontario than any Conservative newspaper; its circulation is twice or three times as large.

Mr. HENDERSON. Not at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend (Mr. Blain) would not suggest that there was any want of wide circulation for this advertisement seeing it was published in thirty different newspapers.

Mr. BLAIN. My point is that the minister is using this large amount of public money for political purposes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister will not say that any single one of these thirty newspapers was a Liberal-Conservative newspaper. If he will frankly admit that the policy of the department is to put these advertisements in Reform papers and refuse them to Liberal-Conservative papers I can understand him.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I told my hon. friend that I would only avail myself of the columns of Conservative papers in cases where I felt it was necessary to give wider circulation by doing so. I may say to my hon. friend that we make out a list of newspapers in which advertisements for works in the district are to be inserted and every day we are refusing to give our friends advertisements. We feel that by advertising in newspapers in the district and surrounding cities where the works are to be carried out that we are giving ample publicity and we do not yield to the request of our friends to extend the patronage.

Mr. BLAIN. How will a Conservatitve contractor know about these works if he only takes a Conservative newspaper.

Mr. GRAHAM. He would not be so narrow as that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not found any difficulty in that direction. We find that Conservative contractors tender and they always get fair play.

Mr. FOWLER. Would it not be much cheaper and do just as well to advertise in the 'Canada Gazette.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think so.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me that you are spending too much money on advertising, and that if these advertisements were published only in the 'Canada Gazette' they would reach contractors and builders all over the country because if such were known they would all take the 'Canada Gazette'. I do not find fault with the minister giving these advertisements to the Liberal newspapers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You think I would be an anomalous sort of individual if I did otherwise.

Mr. FOWLER. If I were running a Liberal newspaper and you advertised in a Conservative organ and not in my paper I would feel dissatisfied. We do not run a political department the same as we run a Sunday school, and you are expected to give the patronage to your friends. That part of it is all right. But, if these advertisements were only published in the 'Canada Gazette' they would reach all the contractors who would be on the outlook for them. A contractor living in Ottawa might tender on a building in New Brunswick and as we know the Sussex building was erected by an Ottawa contractor. It might be a little tough on the newspapers to advertise only

in the 'Gazette' but it would be satisfactory.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would be a great departure from the practice of the last forty years and I fear it would be said that I was not giving sufficient publicity.

Mr. FOWLER. It would be said that you were not giving sufficient pap to the newspapers that are supporting you. The hon. gentleman need not be afraid of a new departure because he is supposed to be a Liberal now and Liberals are always making departures.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have some sympathy with the suggestion made by the hon. member (Mr. Fowler). I have often thought it would be a good idea to have one standard publication in which these contracts would be advertised, and the contractors all over the country knowing of that would look out for these advertisements. With reference to the Owen Sound public building, I do not agree with the hon. member for South Grey that it is necessary to spend this large amount of money for a public building even in the thriving town of Owen Sound. It seems to me that for a great deal less, ample accommodation could be furnished for the Post Office, Customs and Inland Revenue Departments. To my mind, this would be an admirable case in which, if the government are determined to spend $90,000 in a county they could divide it up among the various towns in the county. I do not know that there is a public building in South Grey or in East Grey. We do not ask the government to increase the expenditure; I would be very sorry to do that; but by dividing the expenditure amongst the different towns and villages in a county, the minister could provide ample accommodation in the county town, and small public buildings in other towns and villages. I hope the minister will take this into consideration.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister seems to think that $90,000 is a very trifling sum for a custom house in the town of Owen Sound, with a population of 7,000 or 8,000 people.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Twelve thousand.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. member for South Grey has made a census of his own, and says 12,000; but he does not know any more about the population of Owen Sound than I do. I would remind the minister that in the city of Fredericton the parliament house, a very handsome and commodious building, was erected and completed at a cost of only $108,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When was that built?

Mr. FOWLER. About twenty-five years ago. It is a large and handsome building of stone, a credit to the province, and it cost only $18,000 more than you are going to spend on this custom house in the little town of Owen Sound.

Mr. LALOR. I think the minister told us that the postal revenue of Leamington was $14,000 and that of Owen Sound, $16,000. A $7,000 public building is good enough for Leamington, but $90,000 is to be spent on one in Owen Sound.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The excise revenue in Owen Sound was $40,000.

Mr. LALOR. I am speaking now of the postal revenue. I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Halton, that there should be some arrangement by which some of the public money would be spent on the smaller towns and villages. I think they are entitled to some consideration. It does seem to me that $90,000 for a public building in Owen Sound is excessive, and that there are many other places that are equally entitled to be provided for.

Mr. GRAHAM. Owen Sound is one of the towns I know something about. It is one of the principal gateways to eastern Canada from the Great Lakes and has perhaps the best natural harbour in the western part of this province. Along a stretch of fifteen miles, a disabled vessel can get in and be in perfect safety. Last year they did a large business. It has large elevators and handled some 6,000,000 bushels of grain and expects to handle more. I have a good deal of sympathy with the idea of the government spending money on good buildings wherever there are a revenue and population to justify it. I do not take the ground at all that we ought to be parsimonious although we ought not to be extravagant. This money is placed where necessity demands it and we should take into consideration the necessity for a building and not say promiscuously that we ought to spend so much in the country and so much in the town. That is not a business way of looking at it.

Mr. HENDERSON. Why not? Is not the country entitled to public buildings as well as the town?

Mr. GRAHAM. I said where the business needs it. We ought not to say that we shall give so much to the country villages and so much to the towns without regard to the needs and interests of the different places. The Inland Revenue at Owen Sound is something like $40,000 last year. The postal revenue is about $16,000 and the customs about $45,000 or over $100,000 yearly revenue. In the smaller places, my hon. friend from Haldimand forgets that they just require post offices whereas here we have three services in the one building. The Dominion ought to take pride in having a good building where there is a large revenue and also out of regard for the safety of the service we ought to have a fireproof building. Owen Sound is one of most

thriving places in the Dominion. It has the situation and the enterprise and to this day they have never had a government building there. For the present needs this building may be a little large, but it is wise economy to look to the future and I believe that no more justifiable expenditure could be made by any public department.

Mr. OWEN. I think the hon. minister must be mistaken when he said the revenue of the post office at Leamington was $14,000 and at Owen Sound $16,000.

Mr. LALOR. From the latest report, the town of Dunville in my constituency has a postal revenue of $4,437 and it has no post office.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not give the postal revenue at Leamington as $14,000. I said that the Inland Revenue was that amount and the postal revenue $3,375.

Mr. LOLOR. Dunnville has a postal revenue of $4,437 and Leamington $3,177. The money order revenue at Dunnville is $15,759, Glencoe $9,773 and Leamington $12,750. Much smaller places get magnificent buildings while Dunnville, which is much more important, cannot get them. The government should take into consideration the importance of the town and the public revenue collected there, and should not make it their first consideration that the town elects a supporter of the government. Towns of less importance should not be given public buildings while the more important ones are suffering.

Mr. BLAIN. I want to attract my hon. friend's attention to the large increase in expenditure over the Estimates first made when the votes are first asked for. For instance in 1906 the Estimates for the building at North Bay was given at $14,000 by the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman). Now my hon. friend says the total cost will be about $60,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Probably my predecessor did not include the site and fittings and furniture. The contract was for $33,000.

Mr. BLAIN. There may be something in that. The estimate for the Owen Sound public building, when the vote was first asked, was between $40,000 and $50,000. The ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) said it would depend on whether the building was to be of stone or brick. Now we have the minister saying that the cost will be $90,000, almost double. I hope my hon. friend will be more careful and see that his estimates are more in accord with the total expenditure. The opposition are always twitted with having consented to these expenditures, but after voting certain amounts, they are then asked to vote a great deal more than was estimated and when objection is raised they are asked if they are going to refuse money to complete the work after so much has been expended on it. As the minister is new to the department and is reforming it on every hand, I hope he will see that his department in future will give a correct statement of what these buildings will cost. I am quite sure that this is one of the ways in which the enormous expenditure of which the people of Canada are complaining is arising and taking possession of the government—and, I fear, is mastering some of the departments.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have been a good deal impressed by the arguments of some hon. gentlemen opposite—my hon. friend from Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler), my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) and others—as to the reasonable demands of the people for erecting buildings in the smaller towns throughout the country. I entirely sympathize with that view. In towns where there is no other very considerable expenditure of public money, even though the population of such towns may not be very large, it is not unreasonable that they should have the accommodation afforded by a public building. They contribute to the revenue of the country proportionately to people living in larger cities and towns. But we must be patient; we cannot erect all these buildings at once, as some of our friends would like us to do. If I am to judge by some of the expressions of our friends opposite, instead of providing for a moderate number of buildings, such as I have provided for, they would like a public building for every town in the country.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have not suggested anything of that kind.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, I hope our friends will be patient.

Mr. MARSHALL. When this matter was discussed a few days ago, I think I did not make myself clear. I stated the population of Leamington at 2,451. The population of Aylmer is about the same. Now, with regard to the town of Aylmer, I would like to call attention to the fact that the postal revenue of that town is $4,459; the amount of money orders issued about $20,000. I did not bring out these facts the other day when I was speaking about the matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Aylmer is a very nice town. I am going to try to go there. Will the hon. gentleman promise me, if I go, that he will not accuse me of trying to bribe the people?

Mr. MARSHALL. I will undertake to take the minister out and show him a good country. Let me add to what I already said that we have one of the largest canning factories in Canada, also a large condensed milk factory, large iron works and other manufactories. Aylmer is a very important town. As I understand it, the

reason given for not building a post office in Aylmer before now is that we have not made claims. I intend to keep on making claims, and I hope to be successful.

Port Arthur public building—addition, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of this, $2,000 is a revote. It is for the erection of a one-storey brick addition on a stone foundation, in rear of the existing building, extending from the examining warehouse towards Court street. The new building will be 38 by 36 feet.

Mr. FOWLER. What will be the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract is for $7,475. It is estimated that heating and lighting will cost $1,000, fittings and furniture, &c., $2,000; contingencies and superintendence, $1,548. Tenders were called for by public advertisement and two tenders were received, one for $7,475 and the other for $10,000. The lowest was accepted.

Mr. FOWLER. I have had some experience in building, and I must say this seems an awful price for a building 38 by 36 feet. It is only a plain building, I understand—a sort of warehouse.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is an examining warehouse. It is very substantially built—very large girders carried on iron columns.

Renfrew public building, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This building is to be of stone on a concrete foundation. The main portion is to have a frontage of 50 feet, and 40 feet in depth, with two storeys, basement and attic; and addition in the rear 27 by 27 feet, and two storeys high.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is to be the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Including everything, $41,154.06. This is for both post office and customs house.

Mr. BLAIN. Are there to be any extras?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a contract for $24,500, and I think there is no estimate of extras.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the population of Renfrew, and what is its revenue?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1901, the population was 3,153; postal revenue, $5,212.79; customs revenue, $3,392.89; money orders issued, $26,681.89; money orders paid, $27,681. Renfrew has a fine water-power. There are there a foundry, tannery and woollen, saw, flour and planing mills.

Mr. FOWLER. This building is altogether too expensive; $20,000 would be enough.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would be glad to cut these buildings to $20,000, but it is pretty difficult.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is not difficult at all. Put your foot down and say that the building shall not cost more than a certain price, and tell your architect he must draw the plans accordingly. The public building in my town houses the post office and inland revenue, and is ample for the purpose, and it cost $14,000 equipped.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am going to see what I can do.

St. Mary's public building, $12,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for a public building in the town of St. Mary's, in South Perth. The total cost is estimated at $40,819.23.

Mr. FOWLER. An outrage again.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You can hardly call it an 'outrage,' though you might say we might erect a smaller and cheaper building That is possible. In future, I am going to try to cut the prices down.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What was the cost of the site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was $2,300.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the population of St. Mary's?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Quite a large town—3,384.

Mr. LALOR. The total post office revenue is $5,740, and we are expending $40,000 upon the post office in a town with a revenue of a little over $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But you must remember that this building is for post office, customs and inland revenue purposes. The customs revenue alone is over $13,000.

Mr. LALOR. It strikes me that the expenditure is far in excess of the importance of a town of the size of St. Mary's. I urge again the same objection, that so large an amount of money is being expended in one town while another town is overlooked.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are endeavouring to cut down the cost below the sum asked for, and we are endeavouring to do the same with all these votes. The contract price of this building is $22,500. The town is in the county of South Perth.

Mr. LALOR. Why is it costing $40,000, when the contract price is only $22,500?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have to take into account the cost of the site, heating, fittings, furniture, and lock boxes, which alone cost $5,000 Inspection is included in the survey of the site. Contingencies and superintendence, $3,009. Survey of site, legal and travelling expenses, printing and advertising, salaries and superintendence, amount to a little over $5,000. The plans were prepared in the department.

Mr. FOWLER. How long will this contract last ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract was dated in September, 1906, and the building is to be completed by the 15th of December, 1907. There are the travelling expenses of the architect to and from Ottawa to examine the building from time to time. It may be that the $3,000 for contingencies will not be all used.

Mr. FOWLER. Who is the architect ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the name of the architect.

Mr LALOR. Was the inspector appointed by the patronage committee of the town?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know that there is any patronage committee.

Mr. LALOR. Was the inspector a local man, or was he sent by the department ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the name of the inspector.

Mr. BLAIN. His name is J. C. Wiederhold.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When we were discussing public buildings before I stated that in some cases the clerk of works got $3 a day, in other cases $3.50, and in some cases $4. That man, as my deputy tells me, is not paid for Sundays ; therefore he gets a little extra pay per day.

Mr. OWEN. I want to draw the minister's attention to the town of Campbellford on the Trent canal.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If we were to erect all the buildings we have in the estimates and all that are asked for by hon. gentlemen opposite we would exceed the revenue.

Mr. OWEN. The postal revenue of Campbellford is $3,500, money orders issued $15,000, and money orders paid $11,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the population?

Mr. OWEN. Three thousand. I have not a statement of the customs revenue, but it is in the neighbourhood of $12,000. The Trent Valley canal will be completed through that part of the country within three or four years and we expect then to bloom into a city. It would be a very deplorable thing if Campbellford should bloom into a city with such a progressive government as we have and we found we had no public building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman expects it will bloom into a city. How does the operation take place?

Mr. OWEN. When the Trent Valley canal is completed we expect to bloom into a city. We are developing in the neighbourhood of 25,000 and 30,000 horse-power.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Have you any flour mills there?

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. OWEN. Yes, and a large woollen mill, but, I regret to say, the woollen mill is running rather slack at present. We have a shoe factory, a sawmill, a planing mill and a sash factory. It is a very progressive town and a large amount of manufacturing is done there. At the present time we have to climb up a long stairs to the custom office and while the post office is moved to a more commodious building the accommodation is inadequate.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is the custom house a public building?

Mr OWEN. No, we have no public building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am very glad to hear as to Campbellford and if I have the opportunity of visiting that section of the country I will be very glad to look into the requirements of the place. It is not at all impossible that next session the wants of Campbellford may receive favourable consideration.

Mr. OWEN. If the minister comes to Campbellford I will guarantee that we will give him a splendid time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sure of that.

Mr. FOWLER. I was going to point out to my hon. friend from East Northumberland (Mr. Owen) that he might save his breath in regard to asking the minister what he shall do next session, looking forward to the time when the blooming process shall take place in Campbellford, because by the time that Cambellford blooms forth as a city this present administration will be out of power, his friends will have the locating of post offices throughout the country and this town of Campbellford will be looked after.

Mr. LALOR. The minister said that if we only had patience for a short time all these things would come right; I suppose he had in view the change which is likely to take place in the administration.

Mr. MARSHALL. We have three customs ports in East Elgin and the revenue amounts to $108,000. Aylmer is the centre of East Elgin and it is a very important place.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are a great many important towns in Ontario.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I cannot help thinking that the minister would expedite matters if he would just be honest with the opposition and tell us that he did not intend to give one hon. member on this side of the House a public building in his riding. I am satisfied that the minister has not taken into consideration the granting of any public buildings to the constituencies represented by members of the opposition.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not agree with that.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. He may have taken it into consideration, but he does not propose to do anything.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is doing me a wrong in that respect. Two or three days ago, when the hon. member for Kings and Albert rose and spoke of a public building at Hillsborough, I, while expressing my regret that the hon. gentleman had not approached me on the subject, told him that others had urged it very strongly and that I had the matter under favourable consideration. I may say to my hon. friend that there are quite a number of counties which are represented by our friends opposite in regard to which I recognize the claims which the people have for consideration in the way of public buildings, and I intend, if I remain Minister of Public Works, to take these claims into favourable consideration.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am very glad to hear the minister make the remark he has. I think from the manner in which he says it that he means what he says. If he takes it into consideration a town such as Campbellford and the one represented by my hon. friend from Haldimand with several thousand of a population and large revenues. I am sure that he cannot consistently refuse to consider their claims, although, when I remember that in some of the Quebec constituencies, towns and villages of 500 and 600 people are receiving $20,000 buildings I cannot help thinking that there is not likely to be a very great deal of expenditure in some of the Ontario towns.

Mr. BLAIN. I see that $262.78 was expended for advertising for tenders for this building at St. Mary's. Would the minister bring down the list of the papers and the amount paid to each?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Certainly.

Sarnia public building—alterations and additions, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision for the completion of the construction of a brick addition 53 by 25 feet to the Sarnia public building alterations. The total estimated cost is $14.999.22.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What amount of money was expended previously?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The amount to the 24th of December, was $5,426.22.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What has been the total cost of the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not that. I suppose the original building was constructed quite a number of years ago.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No. just two years ago.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is this the Sarnia post office?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is purely a post office.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, because the addition involves alterations to the roof of the examining warehouse.

Mr. HENDERSON. When originally constructed it was not intended for any other purpose than that of a post office.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is used as an examining warehouse. The cost to the 30th June, 1906, was $73,915.78.

Mr. HENDERSON. I remember being in that building once and I thought it was a miserable small place, altogether insufficient for the requirements of Sarnia.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is used for post office, custom house, inland revenue, examining warehouse and the Indian agent. It is 99 feet on one street and 73 feet on another.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then it must be altogether a different building from that I have in mind. I remember when Sir Wm. Mulock was Postmaster General discussing the matter and my remarks were endorsed by Dr. Johnston who then represented the constituency.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What will this extension to the building be used for.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will be used in connection with some of the various services accommodated there.

Simcoe public buildings, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is in the county of Norfolk. Now, here is a constituency represented by one of the hon. gentlemen opposite, which illustrates the fact that we are endeavouring to meet the wants of the public irrespective of the views of the representative.

Mr. HENDERSON. Carried.

Mr. BLAIN. Let those Toronto items stand, until the members for the city are present.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am quite willing to do so if the hon. gentleman desires. I move that the vote for the Toronto custom house be dropped.

Mr. BLAIN. Why?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is all paid for in the past year; the work is completed.

Welland public building, $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The lot here is known as the market site and has a frontage of 58 feet on one street and 150 feet on another street.

Mr. FOWLER. What did you pay for the lot?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was owned by the corporation of the town of Welland and the

price was $6,000. The town reserves at the rear of the town hall a strip of land for a driveway to be held in common with the town.

Mr. FOWLER. What was the total cost of the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The plans have not yet been completed, but it is supposed it will cost about $30,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Why don't you keep it within $20,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the estimate of the chief architect. I will try to keep it down to $20,000 exclusive of the site, but it will be pretty difficult to do that. This is to be for customs as well.

Mr. FOWLER. Why don't you keep it down to $20,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I don't like to set up my judgment against that of the chief architect. Welland has a population of about 4,500 and within last year it has increased by between 1,500 and 2,000. It is moving ahead very rapidly. Last year the Plymouth Cordage Company which will employ 400 hands spent $300,000 there.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you allow the chief architect to say what shall be the cost of a public building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No; but I respect his judgment.

Mr. FOWLER. The chief architect may have judgment with respect to drawing plans, but with respect to the requirements of the different towns throughout the country I would not consider the chief architect's opinion was worth a cent. It is the minister who is responsible for that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief architect gets information as to what accommodation is required for the present and for the future.

Mr. HENDERSON. No doubt we will be told that the chief architect will take the $8,000 salary and the minister will take the chief arcnitect's salary. I was astounded to hear the minister say that he had to give attention to the chief architect as to what amount of money should be spent by the government in any particular place. Surely the minister spoke these words without consideration.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, that was said deliberately.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then I regret it very much. The minister should be responsible for the expenditure.

Mr. PUGSLEY. So he is.

Mr. HENDERSON. Not if he allows his chief architect to overrule him. The minister should be in a position to say to the chief architect: I want you to draw plans for a building costing so many thousand dollars, and all the architect should have to say about it is to draw the plans. If he did that, the chief architect would have obeyed his order, and the minister would be surprised, when the building was erected, what a beautiful building he would get for that amount of money. The country will be surprised when they read that the minister has acceded to the officers of his department the right to say how much the expenditure of this country is to be.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is delightful to see the serious countenance of my hon. friend when he knows that he is only joking.

Mr. HENDERSON. No, I am absolutely serious.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it would be absurd for me to say to the chief architect, they want a post office in Montreal and I want you to spend $50,000 on it, or they want a post office at Ottawa and I want you to spend $25,000 on it. What we do is this. The chief architect finds out what the requirements of a town are, considers what its present population is and whether it is a growing town or not, and is then able to judge what accommodation is required, and he makes his estimate accordingly. When it comes to my hands, I cut it down as much as possible. At the same time I want him to erect a building which will be a credit to the government and not a discredit to the town. I am quite ready to admit that I am advised by the chief architect and the chief engineer and the deputy, for whose judgments I have great respect.

Mr LALOR. The town of Welland I know very well ; the county of Welland adjoins my county, and I quite agree with the minister when he says that Welland is a growing and prosperous town. I do not know any town that is growing as fast. I think the expenditure of $20,000 in Welland is a necessary and very wise expenditure, very much more so than an expenditure of $40,000 in St. Mary's or $90,000 in Owen Sound.

Mr. FOWLER. We are not objecting to an expenditure of $20,000 in Welland ; but the point was that the building was to cost $30,000 instead of $20,000. I cannot agree with the views expressed by the minister in regard to how far he should be guided by his officers. Along certain lines that is correct. As he is not a draughtsman, he must be guided by the chief architect in the drawing of the plans ; but in regard to the requirements of a town the minister ought to know a great deal more than the chief architect. But according to the statement of the minister, the chief architect is the only one in the department who assumes any responsibility in regard to the erection of buildings. He makes inquiries as to the requirements of a town and its prospects of growth ; he makes his plans accordingly ;

and estimates the cost after he draws the plans. That seems to be a very strange way of proceeding. The country will be surprised to learn that the chief architect is the master of the situation in the Department of Public Works. He may be a man of great ability along his particular line but the exhibition we have had in the last week or two in the estimates of the Department of Public Works that have been under discussion, have convinced me at any rate that the chief architect is a man upon whose judgment it is not safe to rely.

Mr. PUGSLEY I am afraid you are hard to convince.

Mr. FOWLER. Not at all. We have found that the chief architect has a staff of twelve architects besides himself, and that in addition over $100,000 was spent last year for architects.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. FOWLER. I say, oh, yes. This is the man who decides whether a public building shall be built in a certain town or not and what money shall be spent on it, and the minister meekly bows his head and confirms whatever statement he makes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not exactly what I said.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. minister left us to infer that, and knowing what a mild man he is, I am sure he bows his head with grace and meekness. I venture to say that even in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, the subordinates have not quite so great control over the minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It strikes me that my hon. friend's remarks are not founded on reason. Surely if a wharf is to be constructed, it would be absurd for me to say to the chief engineer, I want you to see that a wharf is built that will cost $10,000. What I ask him to do is to examine the site, find out the depth of water, the size of the steamers which will use the wharf, what frontage is required and how far the wharf should extend into the water and then give an estimate of the cost. And if he should estimate that a wharf suitable to the requirements will cost $10,000, it would be absurd for me to limit the expenditure to $5,000. In the same way, when a public building is required, I have to get the chief architect to examine into the details and make his estimates according to the requirements. And if a public building requires a certain number of offices, it would be absurd for me to order one with insufficient accommodation. I have to be guided by the report of my chief architect.

Whitby public building, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The lot is 150 feet by 65. The estimated cost is something over $20,000. The building will accommodate both Whitby east and Whitby west. The total population is 4,060.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Pugsley, House adjourned at 1.30 a.m. Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, May 5, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. HONORE GERVAIS (Montreal, St. James). I beg leave to move that the second report of the Debates Committee be concured in.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I wish the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gervais) would delay this motion until the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is in his seat. He will be here, I think, to-morrow or the day after.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I stated yesterday that I would give the House some idea of the measures which the government propose to introduce during the present session. These measures are not new; they have been more or less discussed already and the House is somewhat familiar with them. In the first place, there is the Civil Service Bill, which, I think, will be introduced early next week. There are also the Bill to provide for the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba, the amendment to the Manitoba Grain Inspection Act—to be introduced within a day or two—and the amendment to the Lands Bill These are the principal measures. But I must say that another important measure to be introduced is that respecting aid to railway construction, including the Hudson Bay Railway. There are some minor Bills of some importance, but, I think, not contentious. One relates to judicature, and another to Chinese immigration, and another is to make the Yukon Council absolutely elective, instead of partly elective and partly nominative as at present. There is also an amendment to the Customs Act. This is a fair list of the measures that we propose to introduce.

CANADIAN AND UNITED STATES BOUNDARIES TREATIES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I would ask the Prime Minister whether he has any news of the treaty, which, I observe, has been ratified by the Senate of the United States. It seems a little curious that we cannot get it here until it has been considered and ratified there.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are two reasons for that. According to the constitution of the United States, as my hon. friend knows, treaties must be ratified by the Senate in executive session. They are not passed unless they have received the approval of the president and the sanction of the Senate. The second is that we could not have the correspondence and treaty laid before this house until we had the authority of the British Colonial Office. We have asked for that authority, and, no doubt, it will be given. I have the correspondence prepared, and, as soon as we have received the sanction of the Colonial Office, we will lay the two treaties—for there are two—before the House.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 115) to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: When this Bill was introduced some two months ago, I gave an explanation, with considerable fulness of detail, of the various provisions therein proposed and the reasons which had led to these provisions being recommended for adoption by the House. In the two months which have passed since that time there has been, in the newspapers and otherwise in the country, considerable discussion with reference to the provisions of this measure. But that discussion seems, so far as I have seen it, to have limited itself very largely, if not practically altogether, to the first clause of the Bill. Perhaps in these circumstances, and subject to what hon. members wish to say with reference to other paragraphs of the Bill, I may, at this stage of its progress, limit myself to a discussion of the provisions of that section, leaving other clauses of the Bill to be discussed either upon this occasion or in Committee of the Whole. The first clause of this Bill deals with the question of voters' lists and the franchise in a very considerable portion of the Dominion. For the purpose of classifying the method of preparation of the voters' lists, one might divide the Dominion, with not unfair accuracy, by the boundary line between the provinces of Ontario and Manitoba. Speaking in the rough, the whole of Canada east of that line prepares its voters' lists with the assessment roll, or valuation roll, of the municipal locality as the basis of the list, while all of the Dominion to the west of that line pursues the opposite system and prepares its lists upon the system of registration and without reference to the assessment roll.

Now it will be no doubt in the memory of many hon. gentlemen, it is upon the pages of the 'Hansard' of ten years ago when our present Franchise Act was under discussion in this House, that that principle was laid down as being the rule in a general way, of application upon which the present Dominion system of voters' lists was based. Prior to that time, for thirteen years the Dominion, under the Franchise Act of 1885, had been controlling the preparation of its own voters' lists. In 1898 the present law was passed, the old Franchise Act of 1885 was repealed, and a system of adopting the voters' lists as prepared by the various provinces, substituted in its stead. Upon that occasion the opposition of that day put itself upon record in the form of a substantive motion against the second reading of the Bill, and in favour of the principle that the Dominion should absolutely control its own franchise, that this House should not under any circumstances part with the preparation of its own voters' lists, or hand that work over to the provincial legislatures in any case. But upon this side of the House, and in support of the proposition, it was contended by different hon. gentlemen that wherever you have voters' lists prepared by the municipalities upon the basis of the assessment roll you have in that circumstance a guaranty of substantiality and a guaranty of fairness. You have the various municipal councils consisting of four or five, or at most six or seven, members who are necesarily acquainted, possibly personally acquainted, with practically all the families in their district. You had the assessor, with certainly no inducement to omit from his roll which was to be the basis of taxation in the community, any landowner or any individual liable to tax, you had that guaranty that every man who ought to pay taxes would find his name placed upon the assessment roll in order that a levy might be made upon him, and you had a local body consisting, possibly and very probably, of men of opposite political feelings engaged in the work of revising that assessment roll, with naturally a personal acquaintance, probably, with the majority of the men whose names they were dealing with, and that roll as so settled by the municipal council to be the subsequent basis of the voters' lists for municipal, provincial and Dominion purposes. It was pointed out at that time, in answer to an observation by the present hon. leader of the opposition, that if, notwithstanding the fears which he then expressed, the time should come when any provincial government or provincial legislature should by its legislation, or by its administration of that legislation, so interfere with the course of the preparation of the voters' lists in that province, or if there was not an acceptable list, or there was ground for belief that the list so prepared was not of a fair and satisfactory nature, then this House always had it in its power, this parliament at any time could resume control over its own lists and over its own franchise, and prevent the apprehended evil from taking place.

Now that being an outline of the considerations which were urged on either side in

1898 as reasons for and against the adoption of the system which was then inaugurated in the Dominion, and which has since obtained, the situation which we have now reached necessarily comes to be considered. At the last general elections in 1904 there was a difficulty, to use a mild word, with reference to the voters' lists in the province of Manitoba, particularly in that province, more especially there, perhaps elsewhere as well, but a difficulty which had its origin out of the system of preparing lists which, under the Manitoba statute, and under the method in which that statute was administered, had necessarily arisen. Their lists were not based upon the assessment rolls, their lists were prepared upon a system of registration, personal registration on the part of the voter possibly, but not necessarily personal registration, provision being contained in the statute law for the registration of the voter without personal application in the circumstances that the statute describes. The general outline of their system of preparing the voters' lists was that registration clerks were appointed for the various constituencies of the province, and the work of the registration clerks in forming the basis of the voters' lists was afterwards revised by some member of a registration board, which consisted I think in practice of the county judges of the province, which upon the face of the statute might consist either of the county judges or of barristers of three years standing. Those lists were necessarily prepared under the system obtaining in Manitoba with reference to the various electoral districts as laid down for provincial purposes. Now what is the consequence ? For the purpose of representation in this House the whole province of Manitoba is divided into ten constituencies, while for the purpose of representation in the provincial legislature of the same province, we have the same territory divided into forty constituencies. For every Dominion constituency there are four provincial constituencies, and the boundaries are not coterminous. I do not know whether in any single instance any Dominion constituency is composed of just four, or just three, or just five, or exactly any other number of provincial constituencies ; but I imagine that in no single case is any constituency as defined for Dominion purposes composed of exactly a certain number of provincial constituencies. The result is that throughout the whole province there is an overlapping. A Dominion constituency will have all round its borders an outstanding fringe consisting of portions of various surrounding provincial constituencies, and in many instances the boundaries of the individual polling subdivisions in the provincial constituencies will not be coterminous with the boundaries of the Dominion constituency either. So you have as a consequence men who would be grouped together for provincial purposes upon the voters' lists for either a particular polling subdivision, or taking it in the large, for a provincial legislative constituency, who would not be grouped together for the purpose of a Dominion election.

Now under the system of registration as distinct from the system of preparing voters' lists with the assessment roll as a basis, you have the voters' lists prepared for the various provincial constituencies divided, not into polling subdivisions, but into registration districts, and the registration districts do not necessarily correspond with the polling subdivisions. They may do so or they may not do so, but the group of voters brought together by the registration clerk upon the one sheet of paper and certified to be the list of qualified voters for a particular registration district consists, it may be, of men who vote in more than one polling subdivision. But more than that and worse than that for the difficulty I am about to present, these voters are not, in I think I may safely say, the majority of instances, designated by the ownership of a particular piece of property. In some cases, possibly in the greater number of cases, the voter's post office addres is given, but in a great many instances, in a very large percentage of the voters' lists throughout the province, not even a post office is given, but simply the name of the man entitled to vote. I have before me ordinary sample sheets of the lists which I shall be happy to lay upon the table and hon. gentlemen may see them for themselves. The lists that I have are taken entirely at random. These were, I may say, presented before the committee of this House which made some inquiry into this matter two years ago, and in that way came before my notice and have been in my possession since. The first of these two that are before me is, the list of voters of 1903, and I shall read the caption in order that you, Sir, may see exactly what the list as certified by the provincial authorities to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery contains, and what exactly is the information and the whole of the information which any one having such a document before him would possess in regard to the voters whose names appear on it. It is headed :

List of voters, 1903, provincial electoral district of St. Boniface, registration district No. 1.

There is no reference to any poll, but simply registration district No. 1 and that is in the provincial electoral district of St. Boniface. This list contains 226 names. To show how these names are in most instances entered I shall read the first one :

Anderson, Eric, Louise Bridge, Mason.

That is the identification of the voter and that is the case in respect of most of the names throughout the list, the voters' name,

his post office, and his occupation are given with no reference whatever to the property in respect of which he votes or to the exact place where he may live. On this list, as a matter of fact, all the names enumerated of the men entitled to vote in the electoral district of Selkirk, are now marked with a check. Those who are entitled to vote in the adjoining constituency of Provencher, as delimited for purposes of Dominion representation, are left without a mark. These 226 names are divided between the two constituencies of Selkirk and Provencher in the numbers of 140 in Selkirk and 86 in Provencher. Of course it will be seen at once that the post office address of the individual without knowledge of who the man himself is and where he lives is no guide. The post office might be upon the boundary line, and a man who voted in the constituency of Provencher might have his post office in Selkirk or vice versa. His post office he selects according to his own convenience, and the post office itself while, if it were far distant from the boundary, would be some guide, in a case where the boundary bisects the registration district, as in this case, affords little or no light.

The other list I have is similar.

List of voters, 1903, provincial electoral district of Morris, registration district No. 5.

There are 120 names on the list and of those 120 names 77 are in Provencher and 43 in Macdonald, as divided for Dominion purposes. If any one taking up this paper without local knowledge entered upon the effort to discriminate between the voters who were entitled to vote in Macdonald and those who were entitled to vote in Provencher, he would simply have to abandon the effort as absolutely impracticable, because in this case we have no post office whatever, we have in some instances, in most instances, a reference to the section upon which the voter, presumably, is to be found or which, at any rate, he may be supposed to own. But we have no other information given than that. These gentlemen whose names are here recorded are voters some of them as farmers' sons, others as farmers, others as blacksmiths ; their occupations are given throughout with simply a reference to some particular lot and nothing else.

Those are ordinary samples. In some instances the lot is given, in other instances no lot will appear from one end to the other of the list. It depended, I presume, on what was the habit of the registration clerk in taking the necessary information and recording the names in the first instance.

In that position of matters, I ask hon. gentlemen to reflect what was to be done by the men who received His Majesty's writs in the fall of 1904, requiring them to hold the ten elections in Manitoba for the purpose of representation in this House. Under the statute, they received from the proper officials at Ottawa printed copies of just such lists as I have been adverting to, which gave them the names by registration districts of hundreds upon hundreds of voters, thousands necessarily, in each constituency. If you take the case of a registration district as defined by the provincial law, which the returning officer, possessing local knowledge, may, of his own knowledge, be aware is in the centre of a Dominion constituency, is wholly within some particular Dominion constituency, the returning officer will certainly be aware that every man on the list for that particular registration district will be within his bailiwick. But in the cases in which there was not a coincidence in all the borders around the four sides of any constituency in Manitoba between the limits of the registration district and of the provincial constituency and the limits of the Dominion constituency, there was, of necessity there had to be, some division of the voters in order that those who voted under any particular returning officer should be known. Now that was a case absolutely unprovided for in our legislation. I suppose it had not been thought of in 1898 or at any subsequent session of parliament. Possibly it was thought of in 1898 but considered not of practical importance for this reason : In 1898 the voters' lists in the province of Manitoba were not revised annually or at fixed times, they were revised whenever the lieutenant Governor in council so directed.

Accordingly the legislation of this parliament as passed in 1898 provided that whenever that was the case with the voters lists of any particular province these voters lists should not necessarily be accepted for the purpose of elections to this House. Our statute at the present time continues to provide that where under the laws of any province the voters' lists for any particular electoral district or division are prepared not at regular intervals but at such times as are fixed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council or by some other provincial or local authority or only from time to time for the purpose of a general or other election in immediate contemplation, then the last preceding list shall be used if it is less than a year old, but only in that event. If it is more than a year old the Dominion prepares its own voters' lists in the manner at present prescribed by the Dominion Elections Act and which has been on the statute-book since 1898. So that in 1898 when this legislation was passed repealing the old Franchise Act of 1885, Manitoba was not having annual revision of its lists, and was not in that sense affected by the Dominion legislation. But the provision of 1898, in the condition of things which then existed in Manitoba, was that the provincial lists of that province should

be used for Dominion purposes only if there came a Dominion election when such lists were less than twelve months old, and that if such lists were at that time over twelve months old then the Dominion would prepare its own lists. That possibly is the explanation of the circumstance that no special provision was made in 1898 for the case of such overlapping as I have been describing. Whatever explanation of it may be, the fact is as I have stated. Now, in the spring of 1904 the Manitoba legislature made a change in its law. The Manitoba legislature provided by the statute of 1904, (repealing the provisions as to voters' lists which had theretofore existed in that province) that their revision should take place annually. It is true it was a sort of peculiar revision, but it was what they called revision at all events. It was not registration preparing lists de novo by requiring each man who claimed the right to vote to appear before the official appointed for the purpose and state his claim, but it was the taking of the existing lists by the registration clerk and the adding to such lists or the revision of them on his part by making the changes which might appear to be necessary. Accordingly we have the legislature of Manitoba in the spring of 1904, by the enactment I have referred to, making their provincial voters' lists revisable at regular annual intervals and no longer at only such times as should be fixed by the government of the province. The effect was at once to make this provision of our Elections Act which authorized the Dominion authorities to prepare lists for a province no longer applicable to Manitoba, and to require the Dominion elections of 1904 which were then approaching to be carried on upon these Manitoba lists, samples of which I have placed before you a few minutes ago. These Manitoba lists of 1903 had been prepared for another purpose altogether; they had been prepared at a time when under the then existing Dominion legislation there was every prospect that they never would be needed for Dominion purposes; they had been prepared with a view solely and entirely to the provincial elections. At the time these lists were prepared in 1903 the Dominion legislation was of such a character that there could have been no expectation on the part of the officials who prepared these lists that they would ever be required for Dominion purposes unless the Dominion elections should follow within twelve months of their completion. Under these circumstances they were not prepared by the officials who were engaged in the work with any idea of their being used in Dominion elections; they were not prepared in any way with reference to Dominion constituencies or Dominion polling sub-divisions but with no other thought than the provincial limits I have mentioned. The consequence was the absolute inapplicability for the practical purpose of conducting an election of those lists which by the change of the provincial law in the spring of 1904 became under the terms of our legislation of 1898 the lists upon which the Dominion elections had to be carried on. Every returning officer in the ten constituencies of Manitoba found himself consequently face to face with the question of what he was to do about it. His duty was to send to his various deputy returning officers for use at the various polling places in his constituency, lists which should show just the names and only the names of the men entitled to vote at that poll.

Now, we who are better acquainted with the older settled portions of this country possibly do not always appreciate conditions as they exist in the larger west. I myself must frankly concede that it was with some astonishment I heard the testimony given before the committee I alluded to a little ago, with regard to the size of the constituencies in Manitoba. We were investigating specially at that time the conditions with regard to the three constituencies of Selkirk, Provencher, and Macdonald and the size of these constituencies was stated to be in round figures: Selkirk 100 miles wide by 210 miles in length, Provencher 50 miles by 115 miles and Macdonald 80 miles by 86. Now, I ask hon. gentlemen who like myself are more familiar with the geography of the province of Ontario: Suppose you had a constituency extending with regard to its width as far as from Toronto to Trenton, and so far as its length as far as from Toronto to Brockville, and you had a returning officer appointed for that whole territory 100 miles one way and 210 miles the other, and you placed in his hands a series of voters' lists amounting to perhaps 4,000 or 5,000 voters in all, scattered over that territory, and with no other guide than at most the number of the lot and very probably with no other guide than the post office or possibly not even a post office, to enable him to say whether or not a particular voter is within these boundaries; is it not manifestly impossible that any man, unless he has travelled from end to end of the province and from end to end of the constituency and unless he has a local knowledge greater far than the average citizen possesses, is it not manifestly impossible that he would be able to do anything more than make one may say a guess, or secure such information as he could with reference to an individual and endeavour to make in that way lists which should be appropriate and legal for the purposes required? The returning officer has no guide in the statute; he is not told what he is to do. He is under obligation to send to his deputies a proper list, and is given no kind of direction or information as to how he can

prepare that list. If a returning officer, face to face with such a difficulty, had in the few weeks which remained before the polling day, set himself to obtain all the information he was able, and having so obtained it, had written down name after name upon sheets of foolscap, extracting them from the printed lists that had come to him from Ottawa, and had sent such certified lists of copied names to his different polling sub-divisions, I venture to say that no man could by any perversion or distortion of the statute assail that returning officer as having transgressed his statutory duty or as having committed any offence against the laws of the land. In this case the returning officers probably never thought of writing out the lists, possibly wished to avoid the manual labour that would involve, and instead of writing out the list for each separate poll, they went through those lists and endeavoured to mark those voters who did not belong to their respective constituencies by striking out the names. They used red ink for the purpose.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. And we have had from that day to this the changes rung upon every platform and in every newspaper in the country upon the convenient catch-phrase that somebody coined of the thin red line. The government of the province of Manitoba had had to do, in the rearrangement of its lists for the purpose of its elections, precisely the same kind of work. Their officials did it with black ink, and that is the only difference.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Will the Minister of Justice say who did it with black ink? What class of officials did this kind of work? Was it the Conservative organizer, like the Liberal organizer in the other case? As a matter of fact, it was done by the judges of the province.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I must ask my hon. friend from Marquette to acquit me of any intention of discourtesy if I do not answer or if I do not notice what he has said, because it is my misfortune to be quite unable to hear him.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. You do not want to hear.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is quite an improper remark.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I am not making the least attack, political or other, upon the officials of the legislature or government of Manitoba in what I have adverted to. I am saying that it was necessary; it was a thing which could not possibly be avoided. I certainly make no point on the colour of the ink. I should have been equally well pleased if instead of being black it had been in accordance with the political sympathies of the gentlemen and been intensest blue. My hon. friend who sits next to me calls my attention in this connection to a circumstance which I might with propriety have adverted to, but which escaped my memory at the moment, that the direction of the Manitoba Elections Act on the subject is the use of a black line or a red line for this very purpose. In section 5, subsection 6, of the Elections Act of Manitoba provision is made for the drawing of a line with black or red ink through the name of any person to be removed from the list of electors or from the list appearing in the register, but in such a manner that the name can be readily read and distinguished, and, of course, it is an important provision, that the name should not be erased so that it could not be distinguished, but that it remain legible, although indicated in some manner as not belonging to that particular voting place or that particular constituency. Now, the doing of this work of rearranging the names by some person was a necessity, as I think any fair consideration of the condition which the law was in at the time will at once demonstrate. There was no statutory authority for it in the Dominion Elections Act. No one, I think, pretends that the Dominion Elections Act ever contemplated the necessity for any such thing, or had provided authority for any official, judge or other, to take that course. But the necessity for it, the reasonableness of it, would, I think, apart from the heat of party conflict in this country, not be questioned by anybody. And let me say here—what will be I have no doubt in the memory of my hon. friend from East Hamilton (Mr. Barker), as a member of the committee to which I have already referred—that in the inquiry into this matter which was made during several weeks of the spring of 1906, we had before us as witnesses two gentlemen from the city of Winnipeg, who were legal men, and who had been by their experience in the courts familiar with this whole business, one on either side. Mr. Knott, who had been the solicitor for the prosecutions which were launched against the returning officers in connection with what I have described, and Mr. Howell, who had been counsel for the defendants in these proceedings. Each was examined, and Mr. Knott, after referring to the statute and detailing in the quiet of an examination before a small committee of this House exactly what had been complained of and pointing out, what was undoubtedly the fact, that there was no statutory authority on the face of the Dominion legislation authorizing this thing to be done, was asked by one of the members of the committee whether he could suggest anything unreasonable about it, or whether it was not the most reasonable thing in the world for these returning officers to have done.

And Mr. Knott, with all candour, said he considered it was perfectly reasonable, but the question was whether or no it was legal. The question was the legality of what was done, and the only thing in that connection I should have to complain of would be that there had been discussion in connection with this matter and an effort to make political capital out of it. There was necessity to do it, it was done, and the question now is whether or no this parliament, with the necessity for doing exactly the same thing, will or will not authorize its officers to do that which is necessary unless we are to throw overboard altogether the provincial lists and prepare our own lists, as we did under the Franchise Act of 1885. In the heated discussion on the conduct of the Manitoba officials, which I have mentioned, there was at all events a very great difference of views as to the number of men whose names were struck off and were not placed upon the lists in their own particular ridings, and in that way prevented from voting. In one sense, for my purpose here in advocating the passing of legislation to remedy the existing conditions, it is not very material how many or whether there were any voters who, as a consequence, lost their votes upon that occasion; but I wish to say a word or two upon that head. because it was a subject of long investigation and consideration before the committee two years ago of which I had the honour to be chairman. The whole matter was debated at very considerable length in this House in the session of 1905, and I have but to refer hon. gentlemen who may be interested to the 'Hansard' of May 30, 1905, when, upon motion to go into supply, the question was taken up and debated. Of the ten constituencies in Manitoba as represented in this House, we had on that occasion, I think, all their representatives taking part in that debate. We had the hon. member for Lisgar saying that in his constituency he had personally examined the lists and had found only nine errors—six names left off and three put on in the wrong polling division, and that of these nine, six were his own supporters. The hon. member for Souris addressed the House on that occasion but made no complaint about the lists in his constituency. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie said that, so far as he could ascertain, there had been but one left off the lists in his riding. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) though he spoke in general terms, made the charge, so far as anything specific was concerned, simply that ten names in one polling division had been put in the wrong township. The hon. members for Brandon, Winnipeg and Dauphin made no complaints whatever; and there could be no complaint in Winnipeg or Dauphin, because in Dauphin the election took place by acclamation and in Winnipeg there was no readjustment because the bounds were coterminous between the one constituency and the other. So that we have seven of the ten Manitoba constituencies accounted for at all events by their representatives in this House on the occasion to which I have referred. And the aggregate of the complaints from those seven constituencies was twenty votes—twenty men misplaced. not twenty disfranchised, but twenty put upon the lists in a wrong polling subdivision or a wrong township.

Mr. STAPLES. May I ask a question? The hon. Minister of Justice has been kind enough to mention all the members who spoke on that occasion with the exception of myself. If he will kindly refer to what I said as to the number who were struck off in Macdonald, that might interest the House.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I am not going to omit my hon. friend's constituency by any means. I say that of the ten Manitoba constituencies, the seven I have spoken of were discussed in the debate by the representatives here. The remaining three, Macdonald, Provencher and Selkirk, were also discussed, and they are the three in respect of whose returning officers there were prosecutions in Manitoba. And those three constituencies were the only ones with regard to which witnesses were called before the committee of two years ago, to which I have referred. In these circumstances, I am not without justification if I come to the conclusion that it is in those three the principal grounds for complaint by our friends opposite exist, and that, to say the least, there is not the same reason for complaint in the other seven, in respect of which their representatives three years ago said that at the most twenty names had been misplaced. My hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) did not limit himself in his general observations, which were strong enough, to the specific statements to which I am about to refer; but so far as he specified any grounds of complaint, there were three polling places or registration districts—I do not know which they are—in his constituency in which he considered there was reason for complaint. These places were Miami, Treherne and Poplar Point. At Poplar Point he said there were fifteen. at Treherne two, and at Miami eleven names misplaced, so that there were twenty-eight voters in the whole constituency who had been disfranchised in this way. There was nothing, so far as I can recall, contradicting that statement in the testimony before the committee. There seemed to be a consensus of opinion that that was about the number of voters in the constituency of Macdonald concerning whom there was ground for complaint. The great complaint was with regard to Selkirk and Provencher, and especially the poll at Beausejour where, it was said, forty-two names had been struck out. We had before us a

witness from that poll, the postmaster, I think, one of the men whose names had been struck off, and who was brought all the way from Manitoba to testify to his undoubted right to vote and to his having been deprived of his vote because his name was struck through by the red line at his own poll.

He was an ardent politician, as he candidly stated. He attended at the poll upon the occasion as the agent at the poll—the scrutineer—of the candidate of his choice. When he found that his name was not upon the list, or had been struck off the list, he protested. He claimed from the deputy returning officer, with whom he was perfectly acquainted, the right to vote. The deputy returning officer fully conceded it; he was given his ballot; he marked his ballot; he cast it and in fact, as he testified before the committee it was counted. He claimed that he had the legal right to vote, independent altogether of the certified list, in the circumstance that he was at the polling place as the accredited agent of one of the candidates. No one felt then disposed, and I have no doubt no one feels now disposed, to question for a moment the course which he took in insisting on casting his vote or the course which the deputy took in receiving that vote, even though the voter's name was not on the list certified to him as authentic. That man's right to a ballot was acknowledged just as effectively as though the 'thin red line' had not been drawn through his name. He travelled all the way from Winnipeg to Ottawa to testify as to these circumstances; and, if he can be taken as a sample of the 42 struck off at the Beausejour poll, one would say, certainly, there was no great grievance in it. But, of course, I do not pretend that the other 41, or, perhaps, any of the other 41, succeeded in voting in the Beausejour poll. None were called before us, and we were not in a position to come to a conclusion as to how that might be. But there is no kind of question that these men, or a majority of them, had voted—or had the right to vote—at the adjoining poll of Cromwell. I do not remember whether this was in the same constituency or not. But that was their proper poll, and the striking off was because the boundary line running through the polling subdivision found on either side of it a portion of the names recorded in the registration list as proper to a certain registration district. It appeared to be the fact that, either by design or inadvertence—which you will, according to your political sympathies—the name of a legal voter at Beausejour, the witness who was before us, had been struck off and that it ought not to have been struck off; but not the slightest evidence was given even hinting at it having been done by intent or otherwise than by inadvertence. Now, I do not make any kind of doubt—I am not pretending to argue otherwise before this House—that, throughout the whole province of Manitoba, there may have been many more names of honest voters who had the right to vote whose names were struck off in this necessary readjusting or redistributing of the voters' names that I have described. And I am not wishing for a moment to pretend that this readjusting or redividing and redistributing was limited to cases in which the boundary line between two constituencies ran through a registration district as it existed for provincial purposes. I do not wish in the least to be misunderstood, and I assure you I am not in any degree blinking the situation, nor am I unwilling to take the fullest responsibility for the measure of redress as I believe this to be, which I am presenting to the House in the Bill now under consideration. Not only were there, in many instances throughout Manitoba the redistribution of names I have pointed out as absolutely requisite under this system of registration by registration districts, of these districts not corresponding to the boundaries of any Dominion constituency, but there was also a similar redistributing of names in cases where that was made requisite because of the Dominion returning officers subdividing polling divisions as they had existed for provincial purposes. The statute under which the registration of voters took place in Manitoba provides for the delimitation throughout the province of registration districts or of polling subdivisions. That statute had been repealed, or these provisions of that statute had been repealed, by the legislative Act which I have already mentioned and which was passed by the Manitoba legislature in the spring of 1904. The authority for the existence of provincial polling subdivisions had been, by that repeal, swept away, and nothing substituted for it; and the result was, when you came to October and November, 1904, and the writs were issued for a Dominion election, there was impossibility on the part of the returning officers to comply with the provision of our Dominion statute which requires the adoption of provincial subdivisions for the purpose of Dominion elections. In many cases, the registration districts of the province, which were supposed to correspond with the polling divisions, and which, I presume, in the main did so correspond, and according to which the voters were grouped, consisted of territories so large as to be altogether unwieldy and in which it was impracticable, it was physically impossible, to poll the vote at one polling booth within the hours assigned for the voters. A case has been mentioned to me by one hon. gentleman from Manitoba as coming within his personal cognizance, where the registration district was over fifteen miles from end to end and where there were two settlements in the same registration district divided by an impassable swamp, a swamp that you had to go round, and which made the colony at one

end, distant, for all practical purposes, from the poll, if it was at the other end, so many miles that it was a physical impossibility for the people there to record their votes. Now, this is not a matter of political difference; it is a matter of men entitled to vote being physically unable to record their votes between 9 and 5 o'clock on polling day, simply because they were too far distant from the poll to make the journey. In these circumstances, which existed, or with regard to which something similar existed, in many cases, wholly within some Dominion electoral constituency, the returning officers appointed two polls, giving one at each side of the swamp—to use the illustration to which I have adverted. Then it became necessary to divide, to distribute the names of the voters upon the voters' list in the registration district in precisely the same way. So, this redistribution of names, while it did not take place in every school section or in every community in the province, was scattered, and necessarily scattered, over the whole area of the province of Manitoba, and I am not pretending to the House that this redistribution was limited to cases where polling registration districts were subdivided by county or electoral district boundary lines. In the whole province, I suppose, there is a matter of 50,000 names to be handled upon the voters' list. I think if you have ten returning officers set down with 50,000 names, 5,000 on the average for each one to distribute according to their proper polling subdivisions, to do that work in the four weeks that pass between the receipt of the writ and of these lists, and the polling day, to get together the necessary information and do the best they can, no matter how honestly they may try, you will find a percentage of inadvertences or honest mistakes, and you will find some men who will be disfranchised. The great bulk of the men whose names were struck off the roll in the voting place to which they did not belong, were left on in the voting place where they did belong; and the great bulk of those who were so struck off, I will venture to say, voted at the election in 1904; they had an opportunity of doing so, at any rate. But if you find any voter whose name was struck off by design and if you find the statute law in such a condition that it is possible, either by inadvertence or by design, that that should take place, you have a condition of things which calls for a change, and calls for legislation in this parliament which would make it impossible, so far as human foresight can do so, that the same state of things should occur again; and that is the whole purpose of the legislation in question so far as this provision of it is concerned. Now I have tried to point out, having reference to the debate in this House, and having reference to the evidence that was given two years ago before the Elections Committee, some indication of how much at any rate was testified to, of how much was asserted by hon. members of this House in regard to the instances in which members' names were struck off and their votes thereby lost, I say as the result of the evidence which we listened to two years ago, equally as the result of the statements made in this House by the ten members from Manitoba in the debate to which I have referred, and especially upon the statements made by the three hon. members from Macdonald, Selkirk and Provencher, that the aggregate number throughout the whole province of Manitoba, of that whole 50,000 voters whose names had to be handled by the deputy returning officers, would not exceed 100; and if you have in 50,000 voters at the most 100 men whose names have been either by design or inadvertence struck off, it is a percentage, not of one in 100, but at most of one in 500 votes; it is a pretty small percentage. If the number had been even ten times as great, if it had been 1,000 and far more, if it had been 2,000 or 3,000, according to some wild flights of imagination I have seen, we might then find some evidence that there must have been intention, that it could not have been by accident, that there must have been design. But it is manifest that the whole contention that there was in what then took place an intention to do wrong, an intention to disfranchise qualified voters, rests absolutely upon the question of the number of men in regard to whom that thing was done. In that respect no evidence certainly was offered before the committee of two years ago; I have never heard any evidence offered other than the statements I have referred to; and I suppose that question of numbers is one which never can be decided. I make no point of it here, I say at once with all frankness that if there were even 100 in the province of Manitoba, it is ample to justify some measure of legislative change in that regard which will secure this necessary work to be done in such a manner that it will not, in human probability, go wrong.

Well, Sir, I need not detail what followed. I am only referring to it in order that I may answer a statement with regard to myself which I have seen rather freely made in the newspapers. The elections of 1904 having taken place in November, and the condition of things I have described as to the rearrangement of names having taken place, prosecutions were promptly instituted under the direction of the Attorney General for the province against the returning officers for, among other constituencies, the three especially I have referred to, Provencher, Selkirk and Macdonald. Originally some sixteen men, deputies and others, were attacked for participation in what was claimed to have been an indictable wrong; but in the result true bills were found against only one of the officials, the returning officer for Selkirk. That true bill or indictment coming up for consideration in

the March assizes of 1905, was quashed by the court. Immediately new proceedings were instituted against Duggan, the returning officer for Selkirk, and the result of these new proceedings was that at the fall assizes of 1905 true bills were found against the returning officers for Provencher and Macdonald, against Duggan and one Leach, the Liberal organizer for the province, who was accused of having wilfully participated in what was called the mutilation of the lists. These four true bills were found by the grand jury at Winnipeg in November, 1905, and they stood for trial before a petty jury at that court. One of them was afterwards taken to trial to the extent of giving evidence. The presiding judge made a ruling which was reversed upon appeal, and the case sent back for a new trial. The case was sent back in the fall of 1906, and the course being clear in October, 1906, for a new trial of these four indictments, the case being clear according to the views of the prosecution we have already heard described, those four indictments against the three returning officers and against Leach stood for hearing at the fall assizes of 1906, and nothing was done. They stood for hearing at the spring assizes of 1907, and nothing was done. They were standing for trial at the fall assizes of 1907, and the defendants then, according to an account of the matter I have clipped from the Montreal 'Gazette' of that date, took the matter up and insisted that these charges should be disposed of. The Montreal 'Gazette' in its issue of 18th November last, gives an account of what took place at the calling of these indictments in Winnipeg on the previous day. It states that Mr. H. W. H. Knott, who appeared for the provincial government, speaking of these indictments and describing their position—and I may remark in passing that he is the same Mr. Knott who appeared before the committee, and who gave his testimony then as the representative of the Conservative party in the province of Manitoba, and who was personally acquainted with all the circumstances to which I have adverted. After describing, according to this newspaper report, what had taken place with reference to these prosecutions and the proceedings before a committee of this House, he takes occasion to say:

> That committee was presided over by Mr. Aylesworth. In the investigation the committee saw fit to probe into malpractices in connection with the elections held——

It is printed Alberta, but that is a manifest misprint, because we had nothing to do with Alberta; it should be:

> —in connection with elections held in Manitoba and under the order of that committee all documents in connection with these indictments, exhibits and papers in connection with the election, were transmitted to Ottawa for the purpose of examination by committee. The committee has not reported and parliament will not sit until the 28th.

He was speaking on the 17th of November.

> These documents are in the possession of the committee, and we shall have great difficulty in getting them unless the committee report to the House this session, which I understand they are going to do.

Accordingly, the absence of these precious documents was made the excuse to the judge, in November last, for the unwillingness of Mr. Knott, the representative of the Manitoba Attorney General, appearing for that government, to go on with those prosecutions. I read that statement in the Montreal 'Gazette' last November with some astonishment. I thought I had a reasonably accurate memory of what had taken place in connection with these documents before the committee in question. I was not then in this country, but on returning I looked among my papers and found my recollection entirely supported by some correspondence which passed between members of that committee in April and May of 1906. It was upon the request of the hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Barker), as a member of that committee, that the papers in question were called for. Those papers were the papers connected with those elections which were properly in the custody of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery here. That gentleman had attended with them under subpoena on two different occasions at Winnipeg, travelling there first upon the occasion of the preliminary investigation and secondly when the case was before the Grand Jury or the Petit Jury. They were left in the custody of the court in Winnipeg. In the spring of 1906 it was thought that they might be needed for purposes of reference before the committee in question, and the hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Barker) asked that they should be sent for. They were sent for, they came here, they were delivered to the clerk of the committee, and for anything that I know, the clerk of the committee has the original package to this day unopened. I do not remember that the package was ever opened before the committee, perhaps it was; my point is simply that this gentleman, Mr. Knott, himself a witness before the committee, himself counsel for the prosecution and having personal knowledge of exactly the situation in regard to the papers in question, in open court, according to this report in the Conservative newspaper of Montreal, alleged as his reason for not going on with this prosecution in November last, that the committee of which Mr. Aylesworth was chairman held these papers and that he could not get on without them. Not only that, but since then, on more than one Manitoba platform, more than one member of the provincial government has charged that I, personally, as Minister of Justice, have had these papers

in my custody, have prevented their presentation to court, and that in the absence of these papers they were precluded by the conduct of the Minister of Justice from probing to its foundation this alleged scandal of which otherwise they were going to make such a manifest exhibition before the courts and before the people of this country. This prosecution, upon the excuse which I have stated, was directed by the presiding judge to stand over until the March assizes this year. On the 3rd day of March, last, these prosecutions were called in the city of Winnipeg and the Attorney General of the province of Manitoba voluntarily entered upon that occasion what lawyers call a nolle prosequi, a formal statement to the officer of the court that he was unwilling to proceed further with these prosecutions which he had launched more than three years before. In the meantime those charges had been canvassed broadcast through this country. I suppose that for the next three years, and possibly for three years beyond that, the same thing will continue, but I point you, Sir, to the circumstance that after three years of consideration and of preparation, if there had been any the least evidence upon which charges such as were so freely made of wrongdoing in connection with the voters' lists upon the occasion in question could have been substantiated by that prosecution, there was the fullest means to their hands to do it, and there was ample opportunity to have justified if they could, by evidence and by the result of that trial, whether or not those men had done anything for which they ought to be condemned. With these prosecutions against men to whom His Majesty's writs for the purposes of a Dominion election had been sent, so instituted by the constituted Crown authorities of the province in which those elections took place, I think, Sir, we should have had difficulty in finding any men willing, in case another election came to be necessary, to execute such writs of election if they were without statutory protection and statutory authority for doing things which are essential to be done if elections are to be carried on at all in the province of Manitoba. We find ourselves accordingly face to face with this situation, that if Dominion elections are to be held in Manitoba, if you are to have men with any stake in the country, men who are not willing to be subjected to legal prosecutions, acting as returning officers, you must point out to them by statute law what course they are to take in regard to distributing the names which they find on the provincial lists to the appropriate polling subdivisions at which these men are entitled to vote.

This Bill accordingly proposes that immediately upon the issue of a writ or, if circumstances render it proper, before a writ issues, men shall be appointed who will act, subject to the revision of the county judges, as a registration board, men who will be acting upon their responsibility as officers of the law and subject to an appeal to the county judges of the province, whose duty it will be to take the lists of voters and to distribute those voters according to the Dominion polls at which they are entitled to vote, and who, if they do that work conscientiously and honestly, will not be subject to subsequent attack in the courts, by reason of the fact that there has been legislative authority for the work they have been called upon to do. Such legislation is, under the circumstances I have tried to detail, in my submission a manifest necessity, and without such legislation it would be impossible that elections for Dominion purposes could hereafter be carried out in Manitoba.

There are other provisions in this Bill in regard to which I have a few words to say. Not only does clause 1—because I am limiting myself to that clause—deal with the necessity for the distribution of names to their appropriate polling subdivision, but it also provides for a measure of revision of the lists, and this feature of it seems particularly to have excited the indignation and the ire of many representatives of the opposite political party in the Manitoba legislature and the Manitoba government. In noticing the newspaper warfare in Winnipeg and elsewhere that has gone on in the last two months in respect to this provision of the Bill, I could not help being reminded of that to which I alluded briefly at the opening of my observations this afternoon. It was the settled policy of the Conservative party in this country when it was in power from 1885 to 1896, that the Dominion parliament should control its own franchise, that the voters' lists for Dominion purposes should be prepared by officials named by the government of the day, that the provincial lists should be altogether discarded; that no reference to them whatever should obtain in the preparation of the lists for Dominion purposes. Not only was that settled policy introduced and placed on the statute-book by the Franchise Act of 1885 which remained until it was repealed in 1898, but when its repeal was under consideration in 1898 a motion was made by the then member for Westmoreland:

> That no system of franchise would be satisfactory which did not preserve federal control over the voters' lists.

That resolution was pressed to vote by way of amendment to the second reading of our present Election Act and the division upon that resolution was an absolute party one. In these circumstances it does seem to me that the Conservative party in this country is certainly—unless it has abandoned the faith of its predecessors—is certainly wedded and wedded indissolubly to the principle of discarding the provincial lists. Speech after speech was made in the debate of 1898 by the leaders and by the prom-

inent members of the Conservative party in this House advocating the retention by the Dominion authorities of absolute control over the preparation of voters' lists for Dominion purposes and arguing strenuously that it was utterly improper for this parliament to abdicate its functions or to entrust the preparation of these voters' lists to any provincial body. Nay more, when the House was in committee on that Bill in 1898, on the 1st of April of that year, (page 2991 'Hansard'), I find the present hon. leader of the opposition placing himself upon record and insisting that it was unwise on the part of this House to denude itself of control over its own electoral machinery; that it was one of the privileges most ancient and most important of this House that it should control its own elections and the preparation of its own voters' lists, and that it was a very unwise thing on the part of parliament to delegate that power to any provincial legislature or to any provincial authority. The opposite view was maintained by the Prime Minister and by the Solicitor General of that day, (Mr. Fitzpatrick), who contended that the proper authority for the preparation of the voters' lists was in origin the municipal authority, and that the proper basis was the assessment roll which contained that element of substantiality to which I have already referred.

In the province of Manitoba and equally in the province of British Columbia and in the unorganized portions of Ontario and Quebec we have under our present law a different system of the preparation of the voters' lists. We have also a totally different system in the new provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta and in the Yukon territory, but legislation on our part is not requisite with regard to these new provinces or to the Yukon territory as such legislation already exists. Under our Election Act a special provision is made for Alberta, Saskatchewan and the Yukon, but the provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia, with the unorganized portions of Ontario and Quebec remain the only portions of the Dominion in which the voters' lists are not in their origin and initiation prepared upon the footing of the assessment rolls and by the municipal authorities. Now, what has been the result? The system in the province of Manitoba—and the system is not different in principle in British Columbia—is registration before an official of the provincial government coupled with revision before some officer, either judge or barrister appointed for that purpose. In the province of British Columbia there seems to have been what I will call a less unsatisfactory administration of the law than has taken place in other parts of the Dominion. There is less complaint in regard to British Columbia but complaint is not absent there, and complaint is, I venture to say, inevitable as long as you have an effort to sandwich together the two systems each of different character, and unless they are to be worked by the same officials. In the province of Manitoba the registration on which the list as it now exists was made, took place at least as long ago as 1903. The lists used in November 1904 were those established in the year 1903, but those lists had been so prepared under the law of Manitoba as it stood in 1903. The legislature by its statute of 1904 provided there should be annually what they call a revision of these lists; not the preparation of new lists but the taking of the lists as they then stood and striking off the names of any persons disqualified or adding the names of any new persons who had become qualified. Since 1904 there has been in Manitoba an annual acting under his provision of the provincial law. I do not think I am doing any injustice to the proceeding which has been taken annually in that province under this provision of their law, if I speak of it as never having been of a very satisfactory character. I think I use a mild word when I say that, and I will explain exactly why. The times at which and within which the revising of the list, such as it is, shall take place are by the provincial statute to be fixed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Formerly the dates and places were fixed by the registration board consisting of the county judges but now they are fixed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Whatever the reason, the result has been that the time allowed for the revision in each year since then has been, according to the view at any rate of the one political party, entirely inadequate for the purpose. The statute requires notices of appeal from the registration clerk to be given within a certain number of days from the closing of the work of the registration clerk. The statute empowers the Lieutenant Governor in Council to fix the number of days upon which the revising officer, judge or barrister shall sit in his work, and when the day fixed by the proclamation for the concluding of that hearing of appeals or revising work is passed there is no power on the part of the officer to continue his work no matter how much may remain to be done and no matter how many appeals may remain unheard. When the hour comes which has been fixed beforehand as that at which his jurisdiction ceases there is an end of his right to continue further in his work, and his work, of necessity, comes to an end. Now, to say nothing more, that feature of the system has been highly unsatisfactory. It has been alleged, I do not know with what truth, that in some instances there have remained hundreds of men entitled to vote, or at all events, claiming the right to vote, with their appeals to get on the list standing regularly for hearing by the revising officer, and with the revising officer, judge or barrister, unable to hear those appeals or to

dispose of them, simply because his time has expired. It is alleged that such men are of one political party, that their names are left off right and left by the registration clerks, that their only means of getting on the list and obtaining the right to exercise their franchise is by an appeal to the judge, and that the judge is given, it may be for a whole constituency, but one day between the hours of ten and five within which to do the work of days or weeks. As a necessary and inevitable consequence, if that state of things exists, there must be throughout the province men by the hundred who claim the right to vote, and whose claim it is impossible for them, in the system as it is administered, to get any adjudication of by the constituted authorities for that purpose.

Well, I do not know—I do not suppose anybody can know, without the taking of evidence—whether or not that state of things as so described does exist. I say simply that men assert that it exists, and I call attention in that connection to a contemporaneous article on the subject which appeared in the Manitoba 'Free Press' on the 26th of May, 1906. I refer to it for the reason that it is contemporaneous with the happening of the events which the writer is depicting. He says that in the constituencies of Kildonan and St. Andrews registration takes place on the same day as elsewhere, May 29 and 30, while revision takes place at Selkirk on June 6, exactly one week later than the last day of registration. Now, under the Manitoba statute, all protests must be in the hands of the revising officer five days before the sittings of his court of revision, and accordingly it follows, if the statement in that newspaper is correct as to the dates, that there was given only one week within which to revise after the close of the work of the registration clerk, and five days out of the seven in that week would have to run for the purposes of an appeal. In other words, the revising barrister or judge would have to be in possession of all appeals for those constituencies within one day after the close of the work of the registration clerk. When you remember that the registration clerk is appointed for a whole constituency, and that the constituency may be and frequently is 100 miles from side to side, you have some idea of the physical impossibility of conducting an appeal under a system administered as this provincial system is said to have been administered in Manitoba. I am not complaining of the system. The system is spread upon the statute-book. I think it might be improved. I think the system in Ontario to-day is much better. That is a matter of judgment; that is a matter in respect of which the views of the Manitoba legislature are no doubt different from the views I am expressing. They think, I presume, that their system is better than the system in the sister province of Ontario, as administered by the government of Ontario to-day. But without questioning what the merits or demerits of the provincial system may be, I say that it is manifest that any system, no matter how good, may be so administered that it will be oppressive and unjust, and that there is at any rate ground for complaint that the present system in Manitoba, as at present administered in the preparation of the voters' lists, is an engine of tyranny and oppression as against the party that is opposed to the provincial government.

We have, ever since 1898, retained in the hands of this parliament a power which was deliberately retained at that time, the retention of which was then urged by the present hon. leader of the opposition—the power to prepare our own lists in circumstances such as are described in the statute, circumstances which existed at that time in Manitoba, which continued to exist in that province for six years afterwards, but which were changed a few months before the elections of 1904. In the condition which now exists in Manitoba, with voters' lists which were prepared more than five years ago, with voters' lists that have never been since that time effectively revised, with voters' lists therefore that contain the names of hundreds of men who are either dead or departed from the province, we have lists that need revision. We have lists that ought to be submitted to the work of a revising officer, a county judge or a barrister according to the Manitoba system, with time given him within which he can effectively do that work of revision, within which he can effectively purge the lists of dead men and of absentees, the presence of whose names upon those lists is but an invitation and a temptation to personation. We have lists from which the names of hundreds of men in Manitoba are absent—hundreds of men who, whether rightly or wrongly, claim the right to be upon those lists, and the right to exercise their franchise; men who claim at any rate that they have been prevented from having their claims adjudicated by the insufficiency of the time allowed under the statute for the purposes of revision. When we have lists presenting features of that description, the question is simply what ought to be done in regard to them? Ought we to adopt the policy which for so many years was that upon which our opponents acted, when, carrying out their views, they had upon the statute-book the Dominion Franchise Act, and when voters' lists for Dominion purposes were prepared throughout the whole Dominion by officials appointed by the government of the day, and the work of the provincial authorities was altogether disregarded.

Or should we, on the other hand, adhere to the policy laid down by this government in 1898 and adopt the provincial system, no matter how ineffective, no matter in how

many features it might be improved, and apply it to the preparation of the Dominion lists ? We have preferred to adhere to the policy of retaining the provincial lists, and not to go to the length, to which the Conservative party went before 1898, of adopting in whole the principle of preparing our own lists altogether from the foundation. We prefer to adhere to the provincial lists, and accordingly, in the Bill I am submitting, the lists as established in the provinces, shall be taken in the preparation of the lists for Dominion purposes, and to them shall be added the names of any persons qualified to vote which are not on them and from them shall be struck the names of all those who are not qualified. The lists so prepared, subject to the revision of a county court judge, shall be allotted and distributed to the polling divisions to be used in the Dominion elections. That is in brief the outline of this clause. We propose to apply it to those parts of the Dominion not already provided for by our own legislation, in which municipal organization and assessment rolls as the basis for the voters' lists, are not to be found ; and with that provision we make the Dominion system consistent with the intention of this parliament, as expressed in 1898. We not only adopt the provincial lists in their entirety as the basis upon which revision and appeal takes place, but in addition we follow completely the provincial method of preparing and revising the lists, and the lists are made in accordance with whatever laws the provinces choose to enact for their own purposes, as was the intention when the statute of 1898 was passed. That is the outline of this first clause of the Bill. The other provisions of the Bill can be discussed in committee or at a later stage of this debate, more especially as I have already, in introducing this measure, explained their general outline with fullness of detail. I beg to move, therefore, the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. R L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). We have listened, Mr. Speaker, to rather a remarkable speech from my hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, on the great question of the reform of the electoral laws of this country. That is the subject which it became his duty to present to us this afternoon, but two-thirds of his speech has been devoted to a consideration of how many voters were disfranchised by the thin red line of 1904, and a very large portion of the balance to more or less irrelevant details of the electoral methods in the province of Manitoba. I do not propose to follow my hon. friend into many of these subjects. I do not propose to waste the time of the House by discussing the number of voters disfranchised by the thin red line in 1904, because that has already been discussed in this House over and over again, and there are other matters of much more moment in which our time may be occupiel.

There can be no doubt that the election law of this country requires amendment. We have been urging its amendment for the last three or four years. In this connection, I very much regret that the government have not seen fit to bring down, at the same time as they brought down this measure, an additional Bill for the purpose of simplifying the Dominion Controverted Elections Act and doing away with some of those delays and useless proceedings which have rendered the administration of the law a by-word and a disgrace. The government have not seen fit to take that step and I am sorry for it.

My hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) has introduced a very elaborate Bill which contains many valuable provisions, and I regret that the Bill now submitted contains but very few of the valuable and useful provisions embodied in the Bill of my hon. friend. I do not say that the measure brought down is without merit in some respects. I approve entirely of sections 2 and 3, especially section 3, which supplies a want that has been long felt, namely, the obligation to furnish an address at which all legal processes, notices and other documents can be served on any man who becomes a candidate under the Dominion Elections Act. That will do away with a great many difficulties in regard to service which we have had in the past. It will do away with all those cases in which, by a judgment of a court of the province or a court of appeal, some hon. member of this House, against whom a petition may have been brought, may have escaped any inquiry whatever into his election simply by reason of some technical point raised in connection with the nature of the service. I approve also of section 19 of the Bill, which is a reform we have advocated ; and the object aimed at in sections 18 and 21 is no doubt a very good one, though I do not think these provisions are adequate to the purposes intended. Section 21 provides :

> Every person, including the candidate, and every partnership, association or company making, on behalf of a candidate at an election, any contribution otherwise than to or through the agent of such candidate, is guilty of an indictable offence.

That does not seem to me adequate because the expression 'on behalf of any candidate' would leave a very wide loophole whereby those who ought to be punished might escape.

Section 28 seems to me rather to lend itself to the making of political contributions by organizations formed for that purpose than to bring about any reform of the law such as has been attempted by my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn). However, as that and other sections

come to the observation of the committee will later on, we can then discuss them more fully. For the moment I can only say that, for the purposes intended, section 28 seems to me absolutely inadequate.

So far as section 17 is concerned, it does away entirely with the secrecy of the ballot. And I, for one, am absolutely opposed to any such provision. The guiding principle of the Dominion Election Act has been the secrecy of the ballot, conveying the assurance to each voter that when he marks his ballot, either for one candidate or the other, his choice will remain a secret within his own knowledge and not to be disclosed. When we find the Minister of Justice proposing to amend the Dominion Election Act by adding thereto the following words :

Provided, however, that no ballot paper shall be rejected on account of any writing, number or mark placed thereon by any deputy returning officer.

—we are face to face with this situation: that if it is desired that the vote of any particular elector shall be known, and the manner in which he marks his ballot shall be known, any partisan deputy returning officer can mark upon it, 'This is John Smith's ballot.' and that will be an absolutely good ballot. I see no jurisdiction for any such amendment to the law as that. And I say it is far better to continue the system we have at present, a system which may bring about the voidance of elections now and then, but which will not do away with the secrecy of the ballot, which secrecy is the safeguard of the country and of the voter.

Now, I commend also the provisions of section 11 so far as they go. There has been an attempt there to provide that the forms of oath which ought to be administered in any case to any elector coming for ward to deposit his ballot shall be set forth in the instructions so clearly and unmistakably that no deputy returning officer, no scrutineer and no voter shall have any doubt upon the subject. I approve of the principle embodied in that section, but I say that the section is not sufficiently explicit, not sufficiently definite, and I shall. therefore, ask that it be amended when we get into committee.

I greatly regret that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice—and the government, for that matter—have not embodied in this Bill certain provisions contained in the Bill of my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn), some, but not all, of which I shall now enumerate. There is no provision in this Bill for the holding of by-elections within a reasonable time, nor is it provided that, where several by-elections are pending, they shall all be held upon the same day. There is no provision by which the respectable character of returning officers shall be assured, and we know from some experience in the past that this is an extremely important desideratum to the end that we shall have fair elections. There is no amendment doing away with the provision of the law by which certain elections in the province of British Columbia and the province of Manitoba shall be held at a time subsequent to the general election. The time has long gone by when these elections should be delayed. In the province of British Columbia, the provincial elections in every constituency are held on the same day. After examining into the matter very carefully, after going to all the sources of information available, I am thoroughly convinced that there is no reason for delaying these elections in British Columbia, or in any other province beyond the time at which the general election is held.

My hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) introduces very elaborate provisions respecting contributions by corporations and contractors, and I regret to see that the corresponding provisions contained in the Bill introduced by the government are not at all effective to my mind and require very important modifications before they can be said to fulfil in the slightest degree the purpose alleged to be aimed at. There is provision in the Bill of my hon. friend from Prince Edward with regard to civil servants taking part in elections. Its effect is simply to embody in the statute law a principle which has been accepted by the government and affirmed by unanimous vote of this House. I see no reason why it should not be placed on the statute-book that he who runs may read and that the civil servant may know that he must not take an active and offensive part in elections. Then, there is no provision in the Bill now before us against bribery by promise of expenditure of public money. or the withholding of that expenditure, according to the election or defeat of any particular candidate. The provisions in this Bill of the government with regard to compelling payments through official agents are not effective, while those in the Bill of the hon. member for Prince Edward are effective and valuable. The Bill introduced by the government omits the statutory declarations respecting expenditure which are required under the Bill of my hon. friend (Mr. Alcorn).

So much for the details of the Bill—and I pass over them very hurriedly for the reason that it will be our duty to go into them more thoroughly when the Bill is in a later stage. Let me pass now to one or two of the reasons given by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, and deal with the ostensible reason assigned by him to-day for clause 1 of this Bill which has undoubtedly provoked a great deal of discussion and a great deal of adverse comment throughout the country. Now my hon. friend either said too much to-day or he said altogether too little when he introduced this Bill. For, I

have read most carefully his remarks on the occasion of the first reading, and I find that he did not allude by one single word in that speech to the preparation of new lists or the revision of any lists whatever in the province of Manitoba or the province of British Columbia. He brought this Bill before the House, and made a very innocent speech with regard to its provisions. We did not know at that time what its provisions were. The hon. gentleman simply pointed out the difficulties that had taken place in Manitoba in 1904 in cases where the boundary of a Dominion riding cut through some local polling division, and he pointed out the necessity of some provision by means of which the distribution of voters to one or another Dominion division could be made in accordance with the law by proper officers and so as not to create any suspicion of unfairness or injustice. But, as to the preparation of new lists in Manitoba or British Columbia, the Minister of Justice on that occasion said not one word in explanation of the Bill the second reading of which has been moved to-day. Well, we have more information on that subject to-day from the hon. gentleman.

I will pass very briefly over a few of the remarks by which he has endeavoured to sustain the recession of his government and his party from the position they took as far back as 1885, when the Dominion Franchise Act was under consideration in this House; which they reaffirmed in most emphatic words in 1893, when they laid down their platform here in Ottawa; and which they reiterated ad nauseam when they introduced and passed, in 1898, the Bill repealing the Dominion Franchise Act. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice declares that there is no provision in the Dominion Elections Act for the case of overlapping, as he termed it, the case where the boundary between two Dominion ridings cuts through a polling division as established under the provincial law. I may not have gathered the intent of the hon. gentleman's remarks in that respect, because, as he proceeded with his argument, he seemed to refer more or less to the registration districts in Manitoba, and to the cutting of these by the boundary between two Dominion ridings. I do not know what the consideration of registration districts has to do with his explanation of this Bill, because I do not find in this Bill the slightest reference to the overlapping of any registration district, but I do find a reference to the overlapping of polling divisions and to the consequent necessity of distributing the voters of any particular polling division to one riding or the other. Why then did the hon. gentleman spend twenty minutes of his time in discussing the cutting in two of registration districts in the province of Manitoba by the boundary between the two Dominion electoral divisions. I do not see the pertinences of the hon. gentleman's remarks. As concerns the cutting of a polling division in two, there is a provision in the Dominion Elections Act under which it was sought to justify, in the province of Manitoba. that which was done, not by the returning officers, but by Mr. Leach, the head of the Liberal provincial organization. I will quote from the Dominion Elections Act two sections :

24. The polling division shall except as herein otherwise provided, be there established by or under the laws of the province for the purposes of provincial elections within the territory comprised in the electoral district for which the election is held.

25. Where any provincial polling division, as constituted at the time of the receipt by the returning officer of the writ for an election, lies only partly within the electoral district for which such election is to be held, the part thereof within such electoral district shall, for the purpose of that election, form a separate polling division, or it may be attached by the returning officer to an adjoining polling division; and the returning officer shall, as soon as possible after the receipt of the writ, prepare from the existing voters' lists a separate voters' list containing the names of the persons entitled to have their names placed on the list for such part of such polling division.

That law can be carried out without any difficulty provided you have honest returning officers, provided you have officers disposed to do their duty, and who do not hand over their functions to be discharged by the Liberal organizer in any province, whoever he may happen to be. The Minister of Justice speaks of the province of Manitoba as if that were the only province in which this overlapping occurs. Does he not know that it occurs in other provinces as well? Does he not know that in the city of Toronto, as I am informed by memebrs of this House from that city, there is exactly the same overlapping? The boundaries of the Dominion divisions are not coterminous with the boundaries of the provincial divisions, and the result is that polling divisions established for provincial purposes are cut through over and over again by the boundaries established for the purpose of Dominion elections. It is not in Manitoba alone that this difficulty occurs, it may occur in any province, and whenever the legislature of any province sees fit to change the boundaries of the provincial riding this difficulty always occurs and probably always will occur, and that difficulty will have to be met in some way. How is it met in Manitoba to-day ? In 1906, when something of the same difficulty had arisen, it was met by legislation, and I will quote from the statutes of Manitoba for 1906, chapter 23, section 7.

In the event of territory comprised within or partly comprised within an electoral division being changed and included in another electoral division, or other electoral divi-

sions whether newly created or not, a judge of one of the county court divisions of the province, to be nominated and appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, shall subdivide the names appearing on the list of electors, as so finally revised, according to the altered boundaries or limits, and make a complete list of electors for the electoral dvisions affected, as aforesaid, and appropriately divide the names of the electors and allot the territory between suitable polling subdivisions, as shall in the opinion of such judge, be just and equitable.

If any amendment is required it is sufficient to follow the lines of that Manitoba statute, and provide that where the boundary between two Dominion electoral divisions cuts through a provincial polling division in the province of Manitoba, then the voters in that polling division shall be alloted, by a county court judge, to that particular Dominion electoral division to which they properly belong, and according to the place where they reside. That is required, if anything is required, and nothing more. When the Minister of Justice in his observations to-day endeavoured to make the people believe that anything more was required by the exigency of the case, he attempted a task which I think even his great ability is unable to accomplish.

Now, the hon. gentleman made a very laboured argument—I do not exactly see the pertinence of it, but it was to this effect, that the two systems of preparing voters' lists which prevail in Canada to-day, had their division line in the boundary between Ontario and Manitoba; west of that boundary line there was a system of registration, east of that boundary line there was a system of municipal lists, of lists made up upon the assessment rolls. As I understand his argument, he appeared to draw the conclusion that because of this system of registration in the west, his proposal as embodied in section 1 of this Bill ought to be favourably entertained by this House. Let me point out to my hon. friend that in the province of Ontario to-day there is a population probably fifty per cent in excess of the population of Manitoba, 500,000 or 600,000 people, in respect of whom the voters' lists are made up, not upon assessment rolls, but by a system of registration. His argument either goes too far or not far enough. The city of Toronto, the city of Hamilton, the city of London, all the cities and towns of Ontario with a population of over 9,000, have, I understand, a system of registration and not a system of preparing voters' lists upon assessment rolls.

Mr. GREENWAY. The registration the hon. gentleman refers to as prevailing in cities is for the manhood suffrage vote, not for the entire registration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not very familiar with the law of Ontario, and I speak under correction. I understand the entire vote in the cities and towns of Ontario may be made up in that way.

Mr. GREENWAY. Only the manhood suffrage.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, the hon. gentleman is apparently right in that regard. But that does not alter for a moment the argument I was making, that the vote of 500,000 or 600,000 of the population of Ontario is derived from a system of registration, and is not made up on the basis of the assessment rolls.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman from Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) is not quite right in endeavouring to make the leader of the opposition believe that this registration in Ontario applies only to manhood franchise voters. It applies to any one who is not on the list and who has a right to be on. If he is a property owner he can register under that system. It would apply, for instance, to a property owner who has been skipped by the assessor.

Mr. GREENWAY. That does not affect what I say at all.

Mr. CONMEE. There is also a very large section for which there is no list, either registration or municipal. I refer to the unorganized section of Ontario, where you have the unorganized list. I wish the hon. member would make reference to that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What does the hon. gentleman want me to explain ?

Mr. FOSTER. His unorganized argument.

Mr. CONMEE. I drew attention to the lists in Ontario in the unorganized sections. One of the hon. gentlemen opposite referred to the Ontario lists and I suggested that it would be well for the hon. gentleman to explain this.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems to me my hon. friend's remarks are a little disorganized and as the Minister of Justice did not see fit to put forward one single word in respect of his proposal so far as it affects the unorganized districts of Ontario and Quebec, it would be well if my hon. friend, when he comes to speak, to supply that omission and to do that which the Minister of Justice should have done if he had regard to his duty to this House.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. gentleman has the floor just now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And is likely to have it for some time, but my hon. friend does not seem to be aware of it.

Let us now discuss the observations of the Minister of Justice with regard to the real object of this Bill—and every one understands pretty well what the real object of this Bill is. It is exactly the same Bill that was prepared in 1904, which at that

time they were afraid to bring down to the House. They have screwed their courage to the sticking point on this occasion and have brought it down, and, absolutely regardless of the pledges which they have made to the people of this country ever since 1885, they are prepared to take the position that, in these two provinces, Manitoba and British Columbia, where there has been no complaint, so far as I am aware, respecting the list, they wish to make the lists by means of their own officers and will not accept those provincial lists respecting which there has been no complaint. My hon. friend the Prime Minister asked in 1885 where were the petitions, where were the public meetings, where were the complaints in respect of the system of preparation of voters' lists which had existed up to that time. The Minister of Justice today said that if statements made to him were correct—a favourite form of expression with the Minister of Justice—there were hundreds of men in the province of Manitoba who had been disfranchised. Disfranchised how? Disfranchised under what circumstances? Disfranchised for what reason? If my memory does not mislead me, I recollect one occasion where the legislature of Manitoba passed a special Bill to put on the voters' lists some seven or eight men who complained that they had been improperly omitted. Where were these hundreds at that time? Why was their voices not raised then? The Minister of Justice used the expression 'if' and he bases the whole of this Bill in respect of this matter upon 'if, if, if,' with regard to certain statements he has made to this House. The province of Manitoba has a system of electoral lists which, in the first place, provides that every man in that province may go before a registration clerk and that registration clerk, as I understand the laws of Manitoba, for a period of two months or thereabouts, the months of May and June in each year, sits to receive applications.

Mr. GREENWAY. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the registration clerk sits two months?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is a period of two months during which these men can put in their applications.

Mr. GREENWAY. A period of two hours.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The proclamations are issued by the first of May and the courts of revision must be completed by the first of July.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the hon. gentleman tell me what his view is of the time during which the registration clerks receive applications?

Mr. GREENWAY. I have told the hon. gentleman and this House before that some registration clerks sat two hours at a particular point to take applications.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as the Manitoba lists are concerned, I would like to quote the opinion of a journal in Manitoba which most strongly opposed the Roblin government at the last election, the Winnipeg 'Tribune.'

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did not that paper attack the Roblin government very severely at the last election?

Mr. GREENWAY. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And did it not take a stand against——

Mr. GREENWAY. No, not very severely.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, I am mistaken.

Mr. GREENWAY. Mistaken in the language.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought the editor of that paper was a candidate in the Liberal interest in that provincial election. That paper made very strong attacks. However, I bow to the hon. gentleman's superior knowledge. He tells me I am mistaken. At all events that journal said this:

To be quite frank, it is our judgment that one of the bright spots in the administration of the Roblin government has been its preparation of the voters' lists. Under the system of registration followed by that government, all parties receive a square deal, and we do not think it has ever been successfully charged against the Roblin government that an injustice in this regard has been perpetrated. Indeed, the conduct of the Roblin government in the matter of the preparation of the voters' lists has been so much better than one might expect from a party government in these degenerate days, that it has always been a pleasure to the 'Tribune' to comment on the action of the government. The fact that an attempt is now being made by the Dominion government to single out this province and have lists of its own prepared, seems to us a sinister proceeding. It is difficult to understand what arguments have been produced to influence the government to depart from the general principle adopted after elections. One would think that the Dominion government had abandoned a sufficient number of its pledges and principles to influence it to at least stand by some one or two in order to save its face.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. What is the date of that article?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Winnipeg 'Tribune' of March 27, last.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. He has changed his politics again since then.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Justice made two rather remarkable statements in dealing with his proposal as contrasted with the operation of this Act in

Manitoba. He said that the time allowed by the officials of the Manitoba government is altogether too short. He spoke of a period of two months in some connection and he tells us that although the provisions of the Manitoba Act are absolutely insufficient, although it is so worked out that men are left off those lists, yet in the preparation of the new lists by officials of this government, they are going to observe, absolutely and thoroughly, the provisions of that law which is so unfair. That is to say, in a period of about 30 days between the issue of the proclamation dissolving parliament and the time of the general election you are to appoint your officers, you are to give weeks during which the voters may register, and you are apparently according to his view—although I do not find it in his Bill—to have a revision by county court judges in the province of Manitoba, and then you are to print those lists and place them in the hands of the returning officers in time to be distributed to the deputy returning officers all over that province in order that they may perform their duty at the then ensuing election. Did any one ever listen to an absurdity more apparent? Why, the mere statement of it by the Minister of Justice is sufficient to indicate to the House and to the country the true nature of this Bill.

The Minister of Justice told us there have been hundreds of men disfranchised in the province of Manitoba. Has he with him to-day a declaration from a single one of these men to that effect? Has he the record of any public meeting, has he petitions from any of these hundreds of men declaring that they have been unable to get their names upon the lists in the province of Manitoba under the operation of the present law. The Minister of Justice has not pointed to the name of a single man who so complains. I venture to say that for every man in the province of Manitoba whom he can show to have been wronged in that regard I will bring two from the province of Nova Scotia which is not to be interfered with by this Bill. The Conservatives of the province of Nova Scotia would rejoice if they had the same opportunity for fair lists as that afforded by the Manitoba law. The Conservatives of Nova Scotia have been asking the Liberal government of that province for the last 15 years to permit them to appeal to the county court judges in respect to the revision of the lists and up to the present time that has not been allowed. The only appeal allowed in the province of Nova Scotia is an appeal from the revising board to the sheriff who is appointed by the provincial government and absolutely under their control. The appointment of these sheriffs has been placed absolutely in the hands of the provincial executive by a statute passed some years ago, although in the good old days the appointment of sheriffs was made by the judges in consultation with a representative of the executive government.

The Minister of Justice tells us in the first place that some provision must be made for allocating the voters in cases where the boundary between two federal electoral divisions cuts in two a local subdivision. I have pointed out there is already provision in section 25 of the statute for that purpose, and that such provision would be presumably sufficient if there were honest returning officers desiring to perform their duty according to the law. In case there might be any suspicion of wrong-doing, it would probably be a prudent course to provide that such revision should not be made by the returning officer himself but should be made by an independent authority—the county court judge—and I do not think any one in this country would object to a proposal of that kind.

The other part of the proposal of the Minister of Justice is that the provincial lists in Manitoba and British Columbia shall be disregarded although the provincial lists are observed and acted upon everywhere else in Canada. I use the word disregarded advisedly because although the Minister of Justice has some very plausible words in his Bill, nevertheless section 1 gives it absolutely into the power of this government to make new lists both in Manitoba and British Columbia. In order that there may be no doubt about it let me read the section:

> Notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein contained, voters' lists for the portions of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec which consist of territory not municipally organized and where there is no regular assessment or valuation roll upon which voters' lists are based and for the several electoral districts in the provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia shall be prepared immediately after the issue of any writ for an election in any such electoral district or in any electoral district composed or partly composed of such territory, or at any time when the Governor in Council so directs; and for the purpose of preparing and giving effect to such voters' lists the Governor in Council may appoint all necessary officers and confer upon them all necessary powers.
>
> 2. In the preparation of such lists the provisions of the laws of the province regulating the preparation and manner of revising and bringing into force the provincial voters' list in the like cases shall as far as possible be observed and followed and no person whose name is not included in the voters' lists as prepared and revised shall be entitled to vote.
>
> 3. In the preparation of such lists the voters' lists which were prepared for the several polling divisions situate wholly or in part within the electoral district or wholly or in part within such unorganized territory as such polling divisions were established at the last preceding provincial election, and which under the laws of the province, are then or were last in force for the purposes of provincial elections, shall be taken, and the

names of voters on such lists shall be distributed among the different polling divisions established for such Dominion election, so that each voter shall be assigned to his proper poll, and the names of all persons who are not qualified to vote in the said electoral district shall be struck off the said lists, and the names of all persons qualified to vote in the said electoral district and not already on the said lists shall be added to the said lists.

I need not read subsection 4 at present. Now there is nothing ambiguous about that. The provincial lists 'shall be taken' whatever that means and whatever legal significance can be given to that, but you are to add thereto, and strike therefrom, names as may be necessary, and that is neither more or less than the making of an absolutely new list in the case of these provinces and of the unorganized territories. For what reason is the government of Canada to adopt provincial lists in the five provinces of Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, and to declare that the provincial lists which have been established, with an appeal to the judiciary, with proper provision for the preservation of the rights of voters, are to be discarded in these two provinces of Canada which happen at this moment to be under the control of Conservative administrations? Why is it that in these two provinces you are to pass by the provincial lists and to have lists made up by officers of the Dominion government? It has been argued in favour of the proposal, that in Manitoba and British Columbia these lists are made up by men appointed by the provincial administration, and that in the sense that the registration clerks who make them up are appointed by the provincial executive, they are partisan lists. As I understand the laws of Ontario the same thing is true with respect to the registration system there.

Mr. CLARKE. Not for Dominion elections.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Am I wrong in my statement?

Mr. CLARKE. The registrars are appointed by the Dominion for Dominion elections.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am speaking of the provincial registration which goes on in Toronto, Hamilton, London and other Ontario cities. The registration, I understand, stands good for a Dominion election if held within a certain period afterwards.

Mr. CLARKE. The Dominion has its own registration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then the hon. gentleman disagrees with me in that?

Mr. CLARKE. Yes.

Mr. BRISTOL. I would be glad if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) would in the course of the debate refer to the section of the Act where he finds that.

Mr. CLARKE. I refer to my own experience.

Mr. BRISTOL. I can assure the hon. gentleman that he is mistaken, under section 6 of the Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would not presume to contradict the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) in regard to the law of Ontario, because he is an old member of the bar of that province, of which I am only a young member. However, perhaps he will permit me to proceed with my argument on the assumption that I am correct in making that statement. I say that, as I understand the law of Ontario, the registration lists which are made up for provincial elections stand good for Dominion elections if held within a year afterwards, and therefore if there be good ground for interfering with lists that have been taken up by appointees of provincial governments, this Bill does not go far enough. It should include all those registration lists which are made up in the cities and towns of Ontario. For what reason is any discrimination made between the province of British Columbia and Manitoba on the one hand and the province of Ontario on the other hand. I do not understand it, unless there be some sinister motive for this Bill which was not disclosed in the speech of the Minister of Justice this afternoon. We adopted in 1898 a system which the Prime Minister had declared for as far back as 1885. I have looked over the debates of 1885. The right hon. gentleman then, and also in 1898, put his argument upon this ground. He said that the regulation of the franchise and the preparation of the voters' lists were absolutely a matter of civil rights and were therefore within provincial jurisdiction, with which it was improper for the parliament of Canada to interfere; when any province established its franchise and prepared its voters' lists, for the election of members to its legislature, that franchise and these voters' lists should stand good for the election, by the voters of that province, of members of this House of Commons. That was the argument of the right hon. gentleman, stated in a few words. He made another argument. He said: Here we were, seven diverse communities in Canada, and to each of these communities, having in a certain respect different ideals and different customs, we should give the right to establish its own franchise and to prepare its own voters' lists. And so, when the Franchise Bill was proposed in 1885, my right hon. friend moved this resolution:

In the opinion of this House it is preferable to continue the plan which has been adopted ever since confederation of utilizing for the elections of this House the provincial franchises and voters' lists.

In 1898 my right hon. friend was still more emphatic. I have a great many references to his remarks at that time, but I shall endeavour to make them as moderate as possible. I quote some of them for the reason that perhaps he has forgotten the length to which he went on that occasion in his statement of absolute adherence not only to provincial franchises but to provincial voters' lists. On page 2280 he said :

Our policy is that the franchise under which the members of this House should be elected is the franchise under which members of the local legislatures are elected. This is the position which we have taken from the beginning; this is the position we maintain at this moment.

On page 2281 he said :

I now come to this proposition, which I lay down as a principle of good government, that under a federative government such as our own it is better that there should be only one franchise as regards the provinces and the Dominion—the same franchise should serve to elect members of this House as to elect members of the local legislatures.

On page 2282 he said :

The regulation of the franchise is above all things, a domestic matter which concerns and ought to be regulated by the local legislatures and not by this parliament.

On page 2286 he said :

In a country like ours, under a federal system of government, the only proper solution of this question is to place the right of suffrage in the hands of the local legislature.

On page 2288, speaking of the Franchise Act of 1885, and referring to the effect of the provisions which had been made for adopting the assessment rolls and the provincial voters' lists as a basis, he said this :

It was far more logical, according to our views, having adopted the principle of the provincial franchise, to also accept the voters' lists so prepared under the authority of the provincial legislature.

On page 3967 he said:

There can be no doubt what the policy of the government is on this subject. We have introduced the principle and have fought for it for many years that the franchise ought to be regulated by the provincial legislatures, that it is for them to decide whether or not the Indians should be admitted to vote or not.

On page 3980 he said :

The hon. gentlemen opposite have taken the ground that this parliament should regulate the franchise, while we have taken the ground that the best method of dealing with it, in view of our complicated government under a federative system is to have one uniform franchise for each province and for the Dominion, that is to say, that the same authority which regulates the franchise for the local legislature should also regulate it for the Dominion parliament.

On page 4012 he said :

I mean to say that civil rights, under our constitution, come within the purview of the local legislature; the franchise being of the nature of a civil right, I say should be determined by the local legislature.

On page 4015 he said :

But I would not have hesitated to accept the franchise provided by a Conservative legislature in Quebec, because, though there were many things in that franchise, on the whole, to which I would have objected, still as it satisfied the province it would have satisfied me. It is in the same way as regards other provinces. It is possible that the control of the several provinces may pass into the hands of the Conservative party; still on a question of this kind I am quite disposed, for my part, to accept the franchise prepared by the legislature, whether Liberal or Conservative.

On page 4016 he said :

Would it not be far better, as a matter simply of good government, if the elections to this House could be conducted on the local lists, and that the members of this parliament and the members of the legislature who represent the same body of people, should be elected by the same electors? Is it not better that it should be so?

On page 4312—and I commend especially to the attention of my right hon. friend this statement—he said:

We do not submit such a proposition——

He had been referring to the possibility of this government appointing their own officers to revise the electoral lists for Canada :

We do not submit such a proposition; we do not want the lists prepared by our appointees. We are satisfied to have them prepared by either the provincial or the municipal authorities.

Then at page 5672 :

We have certainly power to take the provincial lists as they are made and to adopt them as our own; but I question very much whether we have the power to interfere in the preparation of the local lists and to impose conditions not imposed by local legislation as to the manner in which they are to be made.

On page 5674 :

Be that as it may, we have come to the conclusion that the best method we could adopt, as regards the preparation of voters' lists for the elections for this House, is the adoption of the local lists.

It seems to me that these are remarkably definite statements of principle by my right hon. friend who leads this government. Why then is it that, after the lapse of ten years and in respect of these two provinces where the local lists are made up under laws which are the subject of discussion in these provinces, which are authorized by the

people of these provinces, and which permit an appeal to judicial authority, the right hon. gentleman should find it necessary to receded from every principle he has laid down in the quotations he has just read and ask parliament and the country to consent to the preparation of lists by this government, in absolute disregard of those prepared by the provincial authorities?

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to refer to the argument with regard to the boundaries of registration districts of Manitoba which are supposed to be not coterminous with the electoral divisions or with the polling divisions. I hold in my hand the Manitoba 'Gazette' of 25th April, 1908, in which appears an order in council passed by the Manitoba government shortly before, setting forth the names and post office addresses of the persons appointed to act as registration clerks for the several electoral divisions of the province. I observe that registration clerks are not appointed for registration districts, but for the electoral divisions. In certain of the electoral divisions only one registration clerk is appointed, in others two, in others three, and in others a larger number. The territorial limit of their jurisdiction in each case is that of the electoral division. I am also informed by my hon. friends from Manitoba on this side of the House that under this system which prevails in Manitoba the lists are made up for the several polling divisions as established under the provincial enactment. So the argument of the Minister of Justice seems to have been based upon a consideration of the enactments as they formerly were and not upon the enactments as they are to-day. His argument does not carry any force as it does not apply to present conditions.

If there is any difficulty about the overlapping of polling sections, to which I have already alluded, let it be borne in mind, in the first instance, that it is not confined to Manitoba and British Columbia. It should be borne in mind, in the second place, that any such difficulty can only be properly met by providing for the allocation of the electors by the county court judge upon such principle as that contained in the Manitoba Act to which I alluded to-day.

I would like to remark once more that no unfairness in making the lists for any province has been brought to the attention of the House except in the statement of the Minister of Justice based upon a hypothesis which he has not been able to prove. It has been stated to me that the Prime Minister of Manitoba has challenged, both inside and outside the legislature, his political opponents or any person within the province to bring to his attention the case of any man who has been unfairly deprived of his franchise in that province. Further than that, I am informed on the best possible authority that during the recent session of the legislature in Manitoba he asked his opponents whether they had any amendments to suggest to this Act and no amendments were suggested. One would suppose that, if the condition of affairs described by the Minister of Justice prevailed in Manitoba, the active, vigilant opposition in that province would have moved in the legislature for the amendment of the Act. I am not aware that any such amendment has been proposed, or that any reasonable amendment has been proposed which has not been accepted.

Further than that, if the government of the Dominion after having adopted, as they did in the most unequivocal way, the provincial lists, have come to the conclusion that the effect of the Manitoba enactments was not in the public interest and operated unfairly or to the disadvantage of persons in the province who were entitled to vote, or operated unfairly in another way by retaining on the list the names of persons not entitled to vote, such a government, desiring to adhere to the principles of 1885, or 1893 and of 1898 would have brought these matters to the attention of the Manitoba government and would have asked that government to propose to the legislature such amendments in the electoral law of Manitoba as would reform the evils alluded to. But I am not aware that such a proposition has been made, either by the government of Canada of by the Liberal opposition of the province of Manitoba.

Now, what objections can there be to the Manitoba lists and to the British Columbia lists? In the first place there can be no possible objection on the ground that the lists are not recent. In British Columbia they are revised every six months and in Manitoba yearly. I understand that, if an election were held this autumn, say in September or October, the Manitoba lists used would be those prepared this year, while in Ontario the lists used would be those prepared last year. So far as time is concerned, therefore, there can be no objection to the lists either in one province or in the other.

There can be no objection on the ground of want of appeal, for appeal to independent judicial authority is allowed in every province except Nova Scotia, to whose case I alluded this afternoon. Any one who has any knowledge of the way in which matters work out in practice is surely aware that the real contest in regard to adding names to the list or excluding names therefrom takes place before the final court of appeals. That is my own experience at least in the province of Nova Scotia, and I suppose it would work out in the same way in the province of Manitoba.

No petitions have been received by this House, no public meetings have been held in Manitoba to protest against the alleged iniquities. I do not know how many electors there are in Manitoba; I suppose from 50,000 to 75,000, assuming the population of that province to be about 400,000. Of the 50,000 or 75,000 electors in Manitoba not one has come to this House by way of petition asking for any redress at the hands of this parliament, and not one name has been given by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice this afternoon of any man in the province of Manitoba who has been unjustly deprived of his vote. I would like my hon. friend opposite to give any names, to adduce any instance in Manitoba or in British Columbia which would justify the interposition of this parliament. I can readily understand that under any system, whether a municipal system of preparing voters' lists based upon assessment, or a system of registration, you will undoubtedly now and then find that the names have been improperly omitted from the list or improperly added to it. I have run three elections in the county of Halifax where a municipal system prevails. At every one of those elections I met dozens of Conservatives whose names had been omitted from the list. I cannot give the names of all of them to-night, but I can assure the House that I am stating the fact. I can give the names of some men who were disfranchised at the last election in Halifax. In 1904, John W. Payment, a leading citizen, possessing large property interests in the city of Halifax and outside, found his name was not on the voters' list. Yet he was a very prominent man, president of the Bank of Nova Scotia, and a man actively associated with many business enterprises in the city. Fortunately he discovered that in a remote district, some distance away his name had been put on in another polling division, but in the division where he usually voted his name was omitted. Then there was Mr. George S. Campbell, one of the leading citizens of Halifax, a merchant possessed of a very large amount of property, who found in the last election that his name was not on the voters' list. Dozens of other illustrations could be given of men who, under that system, were deprived of their vote in that election. This does not necessarily prove that the Dominion parliament should intervene, after it has once adopted the system of relying upon provincial voters' lists. I do not care whether you have a municipal system or a system of registration, notices must be given, proceedings must be taken in order that justice may be done and that names may be struck off the list or added to it. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice has not given any names of persons deprived of their votes; I have, and I happened to remember just by chance this afternoon that some papers were sent to me a year ago from the province of Nova Scotia touching the default of a revising officer in not posting a list of names sent to him for the purpose of an application to strike them off, and another list of names sent to him for the purpose of having them added. By reason of the default of that revising officer, fifty-five names were left on the list which should have been struck off, and eighteen names remained off the list which should have been added. The case went before the revising officers for consideration and they decided that the fifty-five names should be struck off and that the eighteen names should be added. The case went upon appeal to the sheriff of the county, a gentleman appointed by the present government, and a strong partisan, and that official decided—I am not impugning his decision—that because the revising officer, without any default whatever on the part of the men who were seeking to make these changes in the list, happened to neglect his duty, the list could not be touched, and the fifty-five names of persons who should not be upon the list remained there, and the eighteen names of persons who should appear on the list disappeared therefrom. Instances of this kind will occur under any system. But I respectfully submit that even if such instances were brought to the attention of the House in respect to the list of Manitoba, there would be no more ground for interfering with the list of that province than there would be for interfering with the list of Nova Scotia under the conditions to which I have alluded.

My hon. friend the Minister of Justice says that if this Bill does not pass it will be impossible to procure returning officers who will undertake the duties of their office. Let me say to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice and to the government, that any returning officer in this country who observes the provisions of the law need not have the slightest apprehension. It is only the man who surrenders his functions to the organizer of a party, and who may thereby be called to account in the criminal courts, that need have the slightest possible fear as to any consequences which will result to him by reason of his undertaking this responsible office. I might retort to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice that if this Bill does pass it will be impossible for the Conservative party to get candidates to remain in the field, or to enter the field, either in Manitoba or in British Columbia. What would they expect? They would expect that some gentleman such as Mr. Leach, or an organizer of that character, would. under the apparent sanction of the law, accomplish in 1908 or 1909 what was accomplished without the sanction of the law in 1904. Although I do not desire to take any but a reasonable attitude in regard to this Bill, I do submit to the Prime Min-

ister and to this House that we are entitled to treat this Bill exactly as if it provided in terms, and not merely in intent, that no person other than a supporter of this government shall be elected either in Manitoba or in British Columbia. A very prominent member of the Liberal party in 1885, in debating whether the Dominion Franchise Act ought to pass, used this language :

> Give us the power of appointing the revising officers and we can determine beforehand who will command a majority in this House.

Now, if there were any cause shown, any reasonable cause shown to this House why we should interfere in Manitoba or British Columbia rather than in Nova Scotia, or New Brunswick, or Ontario or Quebec, there might be some ground for considering this Bill and treating it as a reasonable measure. But when we realize that it is precisely the same Bill as that which it was intended to introduce in 1904, and when we know that the proposed introduction of that Bill was the signal for the intimation to the Liberals of Manitoba in the spring of that year that they need not pay any attention to the lists because there would be lists prepared by Dominion officials for the election of that year; when we realize that the interference with the lists of the province of Manitoba and the province of British Columbia is altogether unauthorized and unjustifiable; and when we realize that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice put it very frankly this afternoon when he said that the lists prepared under the Manitoba statutes were not very acceptable to some members of the Liberal party in that province; when we realize all this, we cannot treat this measure otherwise than as an intensely partisan one. Show me, in the first place, the wrong that has taken place under the Manitoba Act; show me the wrong that has taken place under the statutes of British Columbia relating to the preparation of the lists; show me that you have brought those alleged wrongs to the attention of the governments in both provinces and that they have refused to redress them; show me that this government has made any representation whatever on this subject to the government of either British Columbia or Manitoba, do this, and you make the foundation at least for the consideration of some measure of amendment, some measure of reform. But until you have done that, until you have furnished to the House something more than the hypothetical statements of the Minister of Justice this afternoon, I venture to think that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on reflection will come to the conclusion that this measure, so far as the particular section is concerned, ought not to be pressed.

Mr. Speaker, I apologize for having trespassed so long on the attention of the House. So far as the proposed Bill effects any reforms of the electoral law of this country, I am prepared to give to the government a hearty and earnest support in their endeavour to improve existing conditions. But so far as concerns those provisions of the Bill which take away the secrecy of the ballot and provide for an unjustifiable interference with the voters' lists in British Columbia and Manitoba, I for my part will give them as strong and vigorous resistance as my physical strength and energy will permit.

Mr. THOMAS GREENWAY (Lisgar). Mr. Speaker, I may be pardoned for taking the first opportunity that presents itself to offer a few remarks on the subject which is now before the House, because it was one of the first subjects upon which I had the pleasure of addressing the House when I came to this parliament. I pointed out then the difficulty under which we laboured in having no lists for the Dominion in the province of Manitoba, and I make that statement now. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) is a lawyer and I am not, but I will take issue with him in saying that there is no provision in the law by which we may legally have a voters' list for the House of Commons in Manitoba. My hon. friend devoted a good deal of time to what the right hon. the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said years ago, that he was in favour of the provincial franchise. That may be right or it may be wrong, I have never had very strong convictions upon it either way, but I do know that the use of the provincial franchise places the electors sometimes in an anomalous position. I am going to suggest to the government now a matter to which I have given a good deal of consideration. I refer to the case of people from other parts of the Dominion, from Ontario for instance, moving to Manitoba, people who have lived all their lives in Ontario, people who have always been British subjects, and who have all the qualifications necessary to vote in Canada, but who, if they go to Manitoba, are immediately met by the Manitoba law which provides that they shall not be upon the list unless they have resided 12 months in that province.

Mr. BENNETT. The Act in Ontario was the same for years until this year.

Mr. GREENWAY. I cannot help that. I believe in some respects it works that way now, but I do say that there ought to be, if it can be worked out, some provision by which persons of that kind should be able to go and register their votes when the time comes. Whether that should be done by supplying them with a certificate from their previous place of residence, or by some other method, I leave to others to work out, but anything that places a man

in that unjust position appears to me to be an unjust law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This Bill would not redress that?

Mr. GREENWAY. Not as far as it has gone, but I had hoped that something might be suggested.

Mr. BARR. Would my hon. friend suggest that foreigners and others coming in should have the right to vote immediately on arriving there?

Mr. GREENWAY. I was not talking about foreigners, I was talking about British subjects, about citizens of Ontario. I take the position, and I think I am correct in taking it, that we have no provision for making a list for the constituencies of the House of Commons in Manitoba, so that if I am correct and I think I am, my hon. friend will see upon reflection that there is not such a provision as he quoted this afternoon.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is the same provision in Manitoba as elsewhere. The Franchise Act provides that the provincial lists in all the provinces shall be taken.

Mr. GREENWAY. If my hon. friend puts the construction he does upon the law he read to us this afternoon, and as a lawyer he ought to be capable of construing it, why was it that we had those prosecutions in the province of Manitoba?

Mr. PATERSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. GREENWAY. Why was it that the Attorney General of Manitoba prosecuted the returning officers for doing what they might have done, according to my hon. friend, under the law? It would be well for my hon. friend to answer that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would refer my hon. friend to the judgment of the Court of Appeal in Rex vs. Duggan, which set forth very distinctly what the difficulty was.

Mr. GREENWAY. I was very much pleased with my hon. friend in the first part of his remarks. It did me good to hear my hon. friend say: I do not propose to discuss the red line. That is a subject out of which my hon. friends since the year 1904, have tried to make more capital than anything else I know of, and for that reason, because my hon. friend would not discuss it, I propose to say something about it before I sit down.

I was referring to my hon. friend's speech in reference to the right hon. the leader of the government and other Liberals who took the ground in 1885 that it was proper to have the provincial franchise. I presume that my hon. friend believes that to-day, but he does not find the machinery by which he can do it. There is no machinery by which he can do it, and I defy my hon. friend or any one who supports him to take the lists we have in Manitoba and compile from them a correct list for any Dominion constituency. The voters upon the list are not sufficiently designated to enable that to be done. My hon. friend asked this afternoon with a good deal of gusto why were men disfranchised? I will tell my hon. friend why they were disfranchised. It is because they had no opportunity to get on the list. I have here the proclamation to which my hon. friend refers in which the government of Manitoba undertake to show they are going to deal very fairly with the people and to give them a little more time than formerly for registration. But what are the facts? Here it is under date April the 25th. They provide a registration booth for the class of people they don't want to give an opportunity to of getting registered, and if they do register they compel them to travel 100 miles. That is what my hon. friend calls a square deal.

Mr. STAPLES. Would the hon. gentleman say where, in this registration that is to take place in the near future, a man will have, in one instance at least, to travel 100 miles to register?

Mr. GREENWAY. In Selkirk, and my hon. friend who represents that constituency will verify what I say.

Mr. STAPLES. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong.

Mr. GREENWAY. I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Staples) will continue asking questions; he asked me this afternoon about the registration clerk coming to a district and spending two hours for the purpose of revised the list. I knew what I was talking about, I lived in Crystal city where it was done. The Minister of Justice spoke about registration districts, but in those days there was nothing else although we were asked to make a voters' list upon the polling subdivisions which the government had made. I have the evidence of that right here too. Let us have another sample of the fair play of these gentlemen, and here it is on their own record. In the large local division of Springfield, situated in the constituency of Selkirk, they have a very large amount of business to do if they make a correct list because there are a large number of foreigners—to whom my hon. friend has referred—who are not on the list, and so far as the Manitoba government is concerned they are very anxious they should not be on the list. In this district of Springfield they have a number of places for the registration clerk to meet, and the last place he meets is at Springfield on the 6th day of June and the court of revision for the whole district—to be wholly completed in one afternoon—is held on the 12th of June. Let me say another word about a

square deal. In the old days when we prepared a list we got it printed, we sent it to the school houses and the post offices and the other places designated in the Act, thus giving the people an opportunity to see whether some were omitted, or voters that should be on. We gave thirty days for that. But now we have a registration clerk, he goes to the office and he does his work there, he is supposed by law to make a list of what he has done, and when he goes outside the door he tacks the list on the door and that is all the notice you get. That is what the hon. gentleman calls a square deal. Then, if you are going to complain of any one who is on the list you are supposed to furnish the registration clerk with his name and post office address and that complaint is to be sent by registered letter to the person complained of. I have here a list of the local constituency of Mountain and upon that list there are 2,194 names and of that number 1,459 have no post office address. The gentleman who complains comes before the judge and he is asked: to what place was the notice sent containing the complaint; because the judges are very particular and some of us knew how difficult it is to take a name from the list unless we have conclusive evidence. He answers the judge: I gave the registration clerk notice that the complaint should be sent to such a post office, and I think that is the right address. Then he is asked if he knows it is right, and if he tells the truth the complainant has got to say that he does not know. My hon. friend was kind enough to remind me of something else and that is that although I have looked over a large number of the lists for the province of Manitoba there was only one so far found where the post offices are given. The hon. gentleman said that this Manitoba government which takes such care of the voters was good enough upon one occasion to solemnly pass an Act of parliament to place certain individuals upon the list in order that they might vote. Well, I have that Act here. An election was coming on and I suppose somebody suggested that perhaps they were going to be shy a few votes in that district, and they had better make a few. Now, this was a premeditated mode of doing business and I am going to show how they made the voters. I am told in reference to this, but I do not know as to the truth of it, that the registration clerk had omitted to put 25 names on the list, but there are not 25 mentioned in this Act of the legislature. The Act reads:

Now therefore His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the legislative assembly of Manitoba, enacts as follows:

1. The names of Eugene Derby, Thomas Smolok, John Craigie, Hanson A. Larson, John George Thomas, Petro Kosar and Frederick Orvis are hereby added to the list of electors for said polling subdivision No. 13 of the electoral division of Kildonan and St. Andrews.

And the names were added with no address or designation of any kind, and somebody went to try and find them and they could not, and the only time they had ever been seen was upon polling day, so I am told. Will my hon. friend say that it is right to put names on the list without any designation whatever, as to where they are to be found, or where they can be complained of, or where they can be canvassed if somebody wanted to canvass them? That is what my hon. friends, I presume, would call a square deal.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman say that the names were not entitled to go on the list?

Mr. GREENWAY. I do not know. I am not going to give the hon. gentleman anything but what I can verify unless I qualify it with the statement I have made just now. I do not know that it is worth while dwelling upon the list, for, after all, that is not the question. If the list were what it ought to be or what it might have been, if these gentlemen had undertaken to do what they might have done, and that was to make the polling subdivisions coterminous with the boundaries of the electoral divisions for the House of Commons, there would be no need of this. But I say again, I defy any man to take the list and go over it, and from that list, with the information upon it, put the voter in his proper place. If you have to find out from other sources, you must have the means of taking evidence.

I will give my hon. friend another reason why people are disfranchised. The revising officers are by this proclamation and by the law designated for certain points. The longest they sit at any one point is from eleven o'clock to six. Where the hours are not specified, according to this proclamation they sit from one to six, for the revision of the list for a whole local constituency. During the time of the revision of 1904 one of the revisers came to a point where the country was divided, and it was represented to him that there were a number of voters at a certain point who ought to get the opportunity to go upon the list. He adjourned the court that day, and called it the next day at the point named, and there put 38 names upon the list. Then what happened? When the list came into the department, those hon. gentlemen who want to be so very fair tore the names out of the book. There was no red line nonsense about that.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Would the hon. member for Lisgar be fair enough to state that Judge Walker, the chairman of the registration board, reported to the government that this officer had held a court of revision illegally, after his certificate had expired.

Mr. GREENWAY. I am not talking about the legality of it; I am talking about

what was done. If there was a law that would allow a man to commit an outrage like that, the law ought to be changed. Now, Sir, what about this list? The body of the list was made in 1903; it is a five-year-old list; and I am somewhat like my hon. friend the leader of the opposition —I do not know how he is going to weed it out. The little things that have occurred since then have been merely revisions, and notice is now given in this proclamation that it is not necessary for those on the list to appear at the court of registration. It is simply necessary to revise the list.

Now, I want to say a word about all this talk that has taken place with regard to the thin red line. My hon. friend, though he does not like to discuss it, does not let it come near him unless he has a slap at Mr. Leach. My hon. friend from North Toronto, who is not at present in his seat, shouted: A man appointed to distribute the seed grain in the west who disfranchised thousands upon thousands.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. STAPLES. What salary did he draw last year?

Mr. GREENWAY. I want to say this, that if my hon. friend knew Mr. Leach as well as I do——

An hon. MEMBER. Did you recommend him?

Mr. GREENWAY. No, I did not. He did not need any recommendation from me. He is a good, respectable citizen of Manitoba, who is incapable of doing the things they alleged, and what happened? In all their prosecution or persecution of him did they show that he disfranchised anybody?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. They dropped him.

Mr. GREENWAY. Yes, they dropped him, because they did not have anything against him. Now, I think perhaps I have said enough about the list; the less said about it the better, so far as its character is concerned. As I said before, that is not the trouble. If we had the means of preparing a list for the constituencies of Manitoba from the local list, with the information which we have there, then I would say that the argument which my hon. friend has laboured so long at might have some force in it; but we have not, and we have to make some provision for it.

Mr. SPROULE. If that be correct, does it not indicate the need of a Dominion franchise and Dominion machinery to compile the list?

Mr. GREENWAY. I would hail it with pleasure, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. SPROULE. Then why did they repeal the one we had?

Mr. GREENWAY. What has that to do with the subject we are discussing? If somebody believed something ten years ago and changed his mind, does that upset everything? My hon. friends opposite must have changed, because now they are arguing against what they argued for in 1885. So that we have all been changing, I hope for the better.

Now, Sir, we have had various exhibitions with regard to this thin-red-line business. We had a gentleman in the legislature of Manitoba saying this:

> Mr. Speaker, I say there is not a man, either in this House or outside of it, who would venture to undertake to defend the appalling, the outrageous conduct of the employees of the Dominion government with respect to the manner in which some 9,000 of the best citizens of this country were deprived of their liberty and franchise previous to the last general election.

I suppose I hardly need tell who it was said that. It was the great author of this scandal. 9,000 people were deprived of their franchise. He got down to particulars, and so, when Mr. Leach was appointed by this government to look after the distribution of seed grain, the Montreal 'Gazette,' a leading paper—a respectable but a misled paper, so far as that was concerned—came out with this comment. Here is a man, it said, appointed to distribute seed grain for the western provinces who disfranchised, because of their Conservative leanings, 1,131 in Lisgar, 1,395 in Portage la Prairie, and 1,406 in Selkirk. Well, I stand here in my place and say that there is not one word of truth in that statement. I have lived in Lisgar, formerly called Selkirk, for nearly thirty years. I know nearly every man in it, and when I heard of this having taken place during the election of 1904, I took care to find out exactly how many people had been left off the lists in my constituency. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) gave the number to the House this afternoon. There were six Liberals left off—by mistake, I presume—and there were three Conservatives who had been misplaced, and consequently had to go to another division to vote. That is the sum and substance of the whole thing, so far as Lisgar is concerned. Do you suppose that if there had been twenty men in Lisgar, prominent citizens, who ought to have their votes—because Lisgar is an old place, there are not many foreigners who go into it, and there is not much change in the people, so that the vote remains about the same—do you suppose that I would not have heard of it and found these men grumbling at being deprived of their vote? And yet we have this veracious newspaper saying that 1,131 had been disfranchised in Lisgar. In connection with this, my hon. friend, who is the chief exponent of this outrage, undertook to particularize.

An hon. MEMBER. Who made that statement in the House?

Mr. GREENWAY. I shall tell you in a few minutes. I want to keep you thinking awhile. I thought possibly some gentleman might have suggested the name, but this same gentleman, on another occasion, made a speech in which he undertook to particularize. I have got his name written on the top of this sheet in red ink. The first letter of his name is Rogers. He went to the constituency of my hon. friend who feels very nervous on this red line business, and he made a speech to explain how this disfranchisement had been done and how it had affected the different local constituencies—because it was a local matter—in that district. He selected Hamiota and he said, giving the numbers of polls from No. 1 to 9, that 777 voters had been disfranchised in Hamiota because they were Conservatives. Well, as a matter of fact, there never was polled in Hamiota any more than 740 altogether. He had disfranchised more Conservatives than were there, by 40 nearly. Let me say this to my hon. friends in all good spirit. I would like, as a sort of climax to this thing, if they would furnish me with the names of fifty people—my hon. friend said 100, and I think I said 100, when I first spoke on the subject, but I have reason to believe that is entirely too much—but I challenge my hon. friends to furnish me with the names of fifty people who were disfranchised in Manitoba by having their names dropped off the lists.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the hon. gentleman give us the names of fifty who should be on the list and were not ?

Mr. GREENWAY. In my constituency?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In all Manitoba.

Mr. GREENWAY. I am asking my hon. friend who complained that names were struck off, to give me the names of fifty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am asking the hon. gentleman to give me the names of those who were left off the Manitoba lists who should be on. Does he say that any names were improperly left off?

Mr. GREENWAY. I do.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who are they?

Mr. GREENWAY. I say there are a good many. I say it is the most imperfect list we ever had for another reason, because there are many names on the list that ought to be off.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the hon. gentleman give us the names?

Mr. GREENWAY. I can give the names right in my own neighbourhood. I can mark them right on this list which I have in my hand, and my hon. friend can see them if he wants to. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) said something this afternoon about the committee of which I had the honour of being a member and of which he was chairman. What was the sum and substance of the whole thing? Chief Justice Howell was on the one side and Mr. Knott on the other, and when we got through we discovered that two men had been left off the list. One was named Johnson; I forget the name of the other. I suppose we shall have to get the names, but they can be got from the evidence. One was left off because of some doubt about his residence, as to whether it was in Winnipeg or in the constituency of Macdonald. That was all the direct evidence we got. If there had been any considerable number disfranchised, why were not witnesses brought here to prove it? As the expenses of the witnesses were paid, it would have been easy to get them. I took occasion to say in this House in 1905, as I say now, that we had no Dominion lists. In order to show that we had none, I sent over to the King's Printer and asked him to send me the voters' lists for the constituency of Lisgar. What did I get? I got a list containing 7,334 names. There were over 4,000 belonging to Lisgar, and the balance of 3,000 had to be distributed between Provencher, Macdonald and Souris. Somebody had to do the distributing, and Mr. Knott told us, in his evidence, that he did not see any other way it could be done than the way it was. Now, I say that there is no local provision for doing this.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Apart from the question of distribution, was there anything wrong with the list?

Mr. GREENWAY. Not that I know of. I am not sure about that. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was kind enough last session to pay me a little attention. He said that I would not have been elected for Lisgar had it not been for the 'thin red line.' I took the trouble to look up the figures so as to make a comparison which would enable the House to judge how far the hon. gentleman was correct in saying that. Lisgar is a pretty well established place, and one in which there are not many changes. In the local election of 1907, when our friends of the provincial government had the compilation of lists in their own hands, doing it at their own sweet will—and some of us know what that means—there were something over 3,200 votes polled as against 3,134 for the Dominion in the election of 1904. Now, in that election and on that voters' list I had a majority of 180. But in the provincial election in which, as I have shown, there were about 100 more votes polled in what constitutes Lisgar, three out of the four local members who represent that district three were Liberals and the Liberal majority was 184. That shows that there was not very much the matter with Lisgar. Or, take another illustration: The vote polled in the whole province of Manitoba in the Dominion election of 1904—estimating Dauphin at

what it had been before—was 51,988, and in the local election of 1903 it was 52,232, or a difference of 244. I am sure hon. members will understand that in a local contest where you have forty-two constituencies and eighty-four organizations you are likely to accomplish more in polling votes than when you have only twenty organizations. Or, let us come down to the election of last year. In the local election of last year the vote polled was 60,593. But the increase was all, or nearly all, attributable to Winnipeg, which, in 1903, had a polled vote of 9,630 and in 1907 of 17,324, an increase of 7,694. Deduct this increase in Winnipeg from the total vote polled in the province and you have left 52,899, as against 51,998 in the Dominion elections, a difference of only 911.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. In three years.

Mr. GREENWAY. And I say, in defence of my province, that Manitoba is not increasing very rapidly in population for the reason that a great many of our young men are going to our western provinces to get free land.

Mr. SPROULE. That would account for the small increase in the vote in that time.

Mr. GREENWAY. That is exactly what I say.

Mr. SPROULE. Take, for instance, the case of Ontario. The newspapers a few days ago said that over 5,000 residents of Ontario have left for the west. Our lists must be decreased in proportion as these who are leaving us are voters. If young men are leaving Manitoba for the west, it would be necessary to accept the same condition of things as in Ontario.

Mr. GREENWAY. I am pointing out that the great increase outside of Winnipeg is in the western provinces. Now, Winnipeg is going to be a very large city, for it is the distributing point not only for Manitoba, but for the western provinces as well. You can see what it did in the way of votes—17,000 as against 9,000 three years before. And then hon. gentlemen opposite will go out and we shall hear them expounding the iniquity of the 'thin red line.' But, Mr. Speaker, I am impressed with the idea that this is a sample of the political capital which these gentlemen try to make. But their percentage of accomplishment is small. What they have accomplished in their exposures is not at all alarming.

Now, I just want to say that I am in hearty sympathy with the proposition that we should have a fair list in the province of Manitoba, and if my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) can find any way in the law which governs the compilation of the lists by which he can increase the length of time necessary or make more registration places he should do so. I do not suppose we are confined to time—you can make the time longer in order to make it right. But I would like to see a law adopted to enable those authorized to deal with the matter to compile a fair list, and, to use the words of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), 'give everybody a square deal.'

Mr. GEO. O. ALCORN (Prince Edward). The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) has emulated the Minister of Justice this afternoon and has made a stump speech—the same stump speech that he gave us in 1905. I am a little curious to know upon what sections of the Bill we are supposed to be discussing the hon. gentleman thinks he has thrown any light. He did not through the entire length of his speech by one syllable refer to any section of this Bill. Probably the best answer which could be made to his speech would be to read to him and the House when the proper time comes the salient parts of the Manitoba Election Act of which he appears to be entirely ignorant. This same gentleman (Greenway) was for twelve years premier of the province of Manitoba. He attacks the Election Act of his province very viciously, without saying anything about the Bill now under consideration.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, if that Act is so very bad that it left the province over which he presided for twelve years in such a mixed condition as to its election law, he himself must be largely to blame. The hon. gentleman then spent a good deal of time in showing from various lists relating to his constituency how it was that he came to be elected to this House. No doubt that is a curious fact and one which requires some explanation. Reverting to the Bill now before the House, it appears to me that foremost amongst the matters of principle with which that Bill deals, and proposes to make law, are the following four. By section 1, the principle is introduced that in all cases of Dominion elections in unorganized Ontario and Quebec and in Manitoba and British Columbia there should be new Dominion voters' lists made up by new Dominion officials, after the issue of writs for an election, distinct from the provincial lists. That is the principle of the first section. Then by section 13 we have introduced the principle of numbered ballots, a principle which finds no place in the Act as it now stands. The introduction of that principle in the cases to which it applies will effect the destruction of the secrecy of the ballot, and in my opinion will open the door for a great deal of corruption. The third principle is introduced by section 17, and is one which we can easily understand. That section deals with the marks which may be placed upon ballots by deputy returning officers. I have simply to observe here that the principle sought to be introduced by that section is the absolute and total destruction of the secrecy of the ballot. Surely,

Mr. Speaker, it is an extraordinary spectacle to see the Minister of Justice of a Reform administration from his place in parliament proposing to cast aside that principle for which the Reform party in former years stood so firmly. Then we have the fourth principle introduced by section 28, which appears to me to be simply legalizing acts of corruption. I propose to say a few words regarding each one of these four points. The first matter to be considered by the House is whether it is necessary or excusable that new lists should be prepared, regard being had to the provincial and federal law as it now stands, or from any other than a mere party view. It seems to me that the best method to prevent all doubt and to enable the House to come to a definite conclusion is to examine the law that we now have on the statute-book. And first, with regard to the unorganized districts of Ontario; I will not speak of Quebec, because that province will be dealt with by other gentlemen. I refer the House to section 6 of the Dominion Elections Act, which treats of lists that are to be used for Dominion purposes.

For the purposes of any Dominion election held within the limits of a province, the voters' lists shall, except as herein otherwise provided, be those prepared for the several polling divisions established, and which, on the sixtieth day next preceding the day fixed for the nomination of candidates for such Dominion election, were in force, or were last in force, under the laws of that province, for the purposes of provincial elections.

Now, dealing with that part of this Act which refers to unorganized territory, we find the law is found in sections 7, 8 and 9. Section 7 reads :

Where, under the laws of a province, the voters' lists for any provincial electoral district or division, or any of them, are prepared, not at regular intervals, but at such times as are fixed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council or some other provincial or local authority, or only from time to time for the purpose of a general or other election in immediate contemplation, the last preceding voters' lists so prepared shall be used for the purpose of any Dominion election in the territory comprised in such provincial electoral district or division, or the parts thereof for use in which they were prepared, if such lists have been prepared not more than one year before the date of the writ for such Dominion election.

Under this and succeeding sections this government has already power to make a separate and distinct Dominion list in the unorganized district of any province, provided that the provincial lists prepared under the section I have just read are more than a year old ; where they are not more than a year old, the provincial lists are to be taken. Now, under the proposed Bill, in every case, without regard to the age of the provincial lists, and without regard to provincial lists at all, new Dominion lists will be made. I may say in passing that Ontario and Quebec are no doubt selected for the operations of this clause very largely in view of the fact that the National Transcontinental Railway will be and is now in course of construction through those two provinces, and that in the wilds of the north this government will find it no doubt very convenient to have lists prepared containing the names of the foreigners and transient workmen who will be engaged on that work, men who will disappear in a short time and can no longer be traced. No doubt full advantage will be taken of their presence and they will be put upon the lists. The lists in the unorganized territories of Ontario are made annually. Formerly they were not made at stated periods, and at one time they were made every two years. By the Act of last session lists are made annually, and, therefore, there is no excuse for this government taking into their hands the preparation of new lists, because they already have at hand the lists made annually, exactly the same as in organized Ontario. Now, let us see how these lists are made as prescribed by the revised statutes of Ontario, chapter 7, section 61 and succeeding sections. I think the House should have an idea of how those lists are made. Section 61 says :

Voters' lists for unorganized territory, where there are no assessment rolls, shall be prepared annually by the sheriff of the electoral district or such part thereof over which he has jurisdiction as sheriff.

62. In case there is no sheriff for the district, or in case there is a part over which a sheriff has no jurisdiction, the duties by this part assigned to a sheriff shall, as to such district or part, be performed by a police magistrate, having jurisdiction as such in some part of the electoral district, or by the senior police magistrate, if there are more police magistrates than one, in the electoral district.

63. So soon after the first day of June in each year as may be convenient, the officer whose duty it is to prepare a list of voters under this part shall cause to be posted in a conspicuous manner throughout those parts of the electoral districts which consist of unorganized territory where there are no assessment rolls, at every public and separate school house, and at every statutory polling place, and at every other place at which a poll was held at the last election to the legislative assembly, a copy of this part of this Act and one or more printed notices in accordance with form 23 appended to this Act; and the said officer shall attend at the time and place mentioned in the said notice.

That form 23 is to this effect :

Take notice that (here insert the name of the sheriff or police magistrate, as the case may be) will be in attendance at (here insert the place) from ten o'clock in the forenoon to four o'clock in the afternoon on the

days of 18 , to en-

roll the names of all persons qualified to vote for members of the legislative assembly.

Appeals with respect to the omission of voters or the improper enrolment of any alleged voter, or as to any error made by the sheriff or police magistrate as to the place at which a voter may vote, may be made to (here insert the name of the stipendiary magistrate or district judge, as the case may be).

Signed by the sheriff or police magistrate.

So the public have express notice of the date at which that officer will be at a certain place and the hours during which he will be there to receive applications for the insertion of names on the list, and they also have notice of the time and place at which an appeal from that list may be heard.

Save as otherwise provided by this part, the sheriff or the police magistrate shall perform the duties assigned to the clerks of municipalities, the court of revision and the judge elsewhere in the province, and the forms and notices as well as other proceedings generally shall, unless otherwise provided by this part, be the same, as nearly as may be, and be taken at and within the same times and with the same effect as in the case of the voters' lists elsewhere in the province as aforesaid.

The effect of that is that every man who has a right to the franchise is dealt with either by way of application to be placed on the list or to strike his name from the list, and every man who is dissatisfied with the decision of the sheriff or police magistrate has a right to appeal to a judge to decide his particular case and to appear personally and be heard upon that application. Section 65 provides :

Not less than 30 days after the posting of such notices the sheriff or magistrate shall personally or by deputies appointed by himself, visit every part of the territory where there is by law required to be a polling place or where a poll was held by order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council at the next previous election to the legislative assembly and shall by all convenient means available endeavour to ascertain the names of all the persons who are entitled to have their names inserted in such lists.

So there are thirty days during which the lists shall be gathered and during which the public have the right to go forward and have their names placed upon that list. By section 66 :

The sheriff or magistrate shall assign to each polling place the voters for whom such polling place may appear to him to be most convenient.

Section 67 provides :

The sheriff or police magistrate . . . shall on the completion of the voters' lists . . . attach thereto an affidavit or solemn declaration to be taken or made before the district or county judge or stipendiary magistrate in the form following:

I (name and title) make oath and say that I have set down in the above voters' lists for the electoral district of according to the best of my information and judgment, the name of every person entitled to be entered thereon, and that I have not intentionally omitted from the said list the name of any person whom I knew or had good reason to believe was or is entitled to be entered thereon, and further say that I have to the best of my knowledge and belief discharged the duties required of me by the Ontario Voters' Lists Act.

So that here we have not only all the safeguards I have pointed out thrown around the right of every man to have his name on the list, but we have the list verified by the affidavit of the officer who made it.

Then comes the provision for an appeal :

There shall be an appeal to the stipendiary magistrate having jurisdiction in the locality to the district or county judge in the same manner as an appeal lies from the court of revision to the county judge elsewhere in the province, and the stipendiary magistrate or judge is to attend to hear any such appeals at such places in the electoral district as may be reasonably convenient for the parties concerned, and is to give due notice thereof as the case may require.

2. Any voter may appeal to a stipendiary magistrate or district or county court judge with respect to the polling place at which his name is entered as a voter as well as in regard to any other matter or thing for which appeals are allowed under this Act.

So that in making these lists for the unorganized territories there is this additional safeguard which is not allowed even in organized Ontario :

Appeals shall be heard by the stipendiary magistrate, district or county judge, as the case may be, at all places in the unorganized portion of the electoral district at which appeals are heard under the Electoral Franchise Act of the Dominion of Canada or at which sittings of the division court are held and at such other places as in the opinion of the stipendiary magistrate, district or county court judge, as the case may be, may be considered necessary. At least 30 days' notice for the hearing of such appeals shall be given by publication in any newspaper published in the district and by poster.

Thus hon. gentlemen will see that there is a delay of at least sixty days required by the section which I have read.

Proceedings upon and in respect to such appeals shall be, as nearly as may be, the same as upon appeals under part I of this Act.

That is in organized Ontario.

And the officer hearing the appeal shall have the same authority as a judge hearing an appeal under part one aforesaid.

Section 70 provides :

In case there is no appeal within 30 days, from the list as at first prepared and published, or in case of appeals as herein provided, the person by whom such list was pre-

pared, or appeals heard and determined shall forthwith after the said period of 30 days or forthwith after the determination of such appeals, deposit in the offices of the sheriff, the stipendiary magistrate, the police magistrate and the clerk of the peace, respectively, a certified copy of such list.

So that there are four public offices in which this list is open and available to the public.

That is the procedure laid down by the statute with regard to the compilation and revision and bringing into force of lists in unorganized Ontario, and I would submit to the House whether they can see any flaw in those proceedings, whether they be not eminently fair, impartial and effective.

The first clause of the Bill before the House provides that separate lists shall be prepared after the issue of the writ for any election and that the Governor in Council shall also have the right to order such lists to be made at any time. Now would this be possible in the case of unorganized Ontario? The time required to post the notices would be say, ten days. The sheriff could not very well occupy less than ten days in driving all over one of these northern constituencies and putting up the notice at the various places indicated by the statutes. The notice to be given of making the lists is thirty days. The notice of appeal is also thirty days and the time occupied in hearing the appeal and correction and deposit of the list is five days, making a period of seventy-five days. By section 86 of the Dominion Act the returning officer is to post up his proclamation within eight days after it is received. It is to remain up eight days, and seven days after that the polling takes place, so it might be that an election might be called on within twenty-three days from the time the returning officer receives his writ. But here in unorganized Ontario we have a period of seventy-five days which, if this provincial Act is carried into effect, and observed, would be occupied in making the list alone. This government made a list in unorganized Ontario, I think, on one occasion only, in 1904. We have had that experience, and I think the House will be told how and in what manner that compilation and revision took place. It is perfectly evident from the figures I have given, that it is absolutely impossible to observe the provincial law in unorganized Ontario in the making of the list. There is no intention, I am convinced in my own mind, on the part of the government that the law shall be observed. It has not been in the past and would not be if this section was adopted. What we have had in the past is just what we may expect in the future with certainty under this Bill.

As to Manitoba I propose, as shortly as possible, to give the House an epitome of the Act, so that they may judge intelligently of its quality and whether it is such a very bad and ineffective Act as the hon. member who has just taken his seat would lead the House to believe. I have here a copy of the Act issued by the King's Printer of Manitoba, and embodying various amendments of the law, up to and including the year 1906. Any person may be registered who—

(a) Is of the male sex.
(b) Is of the full age of twenty-one years.
(c) Is a British subject by birth or naturalization; and
(d) Has resided within the province for one year, and within the electoral division, for which he makes application to be registered as an elector, for three months, next preceding the date of his application for registration.
(e) Provided, however, that any person otherwise qualified who is at the said date a resident of and domiciled within said electoral division, and who has been a resident of and domiciled within the province for one year, immediately prior to said date, but who has not been a resident of and domiciled within said electoral division for three months immediately prior to said date, shall be entitled to be registered as an elector for the electoral division of and within which he was last a resident and domiciled for three months during the said period of one year.

That is a much more liberal provision than we have ever had in Ontario. In Ontario a man must be resident in Canada for a year and until the session of the legislature before the last, within Ontario for a year, and he must have been resident during the last preceding three months in the municipality in which he applies to be put on. In Manitoba, when a man has been resident for three months in any electoral district, and for a year in the province, he can get upon the list:

Any person, if otherwise qualified, becoming a natrualized British subject, or of the full age of twenty-one years, at any time up to and inclusive of the last day fixed in an electoral division for the revision of the lists of electors shall be entitled to be registered as an elector.

These are certainly very liberal provisions. Now in regard to the making of the lists, it has been questioned during this debate whether these lists were or were not made annually. The law distinctly provides they must be made annually:

Annually on or before the first day of May, the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall, by order in council authorize the issuing of a proclamation (form 1 in the schedule to this Act) setting forth:—
1. That it has been determined to add to, correct and revise the list of electors;
2. The names and post office addresses of the persons appointed by such order in council to act as registration clerks in the respective electoral divisions of the province, for such purposes;
3. The date or dates on, the place or places at and the hours between which applications for registration and the correction and striking off of names of electors will be received

and shall be concluded in each electoral division;

4. The date or dates on, the place or places at, and the hours between which courts of revision will be held in the several electoral divisions of the province to consider and decide such applications, and to receive further applications of others to have their names added to the list of electors.

This again is a more liberal provision than we have in Ontario. The judge in Ontario upon revision is powerless to put the name of a single applicant upon the list unless it comes regularly by way of appeal; in the first place, he cannot proceed with an application in court as apparently can be done in Manitoba:

That only such persons as shall possess the qualifications to be registered electors under the provisions of this Act, and whose names do not appear on the list of electors, need attend and apply to be registered as electors at the registration sittings of courts of revision.

This provides that all those who are already on the list and who are not objected to shall remain upon the list, which is extremely liberal, and it compares very favourably in that respect with the making of the list in Ontario:

Provided that at least five days shall elapse between the last day fixed in each electoral division for the sittings of registration clerks and the fixed days of sittings of courts of revision in each electoral division.

23. It shall be the duty of the provincial secretary, forthwith after the issuing of the proclamation hereinbefore provided, to publish the same in the 'Manitoba Gazette' and to cause to be published a notice, containing the information contained in such proclamation, in a newspaper published in each of the several electoral divisions in the province, or, if there be no newspaper published in any of such electoral divisions, then in a newspaper which has a circulation in such electoral division; and to have printed in poster form a sufficient number of copies of such notice as shall be adequate, to post up one of such posters in a conspicuous place in each of the polling divisions established and maintained at the last previous election held in the respective electoral divisions and at the place or places named in the proclamation at which applications for the registration of electors and for the correction of names and for striking off of names of electors from the list of electors will be received.

So that there is the most ample provision made for giving the utmost publicity to every step in the compilation of those lists:

A registration clerk appointed under the provisions herein contained shall either be a qualified resident elector for the electoral division for which he has been appointed such registration clerk, or be possessed of the qualifications entitling him to be registered an elector of the electoral division for which he has been appointed registration clerk (form of commission of registration clerk, form No. 2 of said schedule).

Every registration clerk shall forthwith, after receiving notice of his appointment take and subscribe to the oath prescribed in form 3 of said schedule of this Act and shall with all convenient despatch thereafter post up or cause to be posted up in the electoral division to which his appointment is applicable, one copy of the poster notice hereinbefore referred to in the manner and at each of the places hereinbefore provided; and a copy of the list of electors for each polling subdivision shall be posted in the respective polling subdivisions, and a complete list of electors for the electoral division shall be posted at the office of the registration clerk.

A further section provides:

Every registration clerk appointed for an electoral division shall sit and attend in the said electoral division at the time or times, place or places and between the hours provided in the proclamation hereinbefore mentioned, and shall at such time or times, place or places and between the hours so fixed, receive the applications of all persons presenting themselves to be registered as electors of the electoral division for which he acts as registration clerk whose names do not appear on the list of electors for such electoral division, and also the applications of any person or persons who desire to have any name or names appearing on any such list struck off therefrom, on the ground that such name or names improperly or wrongfully appear thereupon according to the provisions of this Act relating to the qualification or disqualification of electors and the application of all others who desire corrections to be made in any name or names appearing on said list.

This disposes of a good deal which was said by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) with regard to the time these registration clerks are to sit. Here is a provision of law saying that the proclamation fixes that time and they are bound to sit during the time named in the proclamation:

Registration clerks shall receive all applications of electors applying in person to be registered electors by means of interrogatories and statutory declaration, as shown in form No. 4 of said schedule of this Act, and of persons unable to attend to make application to be registered, as aforesaid by reason of any of the causes hereinafter set forth in this Act, by means of interrogatories and statutory declaration, as shown in form No 5 of said schedule of this Act.

To any person not accustomed to this method of registration it is almost a curiosity. The statute provides in parallel columns a series of interrogatories which are to be answered in detail by every elector presenting himself for the privilege of registration. The registration clerk puts the interrogatory and the answer is written opposite the interrogatory in each instance. The full particulars with regard to every case are thus kept a strict record of and it is sworn to by the elector and signed by him:

In a book to be provided for the purpose, as hereinafter mentioned, which shall be called

'The Registration Register' and be as in form No 6 of said schedule of this Act, the registration clerk for the electoral division for which he acts or has been appointed, shall enter the names, residences, occupations and post office addresses of all persons applying to be registered as electors in or for such electoral division and the names, residences, occupations and post office addresses of all persons whose names and applications have been filed with him, as hereinafter provided, to have struck off the list of electors, and similar information as to all such applicants.

The registration clerk before registering the name of any applicant for registration in the registration register, shall fill up from the statements of the applicant the blanks contained in the form of interrogatories, and shall also fill up and administer to the applicant the form of statutory declaration at the foot thereof after the applicant has signed the same.

We have had instances cited here to-day, and the newspapers have been teeming with instances of want of observation of matters of form consequent upon which many electors have been disfranchised. As will subsequently appear both political parties and all applicants have the right to be present at these proceedings before the registration clerk to see that he performs the functions which are laid down in the Act. If that has not been done it is as much the fault of the political representative present for the purpose of seeing that the law was observed as of any one else. There is also the fullest opportunity given in the Act for those who are sick or absent to become registered voters.

Section 40 says:

Any qualified elector may, on his behalf or on behalf of any other person or persons, file with the registration clerk, an application or applications to strike off the name or names of any person or persons from the said list, for want of qualification, death or removal, or upon any ground as would disqualify such person or persons from having his or their names retained on such list.

So that every possible step is provided for in the fullest possible manner.

During or at the conclusion of the registration sittings, the registration clerk shall by registered letter, notify, or cause to be notified, each person against whom application has been made to strike off his name from the list of electors, stating the grounds of such application, and the date or dates on, the time or times when, and the place or places at which the court of revision for the electoral division to which the application relates or refers will sit.

Here we have personal notice given to every man whose name is to be dealt with at the court of revision, sent him through the post by registered letter. Here is a provision that is not contained in the law of Ontario.

Any person who shall have changed his residence from a place in one electoral division to a place in another electoral division, shall be entitled to make application to be registered an elector in and for the electoral division in which he resides, upon filing with the registration clerk a written request——

In the form which is given.

All such requests received by and filed with the registration clerk shall be transmitted to the revising officer, and it shall be the duty of the revising officer to strike off such names without investigation or inquiry.

In the event of any manifest clerical error being evident in the description of the boundaries of any registration district or polling sub-division, the revising officer may correct the same and apportion and divide the names of electors therein according to said corrected description.

This is in addition to the provision to which attention was called this afternoon, under which a judge has the right to make the allotment of names where there is a division of a provincial polling division. There is a further section to this effect:

The registration clerk shall receive all applications of electors for registration, striking off names of electors, and for the correction of names on the list, who are present for that purpose at the time fixed for the conclusion of the registration sittings, notwithstanding that such applications are, in point of fact, received by the registration clerk after the hour of closing the registration sittings aforesaid.

It has been said that these registration clerks are remiss in their duties, and that in consequence people have lost their franchise. Here is a provision which any person can set in motion by applying to the law officers:

Any registration clerk who shall wilfully refuse or neglect to make out any list of electors, or who shall wilfully neglect to insert in the registration register the application of any person who claims to be entitled to be an elector and shall have complied with all the provisions of this Act necessary to entitle the application of such person to be received and entered in the registration register, or who shall wilfully and without reasonable cause insert in any such registration register the name of any person not having applied for registration, or the name of any person against whom no application shall have been filed to strike off from the list, or the name of any person not having so applied, or who shall wilfully neglect to publish any notice, post any lists, or decline to give access to a copy of same to persons entitled thereto, or who shall wilfully refuse or neglect to make the return and deliver or transmit the books and documents to the revising officers, as required by this Act, or who is guilty of any other wilful misfeasance or malfeasance or wilful act of omission or commission in contravention of the duties of his office, shall for every such offence be liable, upon summary conviction before a police magistrate or two or more justices of the peace, to a penalty not exceeding two hundred dollars and to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months.

Then, by section 48 it is provided:

The following persons shall be entitled to be present at sittings of the registration clerks: the candidate or candidates of the last election; any person who considers himself to be a prospective or probable candidate; any two qualified persons entitled to be registered electors representing any political organization; any person desirous of being present as a spectator; provided that no more than twelve persons, other than the persons before mentioned and officers in attendance, shall be entitled to be present at the same time.

The registration clerk shall strive as far as possible to allow the representation of all political parties in the place or places of registration to be fair and equal.

Then it is provided:

The King's Printer shall, free of cost, provide and furnish to registration clerks a sufficient number of copies of the last revised list of electors, duly certified by the clerk of the executive council.

With regard to the posting of lists we have this provision:

Within two days succeeding that on which applications for the registration and striking off names of electors from the list of electors shall have closed, each registration clerk shall prepare, in writing in duplicate, a full, complete and true list, duly certified to, of the names of all persons having applied for registration alphabetically arranged, and also a list of the names of all persons against whom applications have been filed to strike off their names from the list of electors, and he shall post one copy of both such lists in a conspicuous place and in a durable manner upon the main outside door of the place in which the registration sittings had been conducted. Certified copies of the lists shall be obtainable from the registration clerk at the rate of 40 cents for 100 names.

For the purpose of revising the list of electors in the manner hereinafter provided, the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall, either simultaneously with the issuing of the proclamation fixing the dates, places and sittings of the courts of revision, or in any event within at least ten days thereafter, authorize the issuing of a further proclamation constituting the several judges of the county courts in the province a board for the purposes hereinafter mentioned. Such board shall be designated or called 'The Board of Registration.'

Then follow the duties of that board. Then it is provided:

The board shall in the first instance be convened and hold their first sitting in the city of Winnipeg, and any subsequent sitting or sittings may be held either at the same place or at such other place or places as may be determined by the board.

On the next day succeeding the time allowed registration clerks for posting the list of applications or registrations and striking off names, each registration clerk shall transmit by registered package, or delivered to the proper revising officer appointed for the electoral division by the Board of Registration, as thereinafter provided, the registration register, all applications to strike off names of electors and to correct names incorrectly printed, all interrogatories and statutory declarations received, and all other books, papers or things in any way relating to the registration in the electoral division for or in which he has acted as registration clerk, accompanied by a certificate to the effect that the list of names of persons desirous of being added to, and of those persons whose names it is desired shall be struck off from the said list of electors, contained in the registration register, is true in substance and in fact, and contains all the names of such persons, and that the applications of persons to have names struck off the list, and of persons desiring to have names correctly inserted therein, comprise all such applications received by him.

So that the judge on revision has before him an absolutely complete return of everything that has taken place before the registration clerk; and the political agents of both parties, and a dozen spectators, if necessary, in sympathy with them, may be present to see that the registration clerk performs all his duties. With regard to revision it is provided:

The Board of Registration shall, within four days after the publication of the proclamation constituting the said board, designate or state who shall preside at the courts of revision and the persons so designated or assigned shall, in all cases, be either a member of the Board of Registration or a barrister of at least three years' standing.

It shall be the duty of the provincial secretary to notify or cause to be notified each person designated or assigned to act as revising officer the fact of his appointment, giving the name of the electoral division to which his appointment relates and the date or dates on, and the place or places, and the hours between, which the courts of revision shall sit in such electoral division, and he shall also, at the same time, forward to the revising officer a copy of the last revised list of electors relating to such electoral division, certified to by the clerk of the executive council.

And subsection 8 of section 63 provides:

Any person claiming to be entitled to be registered as elector in any electoral division may, notwithstanding the fact that he has neglected or omitted to apply for registration at any of the sittings of the registration clerk in the electoral division of which he so claims to be entitled to be registered an elector, or having applied was refused registration by the registration clerk, apply at any of the sittings of the revising officer for registration as an elector.

This is a provision not obtaining in Ontario.

No notices of application for the purposes of this subsection shall be required.

And section 72 provides:

The revising officer, at any court held by him for the revision and closing of list of electors under this Act, may, without previous notice of complaint having been given in that behalf, as hereinbefore provided, correct any

mistake which shall have been proved to him to have been made by the registration clerk in the registration register in respect of name, residence, occupation or otherwise howsoever.

So that there appears to be practically no limit to the anxious care exercised to make the revision of the list absolutely perfect. Then as regards the closing of the lists, section 79 provides :

Immediately after the closing of the list, the revising judge or barrister shall:—

1. See that all names, decided by him to be struck off the said list, are in fact struck off and duly initialled by him in the manner hereinbefore provided;

2. Make a list of all names on and added by him to the list of electors, pursuant to applications made to the registration clerk, and under the provisions of this Act, appropriately divided in or between the polling subdivisions, as established in the electoral division at the last previous legislative election held in such electoral division, and shall append such list in a secure manner to the list of electors accompanied by a certificate;

3. Transmit the completed list of electors, as aforesaid, accompanied by all the lists, books, papers and documents referring to the revision, by registered package, addressed in a distinct and legible manner to the clerk of the executive council at Winnipeg.

Here is a provision cited this afternoon, to which I direct the particular attention of the House :

In the event of territory comprised within or partly comprised within an electoral division being changed and included in another electoral division, or other electoral divisions, whether newly created or not, a judge of one of the county court divisions of the province, to be nominated and appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, shall subdivide the names appearing on the list of electors, as so finally revised, according to the altered boundaries or limits, and make a complete list of electors for the electoral divisions affected, as aforesaid, and appropriately divide the names of electors and allot the territory between suitable polling subdivisions as shall in the opinion of such judge be just and equitable.

And section 81 provides :

Every list of electors revised and closed under the provisions of this Act shall be binding and conclusive and shall be subject to no appeal.

And section 82 :

All lists of electors revised and closed under the provisions of this Act shall be and shall constitute the lists of electors of the electoral divisions or division to which they refer until other lists of electors therefor shall be similarly revised and closed.

Section 83 provides :

Lists of electors shall, in any event and in all cases, be finally revised and concluded, as by this Act provided, annually, not later than the 1st day of July.

That is the Act which the hon. gentleman has designated as so faulty. It seems to me most complete and to provide for almost every conceivable contingency.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the Manitoba Act.

Mr. ALCORN. Yes. Nevertheless the Bill before the House provides that separate Dominion lists shall be prepared immediately after the issue of the writ for an election. That would eventuate in this way. Notice of registration must be posted ten days at least prior to the appointment of the registration sittings, and the period occupied by registration could not be less than six days. The interval between registration and court of revision would be six days. The time occupied by the court of revision—there are ten constituencies and six judges—would be twelve days. The printing of the lists would take six days and it would take much longer to have them printed in Ottawa. Then the lists must be printed and distributed before polling, which would take up an interval of ten days. This makes a total of fifty days, and an election might be called within twenty-three days from the time the returning officer received the writ. In Manitoba, therefore, it is obviously absolutely impossible that, if this Bill comes into force, the provincial law could be observed, because this period of delay must be consumed in compilation and revision of the lists. It appears to me that the Manitoba Act is as near perfection as any election Act could possibly be. Mr. Watson, M.P.P., has given some evidence on that point which I propose to read to the House. I take it from a report in the Winnipeg 'Free Press.' Speaking of this Manitoba Act, he said :

As first passed it was very fair, but it has been mangled out of all resemblance to the Act which Liberals in the legislature declared some years ago to be fair. . . . Even now it would not be a bad Act if it was fairly administered, but I could give you many other instances of the partisan way in which it is carried out.

That appears to be the whole of the difficulty. If the list is prepared by any set of officials not in accord with this government, it is a very bad Act and badly administered, but if the list is prepared. under the same Act, by this government's own officials, we are told the lists would be perfect. As has been observed on the other side, a great deal has been said in the press of late with regard to the first clause of the Bill now under consideration and with regard to the Manitoba Act ; and in straining after ground for finding fault with the provincial Act, we are told that in other provinces the lists are municipal. Perhaps I had better read an extract from the 'Free Press' of Winnipeg, on the Bill now submitted :

The critics of the measure cannot understand why provincial lists are good enough for the Dominion in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and other provinces but not good enough for

Manitoba and British Columbia. The explanation is very simple. The Dominion accepts without question as suitable for Dominion elections provincial lists which are prepared by municipal councils; but where provincial lists are made by officials appointed by the provincial governments, the Dominion stipulates that they must be revised by a judge before being available for Dominion contest.

But it must be remarked that those lists are all revised by a judge before they become provincial lists. If, however, this government succeeds in passing its Bill and makes new Dominion lists, it will be absolutely impossible to procure a second revision. The 'Free Press' goes on to say:

Why does Mr. Aylesworth provide that, in the unorganized districts in Ontario, the provincial lists must be revised? Because in those districts there are no municipal councils and the lists are prepared by enumerators appointed by the Ontario government. One who reads the discussion in the House of Commons in 1898, when the Dominion Franchise Act was passed, will see that the Dominion government assumed that where there was a permanent provisional list it was municipally made. A permanent provincial list, made by party workers and subjected year by year to party manipulation, was unheard of at that time in Canada; but it has since made its appearance in Manitoba.

In deciding that this Manitoba list shall be subject to revision by a judge or revising barrister before being available for Dominion purposes Mr. Aylesworth has safeguarded the rights of the electors and the interests of the public.

We are told the lists produced by the provincial Act of Manitoba are faulty, imperfect and improper lists. We are told that proper lists can only be compiled from municipal sources. Now, what the government is proposing to do is to make their new Dominion lists under the Manitoba provincial law and not from municipal sources. In effect, we are told that a list compiled by their party and officials and under the provincial Act will be a good list, while that produced by officials of the Manitoba government is a bad list. Now, this matter of municipal origin was put forward to a considerable extent in this House in 1898 on the occasion of the repeal of the Franchise Act, and the same excuse was there put forward that only muicipal lists could be acceptable for the election of members to this House. Having had a fairly extensive experience of the compilation and revision of lists in Ontario, which lists are of municipal origin, I beg to say, and I am sure that hon. members in this House from that province who have had a like experience will bear me out in saying, that these lists, so far as they are municipal and are the work of the municipal clerk, are extremely faulty and inaccurate and wholly unreliable. The whole value of the Ontario lists in the work of revision by the judge is entirely independent of any muicipal control. Every page, and almost every line, as they leave the municipal clerk is full of errors of every description, and any hon. gentleman of Ontario undertaking to run an election on these lists unrevised would find that he was leaning on a broken reed. No person who has had experience would think of attempting to run an election on these lists without a revision by the judge. The lists prepared in Manitoba are an immense improvement on those municipally prepared in Ontario. As a matter of principle what difference can there be between the preparation of a list by officers appointed under an Act passed by the representatives of the people in their legislature for the making of a list for an assessment roll, as in Ontario and the preparation of a list by certain officers appointed by the executive also under an Act of the legislature as in Manitoba representing the people? They are both the Acts of representatives of the people. I have never heard that, so far as Manitoba is concerned, there were any complaints except from certain representatives of the Reform party who regret the fact that their party has not control of the making of the lists. A good deal has been said by Mr. Walton, the Reform organizer in Manitoba, in the 'Free Press,' by way of instances of people who have been disfranchised under the Manitoba Act. I have his complaint here, but I will not trouble the House with it. I find it relates simply to matters of procedure. He complains that, in certain instances, certificates were not attached to certain lists, that matters of formality had not been observed, but these are things such as might take place in the case of any list no matter how compiled. Unless the prescribed steps on the application and on the appeal had been observed, the judge could exercise no jurisdiction in any province. It has been referred to this evening before, but it will not be amiss to mention again that the government of Manitoba has evinced every anxiety to produce as perfect an Act as possible which should have the effect of placing on the list every man who ought to be there and leaving off every vote that ought not to be included. In one instance, so desirous were they to make the lists perfect that they passed a special Act to place upon the list seven men at Balsam Bay, who, by some accident, had been left off. Mr. Roblin, the premier of Manitoba, has in the legislature, on the platform, and in the press, continuously requested suggestions from any source which would aid to make the Manitoba Election Act more perfect and make it serve the people better. And the Act I have read is the result of the various amendments made from time to time up to 1906. Hon. Robert Rogers, also a member of the Manitoba government, has issued a challenge which has never been taken up, that, if in one authentic case it could be shown that even one man had

lost the franchise through the wanton or wilful act of an officer of the government, every seat in the province would be allowed to go by acclamation to the Reform candidate in the next election. This was a perfectly safe challenge because it was known in the province that these lists were absolutely fair and impartial. In Ontario we have, as has been mentioned, a system of registration in our cities and towns of over 9,000 inhabitants. If the government desired to be consistent they would have to include in this Bill a provision for making new lists in each one of the many places in which the Ontario Registration Act applies. If their objection to the lists is based on the contention that those made by the registration are faulty, that would be the only consistent contention they could set up. Now with regard to British Columbia, I propose as shortly as possible to place the House in possession of the provisions of the Act in that province. Section 4 provides the qualification and says :

Every male of the full age of twenty-one years, not being disqualified by this Act or any other law in force in this province, being entitled within this province to the privileges of a natural born British subject, and being able to read this Act, or any portion thereof, to the satisfaction of the registrar, if required by such registrar so to do, having resided in this province for six months, and in the electoral district in which he claims to vote for one month of that period immediately previous to sending in his claim to vote as hereinafter mentioned, and being only registered as an elector under the provisions of this Act, shall be entitled to vote at any election.

Then with regard to the revision of the lists :

The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall appoint for each electoral district, or for any polling or polling divisions of an electoral district, a person to be registrar of voters, and the duties of such registrar shall be as follows:

(a) To furnish to any one applying for the same any of the first three forms in the schedule hereto, without charge.

This is the form of application to be placed upon the register:

I do hereby apply to have my name inserted in the register of voters for the electoral district, and I do hereby make oath and say (or solemnly affirm):

1. That I reside at in the electoral district, and my post office address is British Columbia.

2. That I am of the male sex, of the full age of 21 years, and a British subject.

3. That I have been for a period of six months immediately prior to the date of this application, a resident of and domiciled within the province of British Columbia, and that I have been for a period of one month immediately prior to said date a resident of and domiciled within the electoral district.

It is further their duty :

To receive from any person offering the same a sworn affidavit in writing in support of application to vote in the form A in the schedule hereto, and to insert the name of such person in a list of persons claiming to vote, which list shall be posted up in the office of such registrar, and a copy thereof shall be placed in some conspicuous place on the outside of the door of such office; and such list shall be according to form B in the schedule hereto. The registrar shall not insert the name of any person upon such list unless the said form A as furnished is in accordance with this Act, and shows such person to be entitled to be placed on the register of voters.

Said list of persons claiming to vote shall be suspended from and after the last Monday in March and September of each year, and all applications to vote received after the said last Monday in March and September shall be held over until after the courts of revision provided for in subsection (e) hereof respectively, when they shall be posted up as provided in subsection (b) hereof.

On the first Monday of May and November, in each and every year, the registrar shall hold a court of revision, of which two months notice shall be given by him; such notice to be published in the British Columbia 'Gazette,' and copies of such notice shall be posted in the office of such registrar, and on the door of the principal court house of the electoral district, and in not less than three conspicuous places within the district for which, or for the polling division whereof, he shall have been appointed.

That is, that all the names that are on it and not objected to shall stay there.

Upon the holding of such court, it shall be the duty of such registrar to hear and determine any or all objections against the retention of any name or names on the register of voters, as settled at the previous revision, and on the said list of persons claiming to vote, as provided for in subsection (b) hereof; provided notice of every objection, and the reason thereof which may be in the form B in the schedule hereto, shall have been given to the registrar by the person objecting fifteen clear days previously to the holding of such court, and that the registrar shall have forwarded, twelve clear days before the holding of such court, a notice through the post office, or in such manner as he may deen advisable, to the person objected to, stating the facts of such objection, the ground thereof, and that the same will be heard at the holding of such court.

Here again we have, as in the province of Manitoba, personal notices given to every man with regard to objections to putting him on or putting him off.

It shall also be the duty of such registrar to strike off the register of voters, and off the said list of persons claiming to vote, all names thereon of persons who shall be dead, or shall have ceased to reside in the province of British Columbia; before striking off the name of any person on account of his being dead, or of his having ceased to reside in the province of British Columbia.

The registrar shall certify to said register of voters, and it shall be the list used at any

election which may take place before the next revision has been completed.

In the case of the first register of voters, the same as made up as above, shall be certified to by the registrar, and forwarded forthwith to the King's Printer, who shall print the same, and the said register of voters shall be the list used at any election which may take place before the next revision has been completed.

After the first register of voters for any electoral district has been made up, the registrar of voters, after the holding of each court of revision shall make up and certify a complete register of voters, which shall consist of the names on the last register of voters not removed therefrom, and all names that have been added thereto, and any other corrections made in such register, and shall forward the same forthwith to the King's Printer, who shall print the same.

Then it is provided that no fee shall be charged for putting names on the register of voters, section 12 provides:

The affidavit provided for in subsection (b) of section 10 hereof, may be sworn or affirmed before any justice of the peace, mayor, reeve, alderman, councillor, commissioner for taking affidavits in the Supreme Court, registrar of titles, notary public, registrar of voters, provincial constable, special provincial constable, government agent, government assessor, mining recorder, deputy mining recorder, judge of any court, stipendiary magistrate, municipal clerk, municipal assessor, postmaster, postmistress or Indian agent, and no fee shall be charged for taking such affidavit or affirmation.

13. The Lieutenant Governor in Council may appoint any person who is a British subject as a commissioner for taking affidavits in the Supreme Court for a limited period without payment of any fee, for the purpose of acting under this Act in the electoral district in which he resides.

14. The King's Printer shall furnish any person with a reasonable number of blank forms of said affidavit, without charge.

Then with regard to the transfer of names:

Upon the written request of any registered voter, in manner aforesaid, for the transfer of his name from any register of voters to any other register, it shall be the duty of the registrar forthwith to remove the name of such person from the register of voters, and to deliver or forward to such registered voter, a certificate that his name has been so removed from the said register, and the said voter may forward the said certificate to the registrar of the district in which he resides and desires to become a registered voter.

So there is the utmost ease provided for the elector who has changed his place of residence, to transfer his name.

Every registrar shall reject every claim or application to be registered as an elector unless the claim contains full particulars of the place of the claimants or applicant's residence, whereby such claimants' or applicants' whereabouts may be easily ascertained.

Where any impediment, misfeasance, or omission shall have happened in the preparation or transmission or printing or publication of any list or register of voters or other document, of what kind soever, the Lieutenant Governor in Council may take all such measures and make such regulations as may be necessary for removing such impediment or rectifying such misfeasance or supplying such omission.

Section 22:

All such regulations, on being published in one issue of the 'British Columbia Gazette,' shall have the full force of law as if hereby expressly enacted, and shall be laid before the legislature within fourteen days after such publication.

Then with regard to an appeal:

Any person dissatisfied with the decision of the registrar may have the same reviewed before any county court holden within the electoral district, or polling division thereof, for which such registrar shall have been appointed; or in case there shall be no county court holden within such electoral district or polling division, then to the county court holden nearest to such district or polling division thereof as aforesaid, by giving to the registrar a notice of review which may be in the form 'C' in the schedule hereto, within six days after such decision shall have been rendered. Such notice shall also be served, within such time, upon the elector objecting, or the person whose claim to vote shall have been allowed, as the case may be; and such notice shall be given ten days before the hearing of such review, or at such other time as the county court judge shall appoint, and the case shall be heard at one of the usual sittings of such county court, and the judge shall either affirm or dismiss such appeal, and make such order as to the costs thereof and generally as to the premises as he may deem just, and may enforce the same as and in the same way as a judgment of the court is usually enforced: provided always, that every such decision of any such county court judge may be appealed from to the Supreme Court of British Columbia; and all the proceedings concerning such appeal shall be conducted as nearly as may be according to the provisions of the County Courts Act, and rules of court made in pursuance thereof for the time being in force relating to and governing appeals. The registrar, on any such review, shall regard and be governed, as to placing, retaining or removing any name on or from the register of voters, by the decision of the county court judge, or if such decision shall be reversed by the Supreme Court, then by the decision of the Supreme Court: provided, however, that with respect to the electoral district of Cassiar, the provision hereinbefore mentioned, instead of being made to, taken, or held before a county court, shall be made to, taken or held before any two justices of the peace residing in such district, the registrar not being one of such justices.

27. The registers of voters, as made, scrutinized, settled and revised under and pursuant to the provisions of chapter 67 of the Revised Statutes, 1897, and amendments, and of the Redistribution Act, 1902, shall, subject

to revision under this Act be, and continue to be the registers of voters in and for the several electoral districts constituted and defined by said Redistribution Act, 1902.

So that in this province we have not only an appeal to the county judge, but a further appeal to the supreme court of the province. The time within which such proceedings shall be had in British Columbia as shown by the sections of the Act to which I have called attention would be: Notice of the court of revision must be published for two months; the holding of the courts of revision would occupy ten days; notice of review of decision of the court is limited to six days; then there is notice of review before the review takes place; and not taking into account the time occupied by the review and correction of the lists there would necessarily be occupied in the compilation and revision of the lists two months and 26 days. Therefore, it is obviously impossible that the provincial law should be observed if the whole work has to be done, as proposed by section 1 after the issue of writs for an election.

Mr. Speaker, there have been absolutely no complaints against this Act by the people of British Columbia. They have chosen to make their lists in this way, and they are satisfied with them. I propose to lay before the House a letter from Mr. W. A. Macdonald, of Nelson, in which he says:

No Liberal papers in British Columbia have as yet been able to advance an argument in favour of the contemplated change.

That is section 1 of the Act.

You will have received copy of 'Daily News,' containing condemnation. Do not forget that Deane, proprietor and editor of paper, is an active Liberal politician. He represented Kamloops in the local House, and at the last Dominion election stumped Yale-Cariboo for Duncan Ross. He is now president of the Liberal Association of Nelson, and is in touch with compilation of voters' lists, elections thereunder and revisions.

The extract from the 'Daily News' to which he calls attention is in these words:

We do not know why Mr. Aylesworth should seek to have special Dominion lists in British Columbia and we have been waiting to learn what explanation he had to offer on the point. The provincial lists, under ordinary circumstances, are, or should be quite satisfactory. They were used in the last Dominion election and we heard no complaint of any injustice being done to any person properly entitled to vote. The system of registration in British Columbia is as near perfect as it is ever likely to be, and, in our opinion, is absolutely fair to all parties. There is practically manhood suffrage in British Columbia and if a man be not registered, who is entitled to have his name on the list, it is usually his own fault. So far as we have observed, no party has any special advantages over the other, as we utterly decline to accept the Tory theory that the collectors of votes and the revising officers are necessarily corrupt.

On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, this government goes upon the theory that because the lists in Manitoba and British Columbia are made under the authority of Conservative governments, therefore the officers who made them are corrupt and also the people are unreliable and corrupt and capable of being corrupted by those officers. I have quoted the evidence of Mr. Macdonald, a very prominent resident in that country, and of the editor and proprietor of that Grit paper.

I further propose to place upon record this extract:

The 'Telegram' has received the following letter from a British Columbia elector: 'I was in active politics in British Columbia for over ten years. I have seen the 'old timers' party in power under successively John Robson, Theodore Davie and J. H. Turner. In many respects these were bad governments. They were far from progressive. In 1898, the provincial party under Chas. Semlin, a staunch Conservative, took office. His government was succeeded for a brief but lurid interval by that of Hon. Joseph Martin. Then James Dunsmuir, a man of no politics, came into office. He was followed by Colonel E. G. Prior. After him, Mr. McBride was called in, and, going to the country on party lines, was returned and has retained office ever since. Through all those changes in all those years, the question of voters' lists was never raised by any person, Liberal, Conservative, Socialist or Mug-wump, black, white, yellow or mixed, except of course in the way of improving registration and purging old lists. Political feeling ran high, very high indeed, but any idea of fighting on an unfair list never occurred to one solitary human being. The lists might be imperfect, they were never unfair.

That is the evidence of a prominent resident of that province.

Mr. GALLIHER. Who is that, is that Mr. Boville ?

Mr. ALCORN. He is stated to be a prominent British Columbian writing to the Winnipeg 'Telegram.'

I would be glad if, at some convenient time during the debate, the government would state whether it is their hope or intention that any provision of the first clause or any other portion of the Act shall authorize returning officers to cut and carve constituencies, or alter the boundary of particular polling divisions. If so that would introduce an excessively contentious principle into this debate. There are certain portions of clause 1 which would indicate that to a certain extent and if the government will during the debate announce their intention in that respect it will facilitate matters to some extent.

With regard to section 13 of the Bill which I referred to some time ago, on the splitting of polling divisions I would suggest that

each portion of a polling division which has been divided in that way should stand as a separate polling subdivision and should not be attached to any other polling division, the latter course would certainly lead to a good deal of trouble. The allotment of the names of the voters between the various portions of divisions so dealt with should be made by a judge as provided in the section of the Manitoba Act which I pointed out. I would also suggest that notice should in such cases be given to every elector who will vote in any portion of that polling subdivision as subdivided. I propose to read extracts from a number of letters that have been received from different persons in those two provinces with regard to this Bill.

Mr. J. D. Taylor of New Westminster, writes:

Apart from the political aspect of the matter with which it is not necessary for me to deal since you must fully appreciate the significance of this seizure of control of the lists, the objections most apparent are as follows:

Lines 12 and 13 provide for the making of the lists by Dominion authority immediately after the issue of the writs, but at last general election three contests in British Columbia were deferred because of the plea that there was not time to go through the necessary formalities on account of the great size of the constituencies. How, then would it be possible to prepare lists as well as fulfil the other requirements of the Act? Is this a scheme to make it necessary to defer all the elections in British Columbia until several weeks after the general elections. The saving clause, 'or at any time when the Governor in Council so directs,' would not be available in the case of the issue of writs immediately after the close of the present session.

Paragraph 2, read in this connection is senseless, in its first provision, because the law of British Columbia compels the provincial lists to be open for inspection for five weeks before confirmation by the court of revision, and this is not too long a time in order to permit any voter against whom an objection is recorded to be notified and make his reply, the mail service here being villainously slow. It would therefore be impossible to apply the laws of the province to any revision after the issue of the writs.

Mr. W. A. McDonald, K.C., Nelson, writes:

The more I think of this Act, the more it is quite apparent that it is nothing but an attempt to get control of the voters' lists so that some partisan officials may pad the lists to suit the Liberal party or cut off names of those likely to vote against them. There is no necessity whatever for the list being amended or interfered with after it leaves the hands of the registration clerk in May, when it will be revised. Our lists are fairly made up and no complaints whatever have ever taken place as to any partiality. I was pleased this morning to see that the 'News' which is our local Liberal newspaper was candid enough to admit that there was no necessity for any change. I do not see what members from British Columbia can suggest as a reason for the movement, and the copy of the paper which I inclose will afford good support to my statement above.

Hon. Hugh John Macdonald:

If the government were allowed to prepare the lists we might as well throw up our hands. The Thin Red Line at the last election was bad enough and shut us out of several seats which were fairly ours, but what is now proposed is ten times worse. One of the strong planks in the Reform platform when they were in opposition was the doing away with Dominion voters' lists and leaving all matters of this sort to the provinces, and this plank was the only one that they really carried out of those that put them into power. Now it seems that even this is broken and thrown on the pile for waste lumber.

Mr. G. H. Barnard, Victoria, B.C.:

With reference to the proposed changes in the Dominion Election Act as they affect this province. It would appear to us that this is a most unjustifiable proceeding on the part of the government and one that is calculated to place us at a great disadvantage during the election. We cannot see how there can possibly be any necessity for the proposed change so far as British Columbia is concerned. Under our Election Act any of the following officials are qualified to take applications from voters to have their names placed on the list: justice of the peace, mayor, reeve, alderman, councillor, commissioner for taking affidavits in the Supreme Court, registrar of titles, deputy registrar of titles, notary public, collector of votes, provincial constables, special provincial constables, government agent, government mining assessor, mining recorder, deputy mining recorder, judge of any court, stipendiary magistrate, municipal clerk, municipal assessor, postmaster, postmistress or Indian agent.

From this list you will see that there is no lack of opportunity offered to any person desiring to get on the list to have the necessary application sworn. Moreover the provincial government has been in the habit of accepting from the Liberal committee recommendations of persons they desire to have appointed as commissioners under the Election Act, and such appointments have always been made without any demur on the part of the government. The existing system has so far been found to work absolutely satisfactorily and without friction. We feel that if this Act is allowed to pass it is opening the door for corruption of the worst kind on the part of our opponents and that we look for a repetition of the 'Thin Red Line' affair. The only grain of comfort in the situation is that the proposed action is such an iniquitous one that it may re-act strongly upon its perpetrators. It is difficult to see why different treatment should be meted out to British Columbia and Manitoba from the rest of the provinces, unless for the reason that they are strongly Conservative in feeling.

Mr. W. J. Bowser, Attorney General of British Columbia:

There is absolutely no justification for the proposed amendment, as we have courts of revision here twice every year, viz., on the first Monday in May and the first Monday in November, and all persons wishing to get

on the list for the May revision must put in their application before the last Monday in March and all persons expecting to get on the list at the November court of revision must apply before the last Monday in September.

At the present time both parties in this province are very active trying to get in their applications before next Monday so that all the applicants will be dealt with in the court of revision on the 4th of May, both sides , of course, feeling confident that this will be the last court of revision before the Dominion election, and every effort will be made to purge the list of dead men and absentees so as to have a clean election list. Now, if the Dominion government gives any 'carte blanche' powers to a nominee of theirs it may simply mean a repetition of the 'Thin Red Line' used in Manitoba, and I know that, so far as we are concerned here, there will be a big row over it, as both Liberals and Conservatives here have every confidence in our registrars of voters who are in nearly every case, government agents, men of high standing in their community.

At the last court of revision in Vancouver there were a great many names knocked off the list and a great many others added, and in no case was the slightest suggestion made that our registrar of voters had acted in any other but a proper manner.

There has been no suggestion that our Election Act is not working out perfectly, and in this last session of parliament there has not been a suggestion on the part of any member on either side of the House that it should be amended in any way. In 1908 it was amended so as to make it easier to knock names off the list than it was formerly. It has worked splendidly in our last election, and no suggestion was made that the election list was not an honest one. I may say that the applicant has only got to be six months in this province and one month in the constituency he applies in, and he must be able to read and write and sign an application and take an oath before commissioners under the Act. We appoint commissioners right along when suggested by any political party in the province. I may say besides that the affidavit can be taken before any justice of the peace, mayor, reeve, alderman, councillor, commissioner for taking affidavits in the Supreme Court, registrar of titles, deputy registrar of titles, notary public, registrar of voters, provincial constable, special constable, government agent, assessor, mining recorder, deputy mining recorder, judge of any court, stipendiary magistrate, municipal clerk, municipal assessor, postmaster, postmistress, Indian agent or any commission appointed by the government in council for taking affidavits under the Election Act. No fee is charged, so that any man in the most remote part of this province could have his application properly sworn to and filed with the registrar of voters, so that, as far as this province is concerned, there is absolutely no necessity for any list to be made up by a Dominion official, and if a man is not on the list now, he has only himself to blame.

These are simply selections from shoals of letters which have been deluging this side of the House ever since this Bill was presented to parliament, and they are all in the same direction. Every one knows that the Liberal party and its leaders both in the present and in the past have always proclaimed as a principle the adoption of the provincial lists for Dominion elections. I propose to read some extracts from the 'Hansard' of 1885 with a view of showing that fact. The Hon. Mr. Mills, speaking on the proposed Franchise Act of Sir John Macdonald, which appointed a revising officer in each electoral district, said:

These gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches and their supporters have a very great interest, and so have we, as to who the revising officer shall be. I say they ought not to appoint him any more than we. Give us the power of appointing the revising officers and we can determine beforehand who will command a majority in this House; and when the hon. gentlemen have that power, we know what it means.

In the present Bill the government are proposing not only to appoint a revising officer, even if there is time for a revision, which I have shown there is not, but also every other officer who touches the lists.

We know it is a decision beforehand what the result of the election shall be. . . . . I say that these provisions of the Bill are pernicious; they are a violation of the first principles of natural justice; they propose to make one of the parties interested in the contest the judge of the matter, or to give him the power of appointing a man who is to determine who is and who is not an elector in this country. In my opinion, that is a principle which is so unjust, so unfair in itself, that this House ought not for a moment to entertain it; it is so atrocious that hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches ought not to have proposed it; it is so atrocious that no minister in England would dare to make such a proposition; no parliament in England is so servile as to support such a proposition Why, what would the hon. gentleman say if we on this side of the House were to claim the right to appoint the revising officers in all the constituencies that we represent? They would not for a moment accede to our proposition, and yet they propose to appoint them in all the constituencies' The proposition is a monstrous proposition, and one which the hon. gentlemen must expect will be very fully discussed when this Bill goes into committee.

This is the statement of the Hon. Mr. Mills, formerly Minister of Justice in this government, afterwards a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, one of the most prominent leaders in the Reform party in Canada. I will next call attention to a speech delivered by the right hon. gentleman himself. He said :

Yesterday the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Foster), speaking on this question said it was the duty of this House to regulate its own franchise, and not to leave it to the whim or fancy of this one or that one, but that we should by law enact who should be the electors to this House. Well, for my part, I

have no objection that this should be done; perhaps it is well after all that the question should be settled once and for all, and that to-day this House should determine who should be the electors to this House. But if that is to be done, let it be done as it has been done in the United States, as it has been done in the Dominion since confederation, and let us determine that the electors to the House of Commons shall be the electors to the several local legislatures. Now again, the hon. gentleman, addressing himself to this question, said we should be independent of the local legislatures. Well, we are independent of the local legislatures in our own sphere, just as much as the local legislatures are independent of us in their spheres. But at the same time this House has no rights at all of its own; the only rights which it enjoys are those which are delegated to it by the people of the provinces, and it is not for this House to determine what people of the provinces shall delegate those powers to the House, or in what manner they shall be constituted for that purpose; it is the people themselves who should determine who shall be the constituents of the members of this House, according to the mode regulated by the constitution, speaking through the local legislatures.

On page 1171 the right hon. gentleman continued:

I submit to the sense of the House that this measure is an invasion of popular rights. Hitherto the voters' lists have been prepared by the people themselves. The assessment rolls have been prepared by the people themselves through valuators appointed by the municipal councils. The lists have been prepared by the people themselves through the secretary-treasurer appointed by the municipal council. The lists have been revised by the people themselves through the municipal councils. This system, so far as I know, has worked satisfactorily and well. Now it is proposed that there shall be a change. What reason is given for that change? Why should this right be taken from the people?

That is a matter I adverted to some time ago, showing that the Act was the Act of the people in every case through their local legislature.

The present system forces them to give their attention to public business. Now that system is to be changed. The voters' lists are henceforth to be prepared, not by the people, but by lawyers appointed by the government, assisted by clerks and constables. What can be the result of that change?

Equally we might ask the same question to-day with regard to this Bill—why should lawyers be entrusted by the government with the making of the Dominion lists? The right hon. gentleman continues:

If the change is made as a consequence of the introduction of a Dominion franchise, this must be a bad measure indeed if to carry it out you are obliged to deprive the people of a portion of the rights they now exercise. The present system has so far worked satisfactorily.

I think I have shown that the system in the province of Manitoba that now obtains has worked satisfactorily in that province, and was placed on the statute-book by the people of that province.

I am not aware that there have been any serious complaints that the lists of voters have not been properly prepared and revised by those who have hitherto had the duty of preparing and revising them. Under the law, in the province of Quebec at all events, there is an appeal from the decisions of the municipal councils through the courts.

Further down he says:

The Bill is still liable to a graver objection: it is a direct invasion of the powers hitherto enjoyed by the people. So far the people themselves have had the preparation of these lists, but henceforward that power is to be taken out of their hands and what is the reason given for taking away from the people that duty of which they have had the enjoyment ever since confederation?

Under the Bill now before the House there is practically no change, except that the government by their officials wish to make similar lists to those now made in the provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia by the officials of those provinces, and their only reason for making that change is to have the lists made by their officials, instead of by those of the local governments.

I use the word enjoyment advisedly, because the exercise of a duty so precious as this must be an enjoyment rather than an obligation. Yet this precious right is proposed to be taken away from the people; and I do not imagine that the sturdy yeomen of this country will submit to this for any length of time; I do not imagine that they will yield without a protest this right to henchmen of the government, to the innumerable army of parasites which feed on the government and whose sole object will be to do the bidding of the government.

I will apply that to the proposed change here:

In every conceivable point this measure is in my opinion a bad measure, one that will be denounced by all those who believe in popular rights, who believe in the sacredness of our constitution, as an invasion of popular rights, and as a step towards centralization; and in this view I beg to move the following resolution:

That all the words after 'that' be struck out and the following inserted: In the opinion of this House it is preferable to continue the plan which has been adopted ever since confederation of utilizing for the election of this House the provincial franchises and voters' lists.

On page 1187 Mr. Blake made a very long speech, from which I make a few extracts. He said:

Now, I want to know whether it is not of the last consequence to insure a true representation of the people, that we should have the lists as full as possible, and the people

placed thereon with as little trouble and expense as possible, and as little doubt and uncertainty as possible, as to who have the right to be placed on the lists and who have the right to vote.

Let me point out that even if this new Dominion list is made, the provincial lists will go on as usual, so that there will be the double expense and double trouble of making both lists at the same time

I say that is a practical question of the greatest consequence to those who really value representative government. I say our first care ought to be to place as few obstacles and impediments as possible in the way of the honest man, who is entitled to the franchise, getting on the voters' list, and as few obstacles as possible in the way of his knowing what he is to do in order to get there; and I say that if you establish, as you inevitably will, by your law, one franchise for the local and another for the federal legislature—because you say you are going to establish one for all the provinces, and because we know that the conditions and the views in the provinces vary—you will then establish complications and trouble, a double trouble, a double registration, a double inquiry on the part of the voters and you will thus create, instead of removing, obstacles towards a full and fair representation of the people.

These observations apply with equal force to the present proposal of the government.

Great expense will be caused too. Why, I suppose everybody knows, who has directed any attention to this subject, that it is an expensive matter to keep the voters' list right, that it is an expensive matter to see that no improper votes are put on, on the one side, and that all proper votes are kept on, on the other side. It is often neglected now; it is often neglected by both parties, and, when an unexpected election takes place, you find sometimes that the real expression of the people's will is thwarted by the circumstance that the lists have not been revised and do not accurately represent their view.

In this way did the Hon. Mr. Blake speak of the municipal lists which this government says should be the foundation of all voters' lists. He said that they are extremely faulty and that no election could be run upon them without revision. He continued:

Are you going to double all that trouble? Are you going to have two sets of voters' lists to be looked after every year instead of one set? Do you think that is helping the elector on? Do you think that is making easy the path to a real and true representation of the people? It cannot be. It is impossible that those who argue for the Bill can contend for that result. Then there is the expense—the expense to the public in this double registration, the work that has to be done, the printing and revising of a separate set of lists. The local authority—in my province, at any rate; I know not whether in the others—provides you a list now; they provide you a printed list; they provide you a revision, a framing of it by the municipal officers elected by the people, a revision by the judicial officers you appoint yourselves; the judicial officers that you appoint here, the county court judges. They give you your list, complete, framed and revised, revised finally by judicial officers appointed by the authority of this legislature. There is the system. And you are going to take upon yourselves the public expense of framing lists and printing them yourselves, and you are going to impose the private expense on individuals which is involved in the carrying out of this double franchise.

All this equally applies to the double list which the government is now proposing to make.

I ask this House not to make this franchise more difficult than it now is, and I say you are making it more difficult, perhaps more than if you raised it, by the practical obstructions you are placing in the way by a double franchise. Make it easier if you can, and the easiest thing you can do is just to leave it alone.

On page 1192, Mr. Blake made certain other observations which I think are material. Speaking with regard to the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald, he said:

When he got back here in 1882, he took the electoral district and now he has taken the voters' lists. His efforts have been to secure and retain and increase a majority by the use of these powers, powers which ought not to be in the hands of government, in the great contest between the two political parties as to which has the majority of public opinion, powers which ought as far as possible, to be kept out of the hands of governments, which being human, are liable to misuse them. Well, the hon. gentleman may succeed in procuring the passage of this clause as to the appointment of revising officers, which he did not say anything about which he did not intimate might be considered an open question, so that any of his supporters he felt they could not conscientiously accept a revising officer of their own nomination might be free to vote against it. He did not make this an open question, and he has not defended it as yet. He may succeed in carrying it, but as he has from time to time found that many of his efforts to obtain control have failed, though many of them have succeeded, I hope and trust that this effort, even if successful here will be less successful elsewhere, that a spirit of fair play and justice will be dominant through the land, that the people at large will say that the hon. gentleman ought to deal as he would be dealt by, that they will say there ought to be a pure and equitable and honest system of making the lists, and that he will not derive, at any rate, all the advantage from this disposition which, in his secret heart, he hopes to obtain.

I might remark in this connection that at present throughout Manitoba indignation meetings are being held in which the action of the government is being denounced in no uncertain tone. I think the observations I have quoted are peculiarly applicable to this Bill, and the right hon. gentleman will find that this very high-handed proceeding will not redound to his credit even among his

own friends. In the third volume of 'Hansard' of that year, I find further observations by Mr. Blake. Speaking on the Bill which had been introduced in 1870 by Sir John Thompson with regard to the making of lists, he said :

It contained the provision objectionable in the highest degree, that the Governor in Council should appoint the persons to make the lists.

Here the government is appointing their officers who will deal with those lists at every stage. On page 2175, speaking of the different plans of making voters' lists, Mr. Blake observes:

The worst plan of all is that which puts the making of lists in the hands of the government of the day.

On page 2176 he continues:

I am not inclined, I hope, to place on too low a position the political morality of our country, the political morality of countries, the standing of those who at one time or another may have the majority in this country, but I say that you have got to remember, whatever elevated view you may take with reference to our status, however far you may be disposed to go in the assertion that Canada will not depart from those principles of justice and fair play which must underlie parliamentary government and all other forms of government—and without it, your talk of self-government is a farce and your talk of parliamentary government is worse than a farce—however much you may be disposed to affirm that no party when in power will use its power to aggrandize itself to the prejudice of the minority, to perpetuate its own power by unfair means, we cannot contend that we are less liable to misuse our own strength, that we are less restrained by high considerations of the character to which I have referred, that we are less moved by those baser considerations to which I have referred than the English people, the English parties, the English government, and yet there no government was bold enough to propose to the free parliament that it should be entrusted with the nomination of the men to make or to revise the lists, no parliament has been base enough to surrender to the executive government, in which it confided, that power. They felt that it was a power which ought not to be asked, and they did not ask it. They proposed a different mode of appointment. Why ? Why is it that no English government proposed to an English parliament, and an English parliament accepted and recorded upon the statute-book, where it stands, amid all the vicissitudes of electoral laws, from that time to this, the proposition that the judges of the land should be the persons who should appoint the revising officers? It was because they felt that it was a power with which the government of the day ought not to ask that it should be entrusted. It was because they felt that the appointment coming from that source was coming from a suspected and tainted source in the eyes of the people, it was because they felt that those engaged in the discharge of this duty could not do it with a fair chance of being considered impartial between the two great parties, if they were the nominees of the government of the day, it was because they felt that the well working of the system depended upon the adoption of that special and peculiar provision which in this case, and for those purposes they used.

Yet in the face of that declaration of policy, the government is proposing to make new lists simply for the purpose of having them made by their own officials. He continues, at page 2177:

The evil is at the source, the taint is at the source, the difficulty is at the source. It is the suspected and improper authority who is to appoint the officer that makes the difficulty. Why, sir, to say that our present system involves occasionally some injustice in the making of the lists to the one party or the other, that occasionally an over-zealous and improper Conservative assessor or functionary, makes the lists wrongly, and occasionally an improper and over-zealous Reform assessor does the same thing and that that is a reason for this change—I do not say for a change, but for this change—is absurd; because this change is one which puts the dead weight of a revising officer all the time on one side——

And in this case the government is putting the dead weight of the revising officer always on their own side.

—which says it shall be the nominee of the government in all cases who shall make the list, and the other party, the party of the minority, shall have the function of appeal.

And at page 2346, Mr. Blake says:

I think it is highly important that there should be as few elections brought on, while yet it is uncertain what the voters' list is, as possible. I think we ought to do everything that we can in the way of legislation to minimize the temptation on the part of the party in power to bring on an election at that inconvenient season. . . . I hope that we are dealing with an entirely exceptional class of cases; I hope, for instance, that such a thing would not be thought of as, in a general election, the government which had control of the issue of the writs not having regard to the general condition of appeals from the voters' lists. I think it would be a very great abuse of power to cause a general election to be had when there was a very considerable number of the voters' lists under appeal pending before the judge, when consequently, in a considerable number of constituencies, it was uncertain who would have the right to vote.

It would be uncertain who would have the right to vote under this Bill, because the list will not be brought into existence until after the writ for the election is issued.

A debate took place in this House in 1898, and which has been referred to here to-day. I think some parts of that debate should be placed before the House. At page 308, the Solicitor General of that time, Mr. Fitzpatrick, in speaking of the Bill said:

The object of this Bill is to repeal the existing Franchise Act and to substitute there-

for the laws of the different provinces as to the qualification of voters, polling divisions and preparation of lists.

Then, at page 2270, he further says:

The object of this Bill is to repeal the Franchise Act of 1885 and to revert for the franchise, for the polling divisions and also for the voters' lists to the condition of things existing previous to that time. The Bill is not a lengthy one. It provides, in the first instance, for the repeal of the Franchise Act; then it provides that the franchise shall be in each province the franchise existing under the provincial law for the purposes of the provincial election—the words 'provincial election' being defined in the Bill—and then it provides that the list of voters shall be the same as that in existence in the province. We then go on to provide that the polling divisions or subdivisions are to be the same as those that exist in the province.

Then, at page 2288, the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), speaking of an amendment which had been proposed to the Bill, said:

The blemish in the Act introduced by Sir John Thompson, and it is to me an absolute and irredeemable blemish, was that while he adopted the provincial franchise, yet he retained the revising officer and the preparation of the list by the revising officer. I say this is the blemish in the Act. Here is section 5: The Governor in Council may from time to time appoint a proper person to be called the revising officer.

Let me call attention to section 10.

Then he reads section 10 which has already been read here, and goes on:

These are the objections which we had at the time to the Bill of Sir John Thompson. It was far more logical, according to our view, having adopted the principle of the provincial franchise to also accept the voters' lists so prepared under the authority of the provincial legislature. On this side of the House we have an absolute hostility to the revising officer and the lists prepared by the revising officer.

And yet these hon. gentlemen to-day are appointing not merely a revising officer, but a full set of revising officers who shall make lists for two whole provinces. At page 2289, the right hon. gentleman says:

I propose that we shall revert to that system. If we apply the principle of the provincial franchise, why should we not take at the same time the means and methods by which the principle is applied?

Later in the same page, he says:

This very Franchise Act was an abuse of power whereby the revision of the lists was placed in the hands of henchmen of the administration.

Then, at page 3983, we find the hon. gentleman speaking as follows:

Let me recall to the hon. gentleman's mind, because he seems to forget these matters very readily, that for the first nineteen years of confederation, this parliament was elected on lists prepared by the local legislatures. Let me recall further that there were no complaints made at that time against that system. Let me recall again that under the system of the Dominion Franchise Act, passed in 1885, there was not a year but there were complaints, and grievous complaints, in regard to that matter. I ask my hon. friend this question: Is it not the fact that if this Franchise Act is not passed during this session we shall be obliged to have a revision of the Dominion lists? There is not an hon. member who would not look with absolute terror on the prospect that in July he would have to meet the worry and expense of a revision of the list.

But what shall be said of the terror of those members of the House who represent constituencies in unorganized territory in Ontario or Quebec or in the other provinces affected, if they have to go to the country and face the expense of two complete lists?

If hon. gentlemen opposite have a better system to propose, let them offer it; but as between a Dominion and provincial franchise, as between a Dominion list and provincial lists, there can be no hesitation, because we have had for nineteen years a provincial list and provincial franchise.

Then, at page 4013, the Prime Minister says:

We propose a system which has been in operation for nineteen years here. We propose a system that has been in operation in the United States ever since the establishment of the constitution. If there is anything better to be offered, I should like it now to be offered; but if we are only asked to adopt a system of registration——

And that is what the right hon. gentleman proposes to adopt now.

—it will not at all remedy the evil, it will not relieve the expenditure necessary to-day; but if the House adopt the principle of the Bill we propose, we shall have a list prepared without any trouble, without any expenditure, and we will have, I believe, the best system of franchise and preparation of lists the country has had so far.

And the right hon. gentleman knows that these provinces have made their lists and they are satisfied. Why should they be changed? And then at page 4014, we find the Prime Minister speaking as follows:

It is easy for hon. gentlemen opposite to pick flaws and create difficulties, but after all we must suppose there is some reason and conscience in them. Local legislatures are likely to represent the people of the province; they are elected to represent the same people we represent here, and no other people. It is supposed, and it is not a very violent supposition to make, they will exercise that power in the best interests of their constituents, according to their judgment and light. It is supposed they will adopt the best franchise to suit the province.

That is what has been done in these provinces, and the right hon. gentleman is not

content to leave it alone, but insists upon having separate lists. He goes on:

It is because we believe and suppose that the local legislatures will act as they have been acting, in the best interests of their own constituents, that we are acting in this way. In 1885 the legislature of the Province of Quebec was in the hands of the Conservative party. It had been in the hands of the Conservative party ever since confederation, with the exception of two years. But I would not have hesitated to accept the franchise provided by a Conservative legislature in Quebec, because, though there were many things in that franchise, on the whole, to which I would have objected, still as it satisfied the province it would have satisfied me. It is in the same way as regards other provinces. It is possible that the control of the several provinces may pass into the hands of the Conservative party——

That is a catastrophe which has happened now.

—still on a question of this kind I am quite disposed for my part to accept the franchise prepared by the legislature, whether Liberal or Conservative.

On the next page he says:

Would it not be far better, as a matter simply of good government, if the elections for this House could be conducted on the local lists, and that the members of this parliament and the members of the legislature who represent the same body of people, should be elected by the same electors?

Then on page 4127 I find the then Minister of the Interior, the present member for Brandon, (Mr. Sifton) saying this:

And I have this to say further, that the Act which came into force in 1891, under which revising officers are appointed, as they are appointed under the Dominion Franchise Act—and who are sometimes judges and sometimes not—has worked satisfactorily. There has not been to my knowledge, and there never was while I sat in the legislature, any complaint made against the conduct of these revising officers. Not a single complaint was made during the five years that I was a member of the government of Manitoba, during which that Act was in force, against the conduct of any revising officer. Not only was no complaint ever proven, but none was ever made.

On page 4309 the right hon. gentleman said:

We are now upon subsection 'a' of section 5 of this Act, which reads as follows:—
The qualifications necessary to entitle any person to vote thereat shall be those established by the laws of that province as necessary to entitle such persons to vote in the same part of the province at a provincial election.

An amendment was moved to that, and to that amendment the right hon. gentleman addressed himself:

Now my right hon. friend wants me to supplement that language in the manner which I have already indicated. Well, it is a matter of record that there are no two provinces in which the franchise are absolutely alike. They are alike in all provinces in principle, they are alike mostly in the nature of the qualification of the electors, but they are not absolutely identical in their respective provisions. What does this prove? It proves the principle which my hon. friend has refused to admit up to this moment, that the local franchise is necessarily, from its very nature, a local question to be determined by the local circumstances of the community in each province.

That remark is very applicable to both provinces in question in this Bill. The people of those provinces speaking through their representatives have passed certain Acts which have established the character of their franchise. Why should this government now, for Dominion purposes, simply because those provinces have become Conservative, insist upon making separate lists by partisan officers of their own?

My hon. friend will at least have to recognize this. The amendment which we have now before us has been considerably changed from what it was the other day when it was first presented. When it was first presented it did not contain a provision that this should apply only to certain provinces; it was to apply to all the provinces in which there exists an appeal as well as to provinces in which an appeal does not exist. Since that time the amendment has been restricted only to apply to those provinces in which there is no judicial appeal. Take the case of each province. Take the case of the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec. They are provinces where an appeal lies to the judicial authority. In those provinces the lists are prepared by the municipal authorities. In the province of Ontario the lists are prepared by the municipal bodies, and in the province of Quebec the lists are prepared by the municipal bodies. If any elector is not satisfied with the lists so prepared, if he feels aggrieved, he has an appeal to the judicial authority. In the province of New Brunswick there is nothing of the kind, there is no appeal to a judicial authority. In the province of Nova Scotia there is no appeal either to the judicial authority. My hon. friend says: Why should there not be an appeal to the judicial authority? The reason is very obvious, it is that in those provinces no want is felt for such an appeal.

On page 5672 the right hon. gentleman says, speaking to an amendment which had been proposed with regard to the revision of the lists:

We have certainly power to take the provincial lists as they are made, and to adopt them as our own; but I question very much whether we have power to interfere in the preparation of the local lists and to impose conditions which are not imposed by local legislation as to the manner in which they are to be made. This is a question which, in my judgment, is one of great moment and of some difficulty. I do not press it strongly, however, because I apprehend that there may be perhaps a difference of opinion in this regard. But there can be no difference of opin-

ion, at all events upon this point, that even if we had power to pass such an amendment, its adoption would create great confusion. You would have a set of lists prepared for local elections, and by this amendment you would introduce federal legislation to take effect at a certain time, which would take away the lists from the local jurisdiction and bring them under federal jurisdiction as to the method of their preparation.

Here the right hon. gentleman is in set terms condemning the precise thing which he now proposes to do by this Bill :

I submit to my hon. friend that this consideration alone shows that the amendment would undoubtedly and inevitably lead to very great confusion.

On the next page, 5673, he says :

I have no doubt that if the people of Nova Scotia——

All this is to show that the lists should be prepared by the people themselves, and that is what is being done in those two provinces.

——find the present system not satisfactory —the system which has given satisfaction hitherto—if they thought that the sheriff being appointed by the executive authority did not give them the same security as in former times when the sheriffs were appointed by the judicial authoriy, they will undoubtedly, in the exercise of their rights as citizens of a free province introduce legislation in amendment to that legislation. But it may be said that their efforts would be unavailing because the party suffering would not control the legislature. That may be so at the present time. But when any grievance exists in any legislature governed under British institutions, the minority is never slow to avail itself of any opportunity to offer amendments to remove it, although the minority may be sure that its efforts will not succeed, but be rejected.

That is what we are doing now with regard to this Bill.

A minority will never fail to bring grievances to the attention of a legislature, though they are satisfied their efforts will be prostrated, because the minority will do so simply for the purpose of affecting public opinion and affecting it in its own direction. I am therefore forced to the conclusion that as no efforts have been made either in the legislatures of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in the direction indicated by my hon. friend, the law has been found satisfactory to the people of those provinces.

On the same ground no change should be made in Manitoba or British Columbia. On the next page the right hon. gentleman continues :

Be that as it may, we have come to the conclusion that the best method we can adopt as regards the preparation of voters' lists for the elections for this House is the adoption of the local lists.

On page 7467, the then Solicitor General, speaking of the amendments which were sent down by the Senate, said :

Mr. ALCORN.

The second amendment provides that on page 2, line 5, paragraph 'c' be left out and in lieu thereof the paragraph 'c' framed by the Senate, be inserted. I would therefore beg to move:

That the amendments be disagreed to for the following reasons:—

Because the amendments made by the honourable the Senate to the Bill, excepting from its operation the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba, and providing for a special revision of the voters' lists in those provinces for elections to this House, is inconsistent with and subversive of the general principle of the Bill.

There the hon. Solicitor General (Sir Charles Fitzpatrick) hit the nail precisely on the head, that is precisely what this government is proposing to do with Manitoba and British Columbia.

That the procedure proposed by the hon. the Senate for securing the revision of such lists, under the authority of this parliament, is wholly inadequate, and cannot be rendered effective without creating complicated and costly machinery incompatible with the object of the Bill.

At page 7543 the Solicitor General said:

The object of the amendment to which I will especially address myself is that which practically provides in effect that in so far as three of the provinces are concerned, Manitoba, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, there shall be for these provinces Dominion lists instead of provincial lists as exist elsewhere. . . . We are by this Bill adopting the principle that obtained in Canada from 1867 to 1885, during which period we had a provincial franchise and provincial lists for federal purposes.

On the next page he says:

Now not only had we those lists from 1867 to 1885 without a single word of protest from the Senate, and without a single word of protest from the Conservative party, but when, in 1885, the Dominion Franchise Act was introduced, a strong protest was made by the Liberal party against the introduction of the principle of having the federal lists under the control of federal officers, and, Sir, not only was there a protest made at that time by the Liberal party against the principle adopted, but in season and out of season since that time the voice of the Liberal party has been raised throughout the whole of the Dominion in protest against these federal franchise lists, and in favour of the principle we are now seeking to carry out by this Bill. Not only did we raise that protest in the course of the debate in 1885, but we protested in the election of 1887, the election of 1891,the election of 1896 and in those elections that was the chief plank in the Liberal platform, in addition to the platform laid down by the Liberal party at Ottawa in 1893.

Now we have the fact that these conditions existed from 1867 to 1885, we have the fact that in 1885 the Liberal party protested against the change, we have in addition the fact that in each recurring election the chief plank in the Liberal platform was a reversion to the condition of things existing be-

fore 1885, and we have also the fact that this policy was inserted in the Liberal platform at the Ottawa convention. The Liberal party came into power, therefore, with an express mandate from the people to repeal the Dominion Franchise law of 1885, and to refer to the provincial lists, and we find that at the very first working session after the change of government, the session of 1897, a Franchise Bill was introduced by us. Not only do we find that, but we find also that because we wanted the Bill to be thoroughly understood and that the public might know what our intentions were, that Bill was placed before the people for their consideration, and at this session, a Franchise Bill was the very first measure disposed of. Under these circumstances, is it possible to conceive for a moment that there can be any doubt that we, the majority in the House of Commons, as now constituted, the supporters of the present government came here with an imperative mandate from the people of the Dominion to rid them of the useless and expensive system known as the Dominion Franchise Act and to substitute this proposed law. Not only did we receive that mandate from the people of the Dominion, but, sir, when we introduced our legislation in this House, there was not a single voice within these walls raised in favour of the old Dominion Franchise Act, and it went down to its grave unwept, unhonoured and unsung. In view of the fact that our desire is to obey the imperative mandate of the people, in view of the fact that our desire is to rid the people of this country of this incubus in the form of the Dominion Franchise Act, an Act which has cost us in the years it was in operation over $2,000,000, an Act which has not been revised for the last four years and that hon. gentlemen opposite dare not revise, because of the expense incurred in that revision, in view of these facts, we are justified in carrying out our promise to the people and in endeavouring as far as possible to place the making of the lists under the control of the people themselves, thus proving that the Liberal party have and always had confidence in the people, as distinguished from hon. gentlemen opposite, who, because they did not trust the people wanted to keep the control of the lists in the hands of officials appointed by themselves.

That is peculiarly applicable at present. Not only have this government no confidence in the Conservative governments of Manitoba and British Columbia, but they have no confidence in the officials whom these governments will appoint and no confidence in the people of those provinces who, they say, may be interfered with, and improperly interfered with, by these provincial officials.

I need not observe that this present Bill absolutely departs from the principle laid down in the extracts I have read and does so because Manitoba and British Columbia are now Conservative. This government insists on having lists made, in the words of the premier, by their own henchmen and parasites who feed on this government. We know what kind of lists we will get if this is done. Mr. Mills' words will be peculiarly applicable.

Section 13 then introduces the principle of a numbered ballot which is a vicious principle and wholly unnecessary. If the object were a legitimate object it would be served by requiring the voter to produce to the deputy returning officer a certificate from the returning officer that the voter's name is on the general list and by mistake was not transferred to the separate list. There should also be a clause inserted in the oath to the same effect. The voter himself should swear that he was on the general list. I invite hon. gentlemen opposite to imagine the operation of clauses 1 and 13 along the line of the National Transcontinental Railway. Here you will find a horde of thousands of foreigners and other workmen, birds of passage, and their contractor will consider it his duty to the Construction Commission and the government who employ and pay him to place all those men upon the lists and to vote them. Being foreigners in great part they will be indistinguishable and it will be impossible to trace them out afterwards; their names will be unintelligible and they will be untraceable. A petition against a government supporter elected by that vote in such a constituency as I have suggested would be without hope. The witnesses whom the petitioner might wish to subpœna, the foreigners and other workmen along the line would be scattered, no one could tell where, and the cost of endeavouring to procure evidence would be absolutely prohibitive. Therefore I ask if it would not be much better to take the provincial lists as the province provides them and not place upon the country the expense of separate lists and open the door, as clause 13 will, to a great deal of corruption in making the lists and recording the vote.

Section 17, as hon. gentlemen are aware, absolutely destroys the secrecy of the ballot. At this late hour I shall not make any extended observations upon that, but will merely say that the Bill which I had the honour to present to this House contained a clause embodying the same principle, but in conversation with my colleagues in the House I find I have yet to meet a single gentleman who is in favour of that principle, and if my Bill was before the House I would drop that section.

I commend the language of section 28 to the consideration of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and other members. It appears to me that it directly authorizes and legalizes the commission by a corporation or association incorporated for political purposes alone, the doing of anything and everything that every person else is by the prohibition contained in the section forbidden to do, so that such corporation or association may collect and distribute in the most corrupt manner possible an election fund of any size.

Under these circumstances and subject to what the leader of the opposition (Mr.

R. L. Borden) may say, but voicing I believe the sentiment of every hon. gentleman on this side of the House, I will observe that if these sections to which I have directed attention, sections 1, 13, 17 and 28, be maintained, the opposition will exhaust their constitutional rights in opposing this Bill before this House.

On motion of Mr. D. W. Bole, the debate was adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—THE QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the House adjourns, I direct the attention of the First Minister to the following statement of the Toronto 'Globe' of to-day :—

It is said here that when the Quebec bridge eventually spans the St. Lawrence it will not be from the points on either shore which it was intended the bridge should link, but at a site farther up the river near Batiscan, where it will not be necessary to erect an arch of such gigantic proportions as was proposed for the first structure. This change of site will necessitate a change in the surveyed route of the Grand Trunk Pacific between St. Maurice river and Quebec.

I would ask the Prime Minister if there is any foundation for this report.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is not the faintest foundation for it. So far as I know the width of the river at Batiscan must be twice the width of the river Cap Rouge.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I regret that I should have been so much misled by a leading Liberal organ.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The best men will fall sometimes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business tomorrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I suppose we will take up the same thing.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, May 6, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

POST OFFICE ACT—AMENDMENTS.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 162) to amend the Post Office Act.

Mr. ALCORN.

He said : The first object of this Bill is to give a one cent drop letter to cities and towns where the free delivery system exists. The second amendment refers to the appointment of a post office superintendent. According to the Act as it now stands, he must have been ten years in the service ; I also wish to amend the Act and provide for the appointment of a financial superintendent who will supervise the books in all branches of the postal service. The work of auditing and inspecting post offices all over the Dominion was given to the inspectors, but it is found, particularly in the Northwest and in sparsely settled districts of the country, that the work of the inspectors is already too large to allow them to audit thoroughly the books in each post office, especially in the large cities. I have decided to appoint a financial superintendent whose duties will be similar to those of the post office superintendent. He will have the supervision and the auditing of the books from one end of the Dominion to the other. I will give further explanations on the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. HENDERSON. When the hon. gentleman is fixing the rate on drop letters in cities at one cent, is it his intention under this Bill also to provide for a half cent rate on drop letters in towns, villages and rural districts ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. When the time comes to discuss this Bill more fully, I will explain to the hon. gentleman that this rate of one cent in cities where the free delivery system exists will help me to give more postal facilities to the rural sections of the country. At present the large cities of the Dominion are paying for the service in the rural portions. We are only giving the cities what already exists in other places where no letter carrier system exists. The one cent rate exists in other portions of the country, provided the letters are not sent outside the locality served by the post office.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When was the one cent rate changed ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The one cent drop letter rate was adopted in 1875, under the Mackenzie government, and it was abolished I think in 1889.

Mr. LENNOX. Does this provision for a one cent drop letter apply only to cities, or to all places where there are drop letters at present ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The one cent drop letter will apply only to those places where the letter carrier system exists.

Mr. LENNOX. We have in the town of Barrie a delivery system in what is called the old part of the town. A portion of the present town of Barrie was called at one

time Allandale, and there is a post office there. It is now all one town, and I understand that if a letter is dropped somewhere midway between Barrie and Allandale, and it happens to be carried into Barrie, though it is directed to Allandale, then the drop letter rate won't apply, it will have to be paid for the same as if sent outside the town. I think that is hardly fair. Where the whole district is practically one town within a radius of a mile, there should be only one rate.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is there a free delivery system ?

Mr. LENNOX. There is in the old part of the town, and Allandale is in the same town.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Then the one cent rate will apply.

Mr. LENNOX. At present there is no delivery in the Allandale portion of the town of Barrie, what we call the sixth ward, because when the delivery was established in Barrie, Allandale was not then a portion of the town. The population of Barrie is about 7,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that the one cent system was abolished in 1879 ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am not very positive as to the date.

Mr. BERGERON. I think it was abolished when the new two cent rate came into operation, by Sir William Mulock in 1897. I think the one cent rate was abolished at the same time that the two cent rate was adopted for all letters.

Mr. PORTER. In preparing this Bill has the minister taken into consideration the condition that exists in the post office at Belleville, to which I have called his attention several times ? Within the corporation limits of Bellevile there are two post offices, the principal post office for the central and business portion of the town, and another post office situated near the Grand Trunk Railway. We have not free postal delivery there. Generally, persons depositing letters in the town office for delivery to persons residing near the station post office, put on a one cent stamp, thinking that is the proper postage. A great many advertisements, circulars and things of that sort are dropped in the main office at Belleville for delivery to people near the station.

When the people go to the station post office for their mail they are met with a demand for the payment of two cents postage on a letter posted at the down town office. They pay the two cents postage, the letter being sealed, they know nothing as to what its contents may be, and then they find that it is an advertisement for dry goods or a show or something that is of no interest to them. It has been considered a hardship that that should exist. I have taken occasion to call the minister's attention to the fact that the delivery of letters at the station post office does not incur any materially greater expense than does the delivery at the central post office. Mails are carried from the central office to the Grand Trunk station for distribution by the railway company and in passing to the railway and back to the post office they pass the other post office door and they could collect the mail there as well. No great expense would be incurred, a great saving to the people would be effected and it seems to me, if the minister has not considered this matter, it should be considered now that an amendment is being made to the Act and that situation should be relieved. I will ask him to give it his careful consideration.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

QUEBEC TERCENTENARY—LEGAL HOLIDAYS.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE asked :

Does the government purpose proclaiming one or more legal holidays during the coming celebration of the tercentenary?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The government does not think that it would be advisable to make one or more legal holidays during the coming celebration of the Tercentenary. We think it would be inconvenient to many people outside the city of Quebec, especially those who are at the celebration, but, if it is thought advisable for the city of Quebec to have a legal holiday this can be done by proclamation by the mayor.

QUEBEC TERCENTENARY—DESIGNS FOR POSTAGE STAMPS.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE asked :

1. Has the Postmaster General asked for tenders for the designs of the issue of the postage stamps for the third Centenary?
2. If so, from whom were they asked, and which was accepted?
3. If there were no tenders, has the Postmaster General conferred with certain artists on this subject? If so, with whom?
4. What price was asked by the artist or artists, and for how many designs?
5. Was this price accepted? If not, why not?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. and 2. No.

3. 4 and 5. The department has had no official communication with any artist on this subject.

QUEBEC TERCENTENARY—FRENCH AND ENGLISH ON SOUVENIR POSTAGE STAMPS.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE asked :

Has the Postmaster General reached a decision concerning the use of French and English on the souvenir postage stamps to be issued at the third Centenary?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). The matter is still under consideration.

MR. FRITZ CIRKEL, M.E.

Mr. GANONG asked :

1. What remuneration was paid to Fritz Cirkel, M.E., for preparing the report issued by the Geological Department on the graphite properties in Canada?
2. How many copies have been printed?
3. Is Fritz Cirkel, M.E., at present in the employ of the government? If so, at what salary?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Mines). Some of these questions were answered on March 16.

1. The report on Graphite was made to the Mines Branch of the Department of Mines; contract price for the Monograph complete with drawings and photographs, $1,300.
2. 3,000.
3. Mr. Cirkel is at present engaged in writing a monograph on chrome iron ore deposits of the eastern townships at a salary of $250 per month.

WHARF AT WELCHPOOL, NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. GANONG asked:

1. Has any estimate been made by the government engineer as to the cost of a public wharf at Welchpool, Charlotte county, New Brunswick? If so, what is the estimated cost of same?
2. Has the location been purchased by the government? If so, from whom and at what price?
3. Is it the intention of the government to include an amount in the supplementary estimates to build this wharf?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1. (a) Yes.
   (b) $10,500.
2. No.
3. Matter under consideration.

HON. ADELARD TURGEON.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE asked :

1. Is it true that the government intends to appoint to the next vacancy in the Senate the Hon. Adelard Turgeon, Minister of Crown Lands in the Quebec Cabinet?
2. If so, is the government aware that Mr. Turgeon is accused of graft in the administration of his department, an accusation of which he has not yet been exonerated?

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

1. The government does not intend to appoint Mr. Turgeon or anybody to the next vacancy that may occur in the Senate. It is time to consider this question when vacancies arise.
2. I think this question is out of order and should not be put, but, on the other hand, I beg to say that the government has no such information.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—USE OF THE FRENCH LANGUAGE.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE asked :

1. Is the Minister of Railways and Canals informed that the notices for the arrival and delay of trains posted at the stations of the Intercolonial Railway, in the province of Quebec, more particularly at Lévis, are solely in English, contrary to the provisions of the Railway Act?
2. Is the minister aware that a great number of employees of the Intercoloniail Railway in the province of Quebec cannot speak French.
3. Is the minister aware that the French language is not employed concurrently with the English on the Intercolonial Railway in the province of Quebec?
4. What means does the minister propose to take to put an end to this injustice?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. The department has not been so informed.
2. The department is not so aware.
3. The only railroad that prints its tickets and time cards in both languages, is the Intercolonial Railway.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—NATIONALITY OF CONTRACTORS.

Mr. WILMOT asked :

1. What is the nationality of Messrs. Foley, Welsh & Stewart, contractors on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway construction?
2. Does the government know that it is asserted that Canadian citizens competing for contracts under this firm are discriminated against in favour of foreigners?
3. Is duty collected on railway construction plant coming from the United States into Canada?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railway and Canals) :

1. The department has no information.
2. No.
3. The Customs Department states that duty is collected on all such importations.

THE STEAMER 'LADY EVELYN.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What date did the steamer 'Lady Evelyn' leave Rimouski for winter quarters in Sydney?

2. What date did the steamer 'Lady Evelyn' return to Rimouski this year?

3. What use is made of the steamer 'Lady Evelyn' at Sydney during the winter months?

4. Has the Post Office Department a service with the island of Anticosti? If so, what is the nature of the service, the number of trips made by steamer, the estimated cost of service per annum, and the population on the island?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. and 3. The 'Lady Evelyn' did not winter at Sydney but at Quebec.

2. The steamer left Quebec for Rimouski on the 30th April last, and after landing the mails at that point on the incoming and outgoing mail steamers this week, leaves for Sydney to perform a like service at Sydney, in accordance with the terms of the transatlantic mail service contract.

4. Yes, between Quebec and Anticosti. The contract is with Messrs. Holliday Brothers—a distance of 410 miles—three trips per month, cost $1,050 per season. The population of Anticosti is estimated at 442.

WHARF AT CHASE'S POINT, NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. WILMOT asked:

1. Has the Minister of Public Works received a petition from the inhabitants of Chase's Point, on the St. John river, New Brunswick, asking for aid in the construction of a public wharf at that point? If so, how many names are on said petition?

2. Did said petition contain a clause pledging the petitioners in the case the prayer of the same were granted, to support the Liberal candidate in the next federal election?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1. (a) Yes. (b) Forty-three.

2. No.

SUPPLIES FOR STEAMER 'PETREL.'

Mr. T. CHISHOLM—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What persons furnished supplies to the steamer 'Petrel' between March 31, 1907 and April 30, 1908?

2. What was the amount paid to each such person, and what was the date of each payment?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I would suggest that my hon. friend make a motion immediately for a return and then the papers can be brought down. The answer to this question is very lengthy.

Mr. BLAIN. Will it stand as an immediate notice of motion?

Mr. SPEAKER. It will stand as a notice of motion for a return.

Mr. BLAIN. I move for a return showing:

1. What persons furnished supplies to the steamer 'Petrel' between March 31, 1907 and April 30, 1908?

2. What was the amount paid to each such person, and what was the date of each payment?

Mr. SPEAKER. By leave of the House this motion is made. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

DEPUTY MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I inquire of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), as I have inquired on two or three previous occasions when he happened to be out of the House, whether or not the resignation of the deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been accepted or whether any action has been taken in regard to it?

Mr. BRODEUR. The deputy minister has not tendered his resignation but has asked for leave of absence and for superannuation. His request in regard to leave of absence has been granted and the other request is engaging the attention of the government.

ALLEGED PADDING OF PAY LISTS AT SOREL.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like also to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he has forgotten to bring down that report of Mr. Gaudet, of Sorel. He promised the other day that he would bring it down.

Mr. BRODEUR. I received the report two days ago and I will bring it down. I have not received the evidence yet, but I will bring it down as soon as I receive it.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MR. JUSTICE CASSELS.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, if, on the 11th March, he was correctly reported in 'Hansard' as having said that Mr. Roy, who was employed at Sorel, had been padding the pay-lists and that the amount involved was considerable. I would further like to ask the minister if he does not consider that as a case where there has been, on the part of an employee of the department, a lack of conscience sufficient to place all the details before Mr. Watson commissioned by the government to inquire into matters appertaining to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and does not the minister think that in addition to other matters placed before Mr. Justice Cassels this matter should be entrusted to Mr. Watson to be speedily inquired into by Mr. Justice Cassels?

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand my hon. friend refers to the investigation which has taken place ?

Mr. BENNETT. Not to the investigation but to the circumstances of the case.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no objection to that. I shall put all the papers before Mr. Watson. The question has been inquired into by Mr. Gaudet and I shall bring down the report.

Mr. BENNETT. I am to understand that this case will be investigated by Mr. Justice Cassels ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know; it would be for the judge himself to decide whether it would be investigated or not. The papers will be brought before Mr. Watson.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Aylesworth for the second reading of Bill (No. 115) to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

Mr. DAVID W. BOLE (Winnipeg). Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to attempt to controvert the speech delivered by the hon. member for Prince Edward county (Mr. Alcorn) last night. I sat attentively for two and a quarter hours, listening to the speech of the hon. gentleman, and I must state, without any intention of offence, that the speech did not contain very much that can be answered.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOLE. I find in 'Hansard' this morning that 40 pages are occupied by the hon. gentleman, 35 of these pages being quotations from the Election Acts of the Dominion, of Ontario, of Manitoba and of British Columbia and letters which have appeared and which a good many of us have read in the public press. But I think I am voicing the sentiments of a good many members when I state that the substance of the hon. gentleman's speech is contained in the last paragraph in which he says :

> Under these circumstances and subject to what the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) may say, but voicing I believe the sentiment of every hon. gentleman on this side of the House, I will observe that if these sections to which I have directed attention, sections 1, 13, 17 and 28, be maintained, the opposition will exhaust their constitutional rights in opposing this Bill before this House.

I have no doubt that an hon. gentleman is within his constitutional rights in spreading 35 pages of extracts upon 'Hansard,' but if you allow me to suggest I cannot see that it adds much to the dignity or the value of the debate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the hon. gentleman whether it is not necessary to consider those Acts of British Columbia and Manitoba ?

Mr. FOSTER. Not for him.

Mr. BOLE. It may be, but all these Acts are in the statutes and can be hunted up and read without spreading them on 35 pages of 'Hansard.' Neither will I attempt to discuss the thin-red-line scandal which has been paraded not only before this House but up and down the country and spread on the newspapers of the country for the last four years. I think I am right when I state that the thin-red-line campaign has completly collapsed in this debate. It does appear to me to be very strange indeed that gentlemen occupying very important positions in connection with the Conservative party, after making such a campaign on this thin-red-line, should have utterly abandoned it in the speeches which were delivered by the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and the hon. member for Prince Edward county (Mr. Alcorn).

Neither will I make any serious attempt to show the necessity of clause 1 of the Bill, which is now before the House for consideration. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) performed tnat duty so successfully, so exhaustively and so completely, that it does appear to me that there is nothing left for either side of the House to state with respect to that clause. There is, however, one feature of the Bill which has not been brought to the attention of the House by the Minister of Justice, perhaps because he does not feel in respect to that feature as I do, and perhaps because I stand alone ; but my feeling has always been that in a growing country like the province of Manitoba there should be only one revision of the voters' lists and that immediately preceding an election. We have in the province of Manitoba and other western provinces a great many people coming from the province of Ontario, the maritime provinces and the province of Quebec, who are good citizens of the Dominion of Canada and who have a perfect right, in my judgment, to reflect their opinion on political matters when an election comes around. I think also that the one year provision with respect to residents should sufficiently qualify an Englishman, a British subject coming from England, to become an elector in the province of Manitoba. The naturalization laws are sufficient, I think, to protect the native-born people and the Canadian citizens from undue influence from alien quarters.

Another objection that we feel in the province of Manitoba with respect to these annual personal revisions of the lists and registration, is the tremendous expense involved. It is simply impossible for either party to secure a completed list in the province of British Columbia or Manitoba without of a very large annual expenditure, and I have thought that when all purposes will

be properly served by a revision immediately before an election, this will be the best course.

The Minister of Justice stated yesterday that the province of Manitoba anticipated an election by certain legislation in 1906. He did not put it in that way but that is the meaning I got from it. It is not the only occasion on which the legislature of the province of Manitoba anticipated a Dominion election by legislation. Mr. Hugh John Macdonald, during the short period of his premiership of the province of Manitoba, I think in 1900, passed a Franchise Act in many respects containing a good deal of merit. It provided, among other things, an educational qualification. No man was allowed to vote under that Act unless he was able to read or write in one of five languages, English, French, German, Scandinavian, or Icelandic. Under that condition and under that clause of the Act, no matter how well a Galician was educated in his own language, it was impossible for him to vote. The result was that a Galician, no matter how well educated he was in his own language, was not able to qualify himself for the franchise unless he was able to establish that right in one of these five languages.

Mr. GREENWAY. Unless he has been seven years in the country.

Mr. BOLE. Yes, unless he has been seven years in the country.

Mr. WARD. Is that law in force now?

Mr. BOLE. No. In the Dominion Franchise Act, I understand, there is a provision that in the event of any legislature discriminating against any class, that class can vote under oath. It was the intention of the Liberal party—and I am one of the guilty parties—to vote the Galicians under that provision, but the legislature of the province of Manitoba, anticipating that Act, struck out the educational clause of the Hugh John Macdonald Election Act. But when they came to make provision for the registration of the Galicians, who were scattered here and there over the province in groups, they placed the registration booths at such a great distance from the Galician colonies, and kept them open so short a time, that these people were practically disfranchised.

Now, the hon. leader of the opposition in his speech yesterday made some statements which I am going to quote. On page 8119 of 'Hansard' I find the following:

I would like to remark once more that no unfairness in making the lists for any province has been brought to the attention of the House except in the statement of the Minister of Justice based upon a hypothesis which he has not been able to prove. It has been stated to me that the Prime Minister of Manitoba has challenged, both inside and outside the legislature, his political opponents or any person within the province to bring to his attention the case of any man who has been unfairly deprived of his franchise in that province.

On page 8121 I find the following from the same hon. gentleman:

I would like my hon. friends opposite to give some names, any instance in Manitoba or in British Columbia which would justify the interposition of this parliament.

On page 8123 I find the following:

Show me, in the first place, the wrong that has taken place under that Manitoba Act.

And then on page 8150, in the speech of the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn), I find the following:

And Hon. Robert Rogers, also a member of the Manitoba government has issued a challenge which has never been taken up, that, if in one authentic case it could be shown that even one man had lost the franchise through the wanton or wilful act of an officer of the government, every seat in the province would be allowed to go by acclamation to the Reform candidate in the next election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it becomes my very unpleasant duty to lay before the House some evidence with respect to these things. The hon. gentlemen have issued a challenge and I am going to accept and respond to that challenge. I do so only with respect to my own constituency. I would very much prefer that some other member would perform this unpleasant duty, but as the incident which I am about to relate occurred in my own constituency, and the evidence respecting the same was submitted to me, it becomes my duty to present that evidence to the House, to show, not only that one man has been deprived of his right to vote under the Act of the province of Manitoba, but that no less than 450 good citizens in one provincial constituency, namely, about one-fortieth of the province, have had their votes nullified by 450 names being placed upon the voters' list by means of fraud, forgery, perjury and impersonation. I will now read some affidavits which have been made by people who are personally interested.

Mr. STAPLES. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman for Winnipeg the date of the affidavits which he is about to read.

Mr. BOLE. The date will be embraced in the affidavits themselves.

Province of Manitoba, to wit:

I, Theodore Rudneski, agent, make oath and say, as follows:

1. I am personally, intimately acquainted with W. H. Hastings, the organizer in the province of Manitoba for the Conservative party, and I have been acquainted with the said Hastings for upwards of two years.

2. About the middle of the month of January 1907, I pointed out to the said Hastings that a large number of foreigners, particularly of the class usually known as Galicians,

were residing in various parts of the city of Winnipeg who were at that time entitled to take out naturalization papers in Canada, but who had not at that time done so and who were otherwise qualified to become electors in the elections then in contemplation in the province of Manitoba.

3. Shortly after the middle of January, 1907, the said W. H. Hastings, in my presence, made arrangements with a committee of six composed of Joseph Makarski, Thomas Snezek, Frank Szablewski, George Czornij, Michael Humilowicz, Thomas Jestremski, to proceed at once to make up a list of Conservative Galicians eligible for naturalization.

4. The said W. H. Hastings further arranged with me to personally superintend the work of the committee referred to in the preceding paragraph.

5. Prior to the third day of February, 1907, the committee aforesaid and other friends of the Conservative party made up a list of some 450, more or less, Galicians, Polanders, Germans, and other foreigners said to be at that time eligible for naturalization.

6. Prior to the said third day of February, 1907, the signatures of a few of the men on the list of 450 as aforesaid, were obtained by different parties to blank oaths of residence and oaths of allegiance on the forms in common use in connection with the naturalization of aliens, but the greater number on the list aforesaid had, prior to the third day of February, 1907, signed no papers whatever or taken no oaths or affidavit whatever with a view of complying with the requirements of the Naturalization Act.

7. On Sunday the third day of February, A.D. 1907, I, this deponent, and Thomas Snezek, Frank Szablewski, Thomas Jestremski, Billey Cichocki, Vladmir Rudko and Julian Nowacki went, at the request of the said W. H. Hastings, in the Maw block on Market square, in the city of Winnipeg, and set to work about two o'clock in the afternoon to prepare the naturalization papers for the parties on the list of 450, thereabouts, above referred to.

8. I, this deponent, and the other parties referred to in paragraph 7 hereof, continued the work of preparing the said naturalization papers on about 2 o'clock on Sunday the 3rd day of February, 1907, until about 3 o'clock in the morning of the 4th day of February, 1907, having taken a short intermission for supper about 6 o'clock on Sunday evening.

9. I was personally present at the time and place aforesaid and I saw the said Thomas Jestremski sign as commissioner, the various naturalization papers aforesaid and certify that the contents of the said papers were sworn to or affirmed by the respective parties mentioned therein, without any of such parties swearing or affirming or being present on the occasion in question.

10. The parties referred to in paragraph 7 hereof, in my presence wrote on such of the oaths of allegiance and oaths of residence as had not already been signed by the applicants for naturalization, the name of such applicants for naturalization in the absence of such applicants and without any authority whatsoever for the doing.

11. In the case of a number of naturalization papers previously filled in by some parties and signed by the applicant for naturalization, the papers had been improperly filled in and a number of the parties referred to paragraph 7 hereof, in my presence did destroy the papers so signed by applicants for naturalization and made out new ones in lieu thereof and signed the names of the applicants for naturalization to the oaths therein contained, and the said last-mentioned papers were then completed by the said Thomas Jestremski in the same manner as is set out in paragraph 9 hereof.

12. The only commissioner present at the time and place referred to in paragraph 7 hereof, was Thomas Jestremski, and it was necessary in order to complete the naturalization papers for the 450 applicants, more or less, above referred to, for the said Thomas Jestremski to sign his name some twelve or fifteen hundred times, more or less, and the said Thomas Jestremski complained from time to time towards the latter part of the session in question of fatigue and complained that he was too tired of writing to complete all the papers. To overcome this the said Jestremski told others of the parties referred to in paragraph 7 hereof, to sign the names of the said Jestremski to a number of the papers which were being made out as aforesaid, and the same were signed accordingly.

13. I am personally acquainted with Mr. Irving, an employee in the Department of the Attorney General for the province of Manitoba.

14. The naturalization papers for the 450 men, more or less, had, prior to the third day of February, 1907, on several occasions been the subject of conversation between Irving and me, this deponent. On the occasion of the conversations aforesaid between myself and the said Irving the said Irving had particularly impressed upon me the necessity of dating the said naturalization papers back to a date early in January, 1907, giving as his reason therefor, that the said papers were required by law to be on file in the county court of Winnipeg for at least three weeks prior to the fourth day of February, 1907, in order that the certificate of naturalization might on the last-mentioned date be issued to the said parties respectively, but stated that if the papers were regular on the face of them he could get them through in a few days without any notice.

15. On the occasion of my conversation with the said Irving the said Irving repeatedly told me that if the said naturalization papers were dated as aforesaid, he, the said Irving, was able to get the said papers through the county court of Winnipeg on four days notice.

16. Instructions were, to my personal knowledge, given to the effect that the 450 sets of naturalization papers above referred to should be delivered on the morning of Monday, February 4, to Mr. Irving of the Attorney General's Department in order that the said Irving might get the certificates of naturalization for the said parties through the county court of Winnipeg on the said February 4, 1907.

17. I personally counted the sets of naturalization papers so delivered to the said Irving and the same numbered 450, more or less, and

were delivered along with 125, more or less, other sets of naturalization papers to the said Irving as I am informed and verily believe, on the said February 4, 1907.

18. Between February 4, 1907, and the 12th day of the same month the certificates of naturalization for the 450 men, more or less, above referred to, were delivered to me personally by the said Irving at the office of the Conservative club in the Maw block aforesaid, and I am personally aware that a greater number of the said 450 were subsequently registered as electors on the lists of the electors compiled in the various constituencies in the city of Winnipeg.

Sworn before me at the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba, March 21, in the year of our Lord, 1907.

(Signed) R. T. HUGGARD,
A commissioner, &c., &c., in B.R.
(Signed) THEODORE RUDNESKI.

Province of Manitoba, to wit:

L. Joseph Szymanski of 177 Syndicate street of Winnipeg, carpenter, make oath and say as follows:

On the 30th and 31st days of January and the 1st and 2nd days of February, 1907, I was working for Joseph Makarski and T. Jestremski securing the names of parties who were not already naturalized. I was told by these men to simply get their names. I was to bring them to the Conservative club rooms in the Maw block in the city of Winnipeg. I secured 80 names and handed the same over to Theo. Rudneski in the said club rooms. I simply took the names and addresses on a sheet of paper.

Mr. Rudneski then informed me that in a few days he would give me the certificates of naturalization, and on Friday the 8th day of February, 1907, the said certificates of naturalization for the parties whose names I had handed in were handed to me by Mr. Rudneski.

I had these naturalization certificates with me on the days of registration, and after the parties had registered I handed them their certificates of naturalization.

I remember on the 7th day of March, the election day, and on the Sunday prior to the 7th day of March there were delivered to me at my house by Jos. Makarki and Theo. Jestremski three kegs of beer in a sleigh, and when they gave the same to me they told me to give this beer to parties who would vote for Mitchell. On Wednesday, March 6th, the same parties brought two more kegs of beer and told me to treat the parties who were voting for Mitchell.

I leave a clause out of this affidavit referring to the distribution which is not relevant to the case.

Mr. BERGERON. If the hon. gentleman does not read the whole thing, that part which is not ready cannot go upon 'Hansard' without the consent of the House.

Mr. BOLE. Then I will read the rest of it:—

I remember on the 7th day of March, the election day, and on Sunday prior to the 7th day of March there were delivered to me at my house by Jos. Makarski and Theo. Jestremski three kegs of beer in a sleigh, and when they gave the same to me they told me to give this beer to parties who would vote for Mitchell.

An hon. MEMBER. Who was Mitchell?

Mr. BOLE. He was the Conservative candidate in the north constituency in the city of Winnipeg.

Mr. BERGERON. Was he elected?

Mr. BOLE. He was elected by 400 majority.

On Wednesday, March 6, the same parties brought two more kegs of beer and tol me to treat the parties who wrere voting for Mitchell.

Before the election I saw an express rig deliver three kegs of beer at 180 St. Stephen street at the house of Joseph Makarski and and six kegs of beer at Jos. Makarski's house at 113 Lusted street.

At polling division No. 1 during election dav I know a number of people, at least ten voted on other people's names, Joseph Makarski being the party who induced them to do so.

One voted as Peter Bodner, one voted as Pete Meseak, one as William Szewezuk, one as John Osadezuk, and one as Simon Chrzanowski. Joseph Makarski told me on said 7th day of March, if I knew any people who were absent to get others to vote on their names and he would pay them money if necessary.

(Sgd.) JOSEPH SZYMANSKI.

Sworn before me at the citv of Winnipeg, this 30th day of March, in the year of Our Lord, 1907.

A. E. BOWLES,
A commissioner in B.R.

Another affidavit is as follows:

Province of Manitoba,
To wit.

Winnipeg, March 22nd, 1907.

I, William Cichoski, of 892 Pritchard avenue, of the city of Winnipeg, school tercher, make oath and say as follows:

During the months of January and Februarv 1907, I was working most of the time for the Conservative association of the city of Winnipeg, whose headquarters are in the Maw block, in the said city. My work consisted chiefly in procuring the naturalization of aliens ready for registration. I was engaged by Mr. Rudneski and Mr. Jastremski to do this work at the rate of $2 per day and $2.50 latetr on.

I know Mr. W. H. Hastings the Conservative organizer, and often saw him in said Conservative rooms directing affairs. Part of the time I was working I went through the city and had with me blank forms of application for naturalization, consisting of the forms of oath of allegiance and residence. I got sixty applications some of these papers I filled in at the time and had the parties sign them, but they were not then sworn to, others were simply signed by the applicant and were afterwards filled in and completed in the office of the said Conservative party by myself or some other person in said room.

I remember Sunday, February 3, 1907, and that day I went to said Conservative com-

mittee room and handed to Mr. Rudneski all the naturalization papers that I had taken. At that time there were working in said Conservative rooms, Mr. Rudneski, Jastremski, Szablewski, Snezek, Nowacki, Roudka and myself. Mr. Hastings was also present in the morning of said Sunday. We went there to work on the naturalization papers, and worked all day Sunday and until about 3 a.m., Monday morning, February 4. We were all working on these naturalization papers filling some out and signing same. About 450 sets of naturalization papers were completed on said Sunday, many of which were not signed at all by the applicant, but some of us employed signed for them or made their mark.

Mr. Jestremski was the only commissioner present and he signed as commissioner, although none of the parties who were making application were present.

The work was so tiresome for the commissioner, Mr. Jestremski, that he asked Mr. Szablewski to sign his name for him to a large number of them, which he did. When we started work in the forenoon of said Sunday, Mr. W. H. Hastings was present and knew the nature of the work that was being done. At the time these papers were made on the said Sunday, February 3, they were dated back to January 2, 5, 8, 9, 10 and 11, 1907.

Out of all the papers that were there completed on said Sunday not one of the parties thereto did appear before the commissioner and make affidavit to same.

On Friday, the 18th day of February, 1907, I was again in said Conservative committee rooms and there I saw a large number of certificates of naturalization corresponding with the papers that had been made out on February 3. Many of those papers were taken by Mr. Rudneski to the Conservative north end committee and were there handed by Mr. Rudneski to the workers of each polling subdivision to be by them handed to the parties for whom they were intended. Many of these papers had no street or number address and they were retained by Mr. Rudneski.

On February 12, registration day, two parties named David Knaur, 855 Aberdeen street, and Rinepart Knaur, 855 Aberdeen street, applied at registration district No. 16 where I was acting as interpreter for the government and mae application for registration to the clerk, and at said time they said they had only been two years in the country and had no naturalization papers, but would like to get on the list, and the clerk said: 'it is all right.' I will put yiur name down without making a declaration.

(Sgd.) WILLIAM CICHOSKI.

Sworn before me at the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba, in the year of Our Lord, 1907.

R. T. HUGGARD.

Mr. WARD. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bole) allow me a question ?

Mr. BOLE. Yes.

Mr. WARD. Who is the clerk of the court in Winnipeg?

Mr. BOLE. I do not know. I have other affidavits here with respect to the same election, but as they are not pertinent to this case but apply only to cases of corruption I do not think it necessary that I should read them. I have other affidavits sent me from other constituencies which I have not now under my hand and which I have taken no pains to bring, as they do not pertain to the constituency I have the honour to represent. I am ashamed that there are people in that constituency who would lend themselves to this diabolical plot. These affidavits to which I have referred, I understand, will be used by others in this debate.

I regret exceedingly that I have had to inflict upon the House these affidavits, but, when challenged by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) to give instances and state names to prove that there was bad work in connection with the voters' list in the province of Manitoba, I felt it my duty to answer the challenge and submit the evidence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question before he takes his seat. Are not the proceedings that he has been detailing at great length to the House proceedings under the Naturalization Act enacted by this parliament?

Mr. BOLE. You say the Naturalization Act is legislation by this parliament ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. These are proceedings under it.

Mr. BOLE. That doesn't make any difference. The challenge which you issued was this, that there was nothing wrong with the preparation of the list. My answer is that there are 400 men whose names were put on that list fraudulently.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In what way would the Bill now before the House redress that?

Mr. WM. J. ROCHE. Why didn't they protest ?

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman lay upon the table of the House the affidavit he has just read ?

Mr. TALBOT. It will be in the 'Hansard'.

Mr. HAGGART. I think he should lay it on the table, and I ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it is often the case when an hon. member reads a document for him to lay it on the table when requested to do so. I am not at the moment prepared to say whether the rule goes the length of requiring it absolutely to be done by a private member. In the case of a minister who quotes from a public document, the rule requires him to produce it. I am not quite clear at the moment, that it is necessary for a private member to do so and I will have to consider the point.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I entirely agree that it is a point proper to be taken into consideration by yourself. But where documents of this character are read before the House accusing persons not members of this House of crimes for which they might be punished under the law, I think, if there is no precedent for it, it is time that a precedent should be established that an hon. gentleman doing so should lay the document on the Table of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot rule on that point at this moment, I will have to reserve it for consideration. My present view is that in the case of private members quoting documents there is nothing absolutely requiring them to lay the documents on the table. It is frequently done, but I do not think there is any absolute rule. However, I am not prepared offhand to give an authoritative ruling on the question.

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Bole) arose about an hour ago to debate the second reading of this Bill. Although I listened attentively to what he said, I was unable to see wherein his remarks threw any light upon the provisions of the Bill which the Minister of Justice introduced into this House yesterday. The hon. gentleman comes into this House very seldom, and if we are to believe the newspapers he has decided, or those who have been in times gone by his supporters, have decided that he will not be in this House any more. But the hon. gentleman comes into this House, and while complaining of the quotation made by my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) of the statutes bearing directly upon the clauses of this Bill, he has no compunction in taking up the time of the House for the better part of his speech in reading names from a document which he, or somebody else, has kept concealed, and of which he is the proper vehicle for producing in this House. Why, the affidavits the hon. gentleman has read, I venture to say, he does not believe himself. If he did believe them, is he not particeps criminis when he attempts to bring before the House affidavits over a year old containing allegations of crime, and then pretends to say when and under what circumstances that crime was committed ? Surely the hon. gentleman is not trying to perpetrate a joke upon this House, at the same time we cannot believe that he is serious.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has read these affidavits to show, as he says, that 450 names had been fraudulently placed on the voters' lists. It does seem to me an extraordinary circumstance that although the election in which these irregularities were committed took place on the 7th of March, 1907, and they were put in the form of an affidavit on the 8th of March, the election of the hon. member who took his seat was never challenged on that ground. His election was never protested. Challenges were thrown out in the province of Manitoba, the hon. gentleman heard them, that if the irregularities could be proven the seats in question would be allowed to go by acclamation in a new election. The election is more than a year old, and not one word has been said about it in Manitoba. But now that hon. gentleman comes down to Ottawa, 2,000 miles away, and flaunts his scandal, and I submit with all respect to this House that he is a fit vehicle for the slander which he has perpetrated. My hon friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) reminds me that there has been a session of the provincial legislature of Manitoba since these offences were committed. Can the hon. member for Winnipeg refer to one word that was said in that legislature with regard to these irregularities ? I invite him to reply. The hon. gentleman is silent ; then I say his slander is silenced. Not one of his party sitting in that legislature has been brave enough to read these affidavits there. The hon. gentleman is not going to seek re-election to this House, and I do not think that any other hon. gentleman in this House who has heard him speak, is surprised that he is not going to seek re-election. The hon. gentleman knows well that after the speech he has made in this House no respectable elector in any constituency in Canada would elect him. Now I do not intend to do more than comment upon the extraordinary manner in which this measure is being pressed upon this House, and the speech made by the hon. member for Winnipeg is a fitting accompaniment to such a measure as the government is now endeavouring to foist upon the people of Canada. The hon. gentleman's speech was absolutely irrelevant, absolutely slanderous, and containing matter which no reputable man——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman should not allude to the speech of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) as slanderous.

Mr. BOYCE. I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, I say that it contained matter which was absolutely slanderous, and it would be slanderous outside of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BOYCE. It would have been slanderous had it been stated outside of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member's indirect imputation of slander should be withdrawn.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think you misunderstood what my hon. friend said. He did not say that the words of the hon. member for Winnipeg were slanderous, but

that the matters contained in these affidavits were slanderous of the persons against whom they were made.

Mr. SPEAKER. That would be quite appropriate.

Mr. BOYCE. That is a sample of the methods by which this measure is to be supported. Well, Sir, during the last two sessions of parliament, in the speech from the Throne, we had been promised that the government would bring down a measure to provide for the suppression of electoral corruption, and the country, in view of the number of electoral scandals which have been aired in the courts, looked for a measure and looked for it eagerly. But the Canadian people were very much disappointed last year when the government did not see fit to comply with the promise made to the country and to bring down a law then. The reason for that is very patent. Certain matters which will be disclosed in this debate, were being considered and the expediency rather than the probity of the measure was the subject of consideration during that delay. as I understand. A measure is brought down now, and in the first clause it contains extraordinary provisions with respect to the making up of the lists. We were promised an Act to suppress electoral corruption. We have been given an Act the very first clause of which promotes electoral corruption and promotes the fraudulent making of voters' lists in the most outrageous and extensive degree possible by any party. I am not saying that extravagantly because I am speaking from experience of the working of the law under the very provision which is put forward now in the first section of this Bill. I am speaking from experience drawn from the northern constituencies of Ontario where, in the last general election, this provision contained in this measure was applied and as to the fairness of this section I will leave it to the House to judge, when I have stated the facts accompanied by sworn evidence with regard to how that law was applied. It is proposed by the Bill to amend the Dominion Elections Act by providing that:

9a. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein contained, voters' lists for the portions of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec which consist of territory not municipally organized and where there is no regular assessment or valuation roll upon which voters' lists are based and for the several electoral districts in the provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia, shall be prepared immediately after the issue of any writ for an election in any such electoral district or in any electoral district composed or partly composed of such territory, or at any time when the Governor in Council so directs; and for the purpose of preparing and giving effect to such voters' lists the Governor in Council may appoint all necessary officers and confer upon them all necessary powers.

That section is very much the same as the old section 9 of the Franchise Act of Canada which was in force prior to the last general election and which reads as follows:

Where, under the laws of a province, the voters' lists for any provincial electoral district or division or any of them are prepared not at regular intervals, but at such times as are fixed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council or some other provincial or local authority, or only from time to time for the purpose of a general or other election in immediate contemplation, the last preceding voters' lists so prepared shall be used for the purpose of any Dominion election in the territory comprised in such provincial electoral district or division, or the parts thereof for use in which they were prepared, if such lists have been prepared not more than one year before the date of the writ for such Dominion election; otherwise, new voters' lists shall be prepared, and for the purpose of preparing and giving effect to such new voters' lists, the Governor in Council may appoint all necessary officers and confer upon them all necessary powers, and in the preparation and revision and bringing into force of such new voters' lists, the provisions of the laws of the province regulating the preparation and revision and bringing into force of the provincial voters' lists in such cases shall, as far as possible, be observed and followed.

I draw your attention particularly to the last paragraph of the section as it stood as section 9 of the electoral Franchise Act which was in force prior to the last general election.

For the purpose of preparing and giving effect to such voters list, etc.

These words remain in paragraph 2 of section 1 of this proposed Act:

2. In the preparation of such lists the provisions of the laws of the province regulating the preparation and manner of revising and bringing into force the provincial voters' lists in the like cases shall as far as possible be observed and followed and no person whose name is not included in the voters' lists so prepared and revised shall be entitled to vote.

There are two lines apparently having no peculiar significance, but to my mind they have a very great significance—that no person whose name is not included in the voters' lists so prepared and revised shall be entitled to vote. It is to paragraph 2 of section 1 that I particularly desire to refer because that deals with the method that was employed by this government by virtue of an order in council which was passed at the last general election to provide, in the unorganized districts of Ontario, for making up the voters' lists in such a way as to ensure for the government the carrying of six seats in New Ontario, let the opposition do what it might to overcome the difficulty. The provisions of that law would apply up to the present time to six ridings in Ontario and to six ridings only

and to no other constituencies in Canada. It would, I believe, apply to Thunder Bay, Rainy River, West Algoma, East Algoma, Nipissing, Muskoka, and, I think, to some extent, to Parry Sound. Prior to the last general election the representation from these districts was in the ratio of two to one; that is Thunder Bay, Rainy River, West Algoma and East Algoma were all one constituency called Algoma, Muskoka and Parry Sound were one and Nipissing was one. So that, by the redistribution Bill six seats were made out of three and of these three, two were represented by government members and one by an opposition member. As it is now, in consequence of the Redistribution Act and of the very drastic remedy which the government sought to employ in carrying out this proposed legislation, or rather in experimenting with it in the northern part of Ontario, the government representation has been increased to four.

Four out of six of these seats are now held by government members. The provisions introduced for the carrying out of the law, the operation of which is extended to cover the provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia and the unorganized districts of Quebec and Ontario, being exactly the same provisions as were in existence and in force prior to the last general election and which were used in the last general election, we may fairly assume that those provisions will be carried out exactly along the same lines as during the elections of 1904. That no other course than that which was pursued in 1904 is possible is apparent from the very wording of the Act itself, because it gives to the Governor in Council absolutely plenary powers with regard to the carrying out of that law. By orders in council the Governor General in Council at the last moment gives the most extraordinary directions with regard to the making up of these voters' lists, and it is unreasonable to contend that when it was done once with very great success the government will hesitate to do it again and will pass orders in council which will be any more strict than those then passed? I think the experience of the average member with this government is that on an occasion like that they would learn wherein there might be some little weakness in the carrying out of the order in council and strengthen its effect along the lines along which it was intended to operate, rather than attempt to secure the strict and more moral operation of the law. During the summer and fall of 1904 a Liberal government was trying to live in Ontario. It had reached about the end of a very dissipated career and it is to be observed how hand in hand this government went with that government with regard to the carrying into force of the provisions of its law. I say advisedly that this government or somebody in sympathy with this government procured the province of Ontario to pass orders in council on July 14 and July 23 opening and directing that polls be held for elections in places in the unorganized districts of West Algoma, where there was absolutely no right whatever and no justification whatever for holding such polls and that the effect, the unreasonableness, the illegality and the expense under the present Act of instituting polls in those places was made so apparent to the provincial government of Ontario by protests from myself and others that that government retracted part of that order in council and modified it to comply a little more with a resemblance to what would be reasonable.

The order in council of the Ontario government of July 14, 1904, reads:

> Upon the recommendation of the hon. the Attorney General, the committee of council advises that pursuant to the provisions of section 62, chap. 9, R.S.O., 1897, being an Act respecting the election of members of the legislative assembly, polls be opened and held at Searchmont, Wilds and Odigiki, in the unorganized territory in the electoral district of Sault Ste. Marie.

Those are stations along the line of the Algoma Central Railway. I presume that order in council was not supposed to be sufficient by the officers of this government who desire to see this law carried out. On July 23 another order in council was passed:

> Upon the recommendation of the hon. the Attorney General, the committee of council, advises that pursuant to the provisions of section 62, chap. 9, R.S.O., 1897, being an Act respecting the election of members of the legislative assembly, that polls be opened and held in the following townships and berths in the unorganized territory in the electoral district of Sault Ste. Marie:—Aweres, Gillmour, Hodgins, Anderson, Curtis, Deroche, Jarvis, Whitman, Hamilton.

Those are townships with names, and names only, unless it be timber and rock.

Berth	10	Range	23
"	11	"	25
"	12	"	24
"	12	"	24
"	11	"	25

That order in council provided for the opening of 14 new polls in the unorganized territory supposed to be in the Algoma district of Sault Ste. Marie, under the provisions of an Ontario statute, citing the section, and when you turn to that section you find that it is not applicable to the district of Algoma at all, but applies solely and exclusively to the district of Nipissing.

However, when it was pointed out to the Ontario government that they were committing a most extraordinary act in passing these orders in council, that in many of these townships there was not one settler, not a road a mile long, and that all the

land was held by the Crown subject to a timber license, with no other settlement in it than persons who were temporarily employed in transient timber operations and no buildings of any description except the shack of the lumbermen, in response to vigorous representations, the following order in council was passed on August 17, 1904:

Upon the recommendation of the hon. the Attorney General, the committee of council advises that the order in council of July 14, 1904, directing polls to be opened and held at Searchmont, Wilds and Odigiki, in the unorganized territory in the electoral district of Sault Ste. Marie, be amended by striking out the name 'Odigiki.'

The committee further advise that the order in council of 23rd July 1904, be amended by striking out the names 'Aseres,' 'Whitman,' 'Hodgins,' 'Deroche,' 'Hamilton,' 'berth 10, range 23,' 'berth 11, range 25,' 'berth 12, range 24,' 'berth 12, range 24,' and 'berth 11, range 25.'

And the committee further advise that polls be opened and held at 'Heyden station,' 'Wabos station,' and 'Mashkode station,' in the unorganized territory in the said electoral district of Sault Ste. Marie.

Thus two months after the passing of these orders in council by the government of Ontario at the solicitation of gentlemen in conference with this government, the Ontario government were compelled on the representations of an enraged electorate to retract the order in council and abolish the polls they had then provided for. That was the first step this government endeavoured to take in carrying out this law, which was then applicable only to the constituencies in Northern Ontario, but which is now sought to be made applicable to such an extended area of territory.

The next step was that this government, on the 25th of August, 1904, just seven days after the last order in council of the Ontario government cancelling these polling places, passed an order in council providing for the making up of voters' lists in the districts of Thunder Bay, Rainy River, West Algoma, East Algoma, Nipissing, Muskoka and Parry Sound. I will not weary the House by reading this very lengthy order in council, but I will just state the effect of it. The effect of it is that under the provisions of section 9 of the Franchise Act, and pursuant to the powers contained in the latter part of that section, which powers are exactly reproduced in subsection 2 of section 1 of this Bill, an order in council was passed appointing officers to make voters' lists, and providing that the lists to be prepared under this section should be completed not later than the 10th day of September following the order in council, the order in council being passed in Ottawa on the 25th day of August, 1904. The section under which this order in council was passed, and which is incorporated in this Bill, provides that in the making up and preparation of these lists, and in the giving effect to the lists to be made up, the provisions of the law of the province shall be observed as far as possible, that is, as far as the officers to be appointed by the government could comply with that law, having regard to the rights of the people. In short, the effect of that, as interpreted by the court, was that all that this government had power to do, in the absence of voters' lists made under the provincial law, was to appoint officers to carry out the machinery of the provincial law, but not to make any law for themselves by order in council. Under the provisions of the Ontario law applicable to the unorganized districts of the province, before the list is made up the sheriff must go round and post up his proclamation that he intends to be at such and such a place, at such and such a building, at such a day and such an hour, for the purpose of taking the names of persons entitled to be placed on the voters' list. Then, having made up that list on that day—and he is to be there from ten to four—he prints his list and posts it; and from the date of posting, and the date of mailing to persons entitled to receive copies in that way, under the Ontario Voters' List Act, a right of appeal to the district judge exists, and thirty days is allowed for the examination of the lists, and for the putting in of notices of appeal. As my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) pointed out, that allowed a period of sixty days, and then the judge appoints a court, which will probably take fifteen days longer. It will therefore be seen that the laws of the province provide that thirty days shall be allowed for the making up of the list. What does the order in council say? The order in council of this government, passed on the 25th of August, so far from following the provincial law as far as possible, immediately sets it aside by saying that 'the minister recommends that a sufficient number of enumerators be appointed to enable the work of enumerating the voters to be completed not later than the 10th day of Sepember next.' So that it dispensed altogether with the idea of a proclamation. Was that a reasonable step to take, when the government bear in mind the fact that they were proposing to make up voters' lists where there never had been a poll opened since the world was created? In practically unknown territory, they set at naught the provisions of the Ontario law, which required thirty days notice to be given to everybody, and said: No, you must have these lists made up so that they will be completed within ten or twelve days after the date we have given out. There is the initial step by which this provident and generous government proceeds to carry out the provincial law with regard to making up voters' lists. I am talking to the Bill now under consideration, which, by the very wording of subsection

2, it is proposed to repeat with regard to the province of Manitoba and the province of British Columbia and all the unorganized portions of Quebec and Ontario ; and I say that if the government were able to do that in the last election, what will they be able to do in the next election ? If they do these things in the green tree, what will they do in the dry ? What was the next step in chronological order? On August 25 they did not even send word by letter to anybody up there ; but the Secretary of State again, in what I consider to be a most undignified and frenzied manner, telegraphed all over the country to get somebody to make up these lists. He telegraphed to the sheriff to find out what lists were to be made up, and on the same day he got a telegram from the sheriff, advising him what lists were to be made up under the Ontario law. On the 25th of August, the very day the order in council was passed, the Secretary of State, on the nomination of the government candidate who opposed me at the last election, sent this telegram :

Jacob Stevenson, Sault Ste Marie, Ontario. You have been appointed to prepare lists for unorganized parts of West Algoma, with power to appoint sufficient number of enumerators to enable the work of enumerating voters to be completed not later than the 10th September.

Here is another frenzied effort on the 26th of August :

Jacob Stevenson, Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario. So soon as a list for unorganized township or polling place is completed, have it printed and notice posted that appeals will be heard six days from date of posting.

I have said that under the Ontario law the good people in these scattered and sparsely-settled districts were allowed thirty days to inspect the list after it had once been printed, and thirty days' notice of it had to be given before it was made up. After it was made up, they had thirty days to inspect it and to appeal from it; and this government would be bound by the legislation in force to observe that provincial law as far as possible. How far did they observe it ? They were opening polls with the assistance of the provincial government at that time. They had nine polls established where polls had never been established before ; those polls were established at distant lumber townships in the fall of the year when travel was difficult and roads were well-nigh impassable. They were providing that the Ontario law first with regard to proclamation, as an initiatory step, should be set aside in toto and with regard to appeal the delay should be reduced from thirty to six days—the six days to be dated from the date of the posting of that notice in some distant lumber camp, probably twenty miles from a railway, over an impassable road, so that you would require some transmission of the news by brain wave to ascertain the date it was posted.

On the 3rd September there was another telegram from the Secretary of State to the sheriff :

Please afford all facilities to enumerators appointed by federal authorities to obtain copies of lists in unorganized districts that you have completed. Government here will pay cost of printing promptly. If printing cannot be done promptly there send lists to Ottawa and I will have them done here.

R. W. SCOTT.

Then comes the most extraordinary part. This order in council was passed August 25, 1904, and on the 3rd of September there is a telegram to the Hon. R. W. Scott from Sault Ste. Marie :

Have all lists about ready for printer. Answer who appeal is to be made to so as to put it in notice. I have been asked for copy or order in council by interested parties.

JACOB STEVENSON.

No provision of the law that the provincial law be observed as far as possible the same as it is proposed by subsection 2 of this Bill. The provincial law requires thirty days proclamation before the making up of the lists. The polls were opened, lists proposed to be made in scattered districts where voters' lists had never been made before, order in council passed the 25th August providing that these lists be made up, telegram 3rd September, 1904, from the enumerator that all the lists are ready. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can testify that they were ready. They were good and ready. They had nine lists duly sworn to before a gentleman, who has since been promoted to the position of Indian agent and who was the returning officer at one of the polls at Michipicoten at which all the voters on the celebrated 'Minnie M.' voted. All sworn to and some sworn to as early as the 2nd September.

Here is an example of an affidavit sworn to before this gentleman, William L. Nicolls, who since then has been promoted for his good work to the position of Indian agent there. He makes affidavit that he has set down, according to the best of his information and judgment—judgment is a good word—the name of every person entitled to be entered thereon and has not intentionally omitted the name of any person he knew or had good reason to believe was not entitled to be entered thereon. And further he swears that to the best of his knowledge and belief he discharged the duty allotted to him under the said Act.

Another provision of the provincial law requires that appeals should be made to a district judge. The senior district judge—who until the last general election was in the habit of hearing all appeals and was always thought competent to do so even by the Liberal government of Ontario, who has always, since his elevation to the bench,

seventeen years ago, been revising the lists and who is a most capable man to discharge his duties seriously—was, for some reason or another, set aside and a change made with regard to Algoma. The senior district judge was not thought acceptable to this government for some reason or another. Judge Johnson was ready and willing to sit. There was nothing to prevent him sitting. There was nothing to disqualify him from performing those judicial functions which properly belong to his office, but he was not allowed to hear those appeals. Before I go further I would like to refer to the very extraordinary document which was sent to the enumerator appointed by this government. It emanated from the Department of the Secretary of State. It is headed 'Suggestion only'—Dominion revision of voters' lists in unorganized territory.' It first proceeds to recite the Act under which the lists are to be made up. Then it gives a number of suggestions which I shall read :

1. Polling divisions and polling places (stations).
2. Enumerator for each and probable or new polling place for fifty probable voters and not more than fifty.
3. Appointed direct by order in council on the recommendation of the candidate, care to be exercised in giving name in full, post office address and other necessary description.

Did I hear a quotation made last night in this House from so estimable an authority as the late Hon. David Mills, Minister of Justice, in which he said : Give me the appointment of the officers for making up the lists, and I will tell you how the election will go. But in this case it is the government candidate himself who appoints the officers to make up these lists, and the government is a mere machine in the hands of its candidate. This is the suggestion from the Secretary of State's Department.

12. Appeals to be heard by the district judge or stipendiary magistrate, corrected and certified to within ten days and sent through the clerk of the peace immediately to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, Ottawa.
16. The chief enumerator to perform the duties of clerks of organized municipalities as to get lists before the judge or revising official and also sent after corrections with clerks of the peace.

The Secretary of State's Department was somewhat mixed up between the clerk of the peace and the government candidate, because both parties happened to be the one and the same person. So that the lists which had to be filed with the clerk of the peace as an official of this government, were filed with the government candidate, and some delay occurred because when the Secretary of State telegraphed to the government candidate, in his capacity as clerk of the peace, he found that the clerk of the peace was out of his office canvassing the district in the interest of the government. There is another instance of the kind of machinery we may expect to be employed by this government in the carrying out of this splendid election Bill. Note the appointment of appeal judges : Nipissing. Judge Valin, Judge Leask and John Loughrin; East Algoma, Judge McCallum, Judge O'Connor; West Algoma, Judge Johnson ; Rainy River and Thunder Bay, Judge Chappell and Judge Fitzgerald ; Parry Sound, Judge McCurry, Donald Roderick McLean, barrister, Burk's Falls; Muskoka, Judge Mahaffy. Well, Judge Johnston did not hear these appeals, because there comes a telegram from the Secretary of State, addressed to the chief enumerator, as follows :

Ottawa, September 5, 1904.

Jacob Stevenson, Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario.

See Judge O'Connor and Magistrate Quibell and on consultation with them fix places for hearing appeals.

Who is Magistrate Quibell? He is a gentleman who was prominently connected with politics both for this government and the provincial government, and who, for very extraordinary services rendered to the provincial government, was appointed stipendiary magistrate at Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. FOWLER. By the Ross government?

Mr. BOYCE. Yes. And he held office until the Ross government met its defeat on January 25, 1905, when, very much to his disappointment, he was immediately relieved of the duties of the office to which he had been appointed. But after he had performed the duties of appeal judge in conjunction with Judge O'Connor he was immediately made returning officer for the election. That is to say, after having acted in the revision of the lists he was made returning officer to carry out the election on that list. What a medley ! And what a contrast with the professions of these hon. gentlemen when in opposition, when they were in a high moral frame of mind and talked about the sacred rights of the franchise and of how iniquitous it would be for the government to interfere in any way with the making of the lists ! They declared that they would not make up the lists themselves—but now they decide that their candidates should name the men who were to make them up and they would appoint these men. Then they take the official by whom the lists are to be handled to be the government candidate. But even that is not all. They remove a judge from his seat in order that they may put a hireling of the provincial government in his place, a man signally useful to that government and promoted for party services, and they appoint that man in place of the judge who has held office and revised the lists for fifteen years. And after that substitute had revised these lists, after he had

ruled, as he did, that the provisions of the Ontario Voters' Lists Act should not apply he was made returning officer at the election, to carry out the will of the people with regard to these voters' lists. I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he conscientiously, as a man—not as Prime Minister, but as a man—endorses acts of this kind?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why was the judge passed over?

Mr. BOYCE. The right hon. Prime Minister may be able to tell. I am informed on very good authority that Judge Johnson was not a favourite with the Liberal candidate, who was clerk of the peace, and with whom he had differed on occasion as to the way in which the administration of the law was carried on in the district of Algoma. And that was the reason why, at the nomination of the candidate, the judge should be deposed from these official functions of his office of revising the voters' lists. It is possible that these things are authorized and carried out by the same hon. gentlemen who declaimed against making lists by Dominion authority, who decried the principle of appointing judges as revising barristers to make up lists under the Franchise Act? Is it possible that this is the party, and that the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is the leader of the party, that at one time declared that it was contrary to good principles that the Dominion government should interfere in the making up of lists?

Well, let me proceed with this history. The lists were made up. Nobody saw these lists until they were made up and sworn to. The provincial law provides that there should be a King's proclamation thirty days before the man starts to make them up, informing every man of the locality where the sheriff's officer is to be between certain hours, so that the voter may see to it that he has the right to vote, that his neighbour has the right to vote and that any trespasser or unqualified person is deprived of that right. Nobody saw the lists until they were printed. I, as a candidate, knew nothing whatever about them until I was confronted with nine lists aggregating 543 names all sworn to. That is the way the voters' lists were made up—all solemnly sworn to by men whose connection with the provincial election of 1903—made memorable by the 'Minnie M.' expedition—was altogether too clear to be questioned. And there was just six days' notice of appeal, dating from the time when the lists were posted up in some distant lumber camp, and this in the fall of the year when the roads were well-nigh impassable. A vigorous attempt was made in West Algoma to meet this outrage, and I am quite sure that the right hon. Prime Minister, in the inner chamber of his heart, concedes that it was an outrage. I do not know of any hon. gentleman who would have declaimed more loudly or more vigorously or more eloquently against it than he would have done if he had happened to be an opposition candidate for this House in that riding under such circumstances. But this matter was brought to the right hon. gentleman's attention two years ago, and still he sits there and says nothing. With all due deference, and with all the respect which I have for him as Prime Minister and as leader of this House, when such facts are called to his attention and he not only does not denounce the wrong, but gives his vigorous support to a clause in this Bill which will perpetuate the outrage, I can only say that I am astonished at the right hon. gentleman. And what about appeal? Surely it was only fair to allow the time for appeal which was allowed under the Ontario law—thirty days. It was little enough, as I can testify, for I have lived in that country for twenty-three years.

Little enough, and it has always been found that the time was short enough. But six days were allowed by this autocratic and tyrannical government within which people could appeal against 543 names, and the six days were to be reckoned from the time these lists were posted in that distant lumber camp. Well, we endeavoured to meet the situation as well as we could, and we met it in two ways. We appealed every one of the 543 names, and sent an army of men to the woods to try to find them. In the second place, we took prohibition proceedings against the officers of the government, the Secretary of State, the Minister of Justice, and the enumerators appointed by them, to test the validity of the proceedings which they were taking. I will not weary the House by telling how these men went through the woods to try to find the so-called electors, and found that many of them had gone long ago, and were not in existence in the district at the time they were put on the list and sworn to. I myself attended the hearing of every one of these appeals. I say there was not one, not ten, but a score of instances where it was shown that the enumerators had taken the names of men and put them on the list and swore to them, when these men, to their knowledge, had only been resident in the province of Ontario two days, in the lumber camp. There was at least one instance out of the 543 of a man who obeyed the subpœna. He was a Frenchman from France. I had taken the precaution of subpœnaing the enumerator and paying his expenses, to confront him with the man whom he had sworn was entitled to be on the list. In this instance this man said that the enumerator had come to him and said he was going to put his name on the list. The Frenchman said, I have no vote. Why? Because I have just come out from France,

I am not a citizen of this country. And the enumerator, Mr. Speaker, used a word that rhymes with lamb. He said it didn't matter a damn whether he was a citizen of Canada or not. And that man's name went on the list, was sworn to by the enumerator and he became a duly constituted voter. The people had only six days to appeal against his name, and had they had not appealed he would have been entitled to vote, according to the rulings of this government. Then prohibition proceedings were taken. I may say in passing that the Minister of Justice was ably defended, and the Secretary of State was ably defended; they were defended by separate counsel, and each counsel was a partner of the Minister of Justice. The firm of Aylesworth & Co. defended the Minister of Justice, and my hon. friend the Minister of Justice knows full well that one of his partners appeared for the Secretary of State, and all the bills were paid by this government.

Now I will refer to the result of that appeal. The appeals were directed against 543 names, and instead of having the senior judge of the district to perform his usual functions with regard to those appeals, we had a board of two. You see the sinister motive of that. Instead of having one judge whose duty had been for years to revise these lists, who knew the law, who knew what the qualifications were, who knew all the tricks of getting men on the list and making an improper list, who was the one man who was competent to sit on these lists, this government deposed him and got two. And why two? So that in case of a disagreement the names should stand on the list. That is the law. If Judge O'Connor differed with the police magistrate with regard to the right of John Jones to be on the list, and the judge said he had no right to be there, and the magistrate said he had a right to be there, he is there, and his name remains on the list. The appeal is against his being on the list, and if the judges disagree the appeal is dismissed and the name remains. Well, Sir, 543 names were appealed against, and I will just read the result. It was proven beyond peradventure that the names of those who were struck off were absolutely without qualification. Some of them had never been known or heard of. Take the list for the township of Jarvis. Ninety names were on the list as originally made up and sworn to, and seventeen were allowed by the judges on appeal—seventeen names out of ninety. Look at this list, Mr. Speaker. Talk about your Thin Red Line, and look at this. There is an instance of the working of subsection 2 of this Bill introduced by the Minister of Justice, and which is going to work such wonders with regard to electoral reform. It will work wonders for the government in electoral reform. I now refer to the list for Breckenridge, a well known camp in the township of Anderson. The list was made up by one James E. McClury. He was engaged with the Lake Superior Company, and was a very influential gentleman in the cruise of the famous 'Minnie M.' He swore to the list of thirty-four, and by the time this appeal board got through with it there were seven names left, and of those seven I doubt whether five of them were entitled to remain. Seven names remained out of thirty-four sworn to, and only six days allowed for appeal. Another instance of the way in which this Bill will be carried out when it is foisted upon the good people of British Columbia, Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec. In the township of Mashkode, ninety names were on the list and only twenty-six remained. In the township of Gillmour thirty-seven were sworn to and eighteen allowed. Only thirteen voted. In the township of Curtis sixty-three were on the list and sworn to and twenty-six were allowed. At Wabose station ninety names were on the list and thirty-eight allowed. At Heyden station twenty-three were on the list and fifteen allowed. At Wilds twenty-five were on the list and nineteen allowed. At Searchmont ninety were on the list and forty-five allowed, the net result of the appeal being that out of a total of 543 names on the list made up and sworn to as being the list 332 were struck off and 211 remained, that they were allowed by a board on which sat one gentleman who certainly was not in a judicial frame of mind at the time these appeals were taken.

Mr. CONMEE. Before what judge or board and at what date were the lists revised to which the hon gentleman is referring? Would the hon gentleman kindly state who composed the board to which he has been referring?

Mr. BOYCE. I thought I had been very plain and had taken up a great deal of time in setting out what these were. My hon friend understood the manner in which the lists were made up. He nominated some of the enumerators in his riding, and I can tell you there were some beautiful lists made up in that constituency. The hon. gentleman knows better than any member in this House the splendid efficacy of those lists in electing supporters of this government.

Mr. CONMEE. That is not answering my question. I want to know what was the date of the lists and who revised them. Was it Judge Johnson, or who else constituted the board?

Mr. BOYCE. I did not catch the latter part of the hon. gentleman's question.

Mr. CONMEE. I wish to know the date of the lists and who constituted the list of revisers? Was the revision before Judge Johnson or before whom?

Mr. BOYCE. No, it was not before Judge Johnson. Judge Johnson is the officer who ought to have revised these lists my hon. friend knows, but, on the recommendation, nay, upon the appeal of the government candidate, who was the clerk of the peace of the district, who did not like Judge Johnson and who had reason not to like him, Judge Johnson was debarred from performing the duties of his office. Does that satisfy my hon. friend ? I will tell my hon. friend who was appointed in his stead—a gentleman whom he knows very well, an officer of the Ross government, Mr. W. A. Quibell who was the returning officer in this district. My hon. friend wants the date of these lists and I will give it to him ; they are dated all the way from the 2nd to the 9th September, 1904, and they were appealed during the month of September.

As a sample of the political complexion of the remainder of the voters of these polls we find that the vote stood as follows :

	Government.	Opposition.
Mashkode..	11	7
Wabose..	23	9
Searchmont	30	2
Jarvis..	11	2
Heyden..	8	4
Wild..	13	3
Anderson..	5	3
Gillmour..	9	4
Curtis..	18	2
	128	36

There were 164 votes polled at these polls out of 211 left on the list and that left the unfortunate present member in a minority of 92. What would have been the result if the 543 names originally on the list, prima facie valid, sworn to and put in the hands of the clerk of the peace, had been allowed, and supposing that the strenuous efforts of the government to prevent an appeal had been successful and that the Conservative party in West Algoma had not used the vigilance that they did in order to overcome them. Again, I ask the right hon. First Minister whether he thinks that is fair play, whether that is the fair play that he contended for in opposition in this House, whether he considers that it is the fair play that should be meted out to this country in making up the voters' lists, or whether it is the fair play upon which, he as Prime Minister of this grand Dominion of Canada, can appeal to the people at the next general election. Will he have the heart or the courage to go before the people and attempt to defend an Act containing a provision, an experiment with which in my district and in five other districts in northern Ontario has demonstrated to his own satisfaction the enormity and iniquity of it in every one of its provisions ?

Now, let me say a word to the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth). He talks about the Thin Red Line in Manitoba. He said that the time for the making up of the lists in Manitoba and the time for appealing and for the completion of them was too short. Will he attempt to defend the iniquities I have spoken about in Algoma ? Manitoba is a well settled country ; there are railways, roads, settlements, buildings and it is a fairly well settled country. Will he attempt to defend the provisions of this order in council and the carrying out of this provision under which no time was allowed for the making up of the lists and but six days was allowed for appeal ? The hon. gentleman pays no attention and he has paid very little attention throughout this debate. This is the worst spectacle that this House has ever been called upon to witness. The Minister of Justice, after bringing into this House a Bill which revolutionizes the franchise of the people of Canada and imposes upon them iniquities so enormous as those which I have spoken of, iniquities that deprive the majority of the right of electing the candidate of their choice, and after delivering himself of an oration which would put Demosthenes in the shade, sits down and remains quiet, or leaves the House. But, when the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) comes into this House and reads a scandal more than a year old which no man in Manitoba dared to read before the Manitoba government, the hon. gentleman pricks up his ears and listens with the most rapt attention. The right hon. First Minister ought to give a hint to his Minister of Justice to show more respect for and more decency in this House than he is doing at the present time. If he expects to get this Bill through he will have to give more consideration to it himself and pay more attention to the criticism of the opposition than he has done. The trouble with the hon. gentleman is that he treats the opposition with contempt which he would like to regard as being supreme, but which is something very much the reverse. The hon. gentleman, in the course of a somewhat extraordinary speech, said that the ground of complaint against the present system of making up the voters' lists in Manitoba was that it had proved to be an engine of tyranny.

What does the right hon. the Prime Minister think about the engine of tyranny contained in and represented by the order in council passed upon his direction and instruction on August 25, 1904? Where is the engine of tyranny? Will the right hon. gentleman say that was not an engine of tyranny? I trow not. There is no man in this House more sensible of the fact that these proceedings were wholly illegal, wholly outrageous and in violation of every right principle of bestowing the right of franchise than the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). But the Minister of Justice gives us no answer. He referred to the fact that one salient provision of this

Bill was that responsible officers of the Crown would make up these lists, men who would be answerable to the Crown for their appointment and who would faithfully discharge their duties. I suppose the hon. gentleman believed what he said or meant what he said, but if he will consult 'Hansard' to-morrow, and see the indisputable facts I have advanced, he will realize how abundantly the falsity of the presumption has been established by the experience that has been demonstrated when this experiment was tried, for that it was an experiment in 1904 I make no doubt whatever. In 1904, we heard something about a Siftonian Bill. But there were hon. gentlemen sitting on that side of the House then, one as Minister of Justice, who would not tolerate the iniquities of such a Bill. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) knows what I mean, he knows what was proposed in 1904, and he knows better than any one else what was the fate of that Bill and the reason for that fate. What was the result? After the election the then Minister of Justice stepped out of public life, and went to a seat on the Supreme Court bench, which he has since adorned with his signal abilities. In his place a gentleman is appointed more pliable, more complacent and more easily convinced of the necessity of regarding the political exigencies rather than the great good of the people of this country. Therefore when the Sifton attempt failed and was blocked, when it was still-born, an experiment was made. The Franchise Act was patched up. A patch was put on section 9, apparently harmless; it went through the House. But the order in council of August 25, 1904, was the experiment made to try how this thing would work in the territories where it was intended to operate. Experiment was made in only six constituencies, but it got four out of the six for the government and now, at the closing session of this parliament. the right hon. gentleman allows his Minister of Justice to bring down a measure which makes that applicable to all seats in British Columbia and in Manitoba, and in the unorganized portions of Quebec, besides the six to which he had already applied it in 1904. Does the right hon. gentleman think that is fair? Can he pledge himself to this House and this country that there will be any better carrying out of the procedure in making up lists in British Columbia, Manitoba and northern Quebec, than there was in northern Ontario? I fancy that experience is a great teacher and that no matter what my right hon. friend said and promised with regard to what would be done in the future to avoid the abuses and enormities that have taken place, the people of Canada will take it with a grain of salt, knowing the many promises he has made along this and other lines which have been broken. One of the remedies taken was for an action of prohibition to the Minister of Justice of Canada and to the chief enumerator and others who were engaged in the work. Notice of motion for the prohibition was dated September 12, 1904. The lists had been sworn to about September 3, and that was the first we heard of them. The notice was for :

An order that Jacob Stevenson be prohibited from taking any further proceedings in the preparation of voters' lists for the unorganized territory in the electoral district of Sault Ste. Marie, in the West Riding of Algoma, and His Honor Edward O'Connor, junior judge for the district of Algoma, and William A. Quibell, police magistrate for the district of Algoma, be prohibited from holding courts for the purpose of revising lists prepared by the said Jacob Stevenson, and from certifying to and confirming such lists or from otherwise acting in connection with the preparation or pretended preparation of lists for said unorganized territory, and that the said Jacob Stevenson and the said Edward O'Connor, junior judge of the district of Algoma, and William A. Quibell, be prohibited from proceeding with the preparation, revision and bringing into force of such voters' lists, otherwise than under the provisions of the laws of the province of Ontario regulating the preparation, revision, and bringing into force of the provincial voters' list in such cases, and for such further and other relief or order as to this honourable court may seem proper.

Upon that motion we had the pleasure of an examination of the enumerator, Mr. Stevenson. Mr. Stevenson is a gentleman who is entitled, so far as I know, to the respect of every one, and is not responsible, otherwise than as chief enumerator, for what took place; but therein lies the iniquity of the whole thing, that the chief enumerator could not himself supervise the making up of those lists, and that the order in council did not compel him to be responsible for that work. That was done by six hirelings, six ward politicians, six ward heelers, all belonging to the political party of the government, and their work was done when they brought their lists into town and swore to them. What could the enumerator do? He could not be on the ground, he was not required to be, the whole thing was left to a pack of party heelers. He was examined for discovery as follows :

Q. Mr. Stevenson, you purported to prepare voters' lists for use in the West Riding of the district of Algoma, as the same is constituted for Dominion purposes?—A. Yes.

Q. Under what authority did you pretend to act in the preparation of those lists?—A. The authority from R. W. Scott, Secretary of State.

Q. Produce the authority?—A. The telegrams are on file.

Absolutely nothing but the telegram was the authority for making up these lists.

4. Q. The original authority that you received were marked as exhibits to your affidavit?—A. Yes.

5. Q. And they consist of three telegrams?—A. Yes.

6. Q. Signed by R. W. Scott?—A. Yes.

7. Q. Did you get any other authority other than what was contained in these telegrams?—A. No.

8. Q. Did you get any other instructions to guide you in the preparation of these list?—A. I got some suggestions after the work started. I did not use them.

9. Q. Where did you get these suggestions?—A. They were handed to me by Mr. J. J. Kehoe.

10. Q. Mr. Kehoe is the crown attorney and clerk of the Peace for the district?—A. Yes.

11. Q. He is also the Liberal candidate for the approaching elections for the Dominion House?—A. It is said he is.

12. Q. You know that Mr. Kehoe has received the Liberal nomination for this riding?—A. Yes.

20. Q. Did you receive any letter enclosing these instructions?—A. It was handed to me by Mr. Kehoe.

21. Q. What instructions did you get when it was handed to you by Mr. Kehoe?—A. None.

22. Q. Anything said about why they were handed to you?—A. Said they might be useful to me, that is all.

32. Q. When did you learn that the appeals would not be before Judge Johnston as mentioned in exhibit 1 but before Judge O'Connor and W. A. Quibell?—A. When I got the last telegram. I wired for that purpose to find out for myself.

33. Q. On what date did you wire?—A. I wired on Saturday night and I got the answer on Monday.

34. Have you a copy of that message?—A. No.

35. Q. Do I understand you to say that it was until September 5 that you knew who would hear the appeals?—A. No, I didn't know except what I saw in that document.

36. Had you any reason to believe that exhibit was incorrect?

This is the document I read, with Judge Johnston's name as the appeal judge.

A. There was something said by Kehoe—I would not be sure what it was—something about Hamilton and some one else hearing the appeals. He said you had better wire and find out. That was the day I wired.

The man was handed a list with Judge Johnston's name, the senior judge of the district, the man who had heard appeals ever since he was judge, for seventeen years, and this man, the clerk of the peace and the government candidate, said: 'You had better wire to the Secretary of State and find out,' and he wired to the Secretary of State, who knew what the government candidate wanted, and he got a reply back on the same day saying that it was not Judge Johnston at all, but a Ross government official. Does the hon. gentleman think that was fair? Does he justify that or would he attempt to justify it?

43. Q. Now you simply adopted the lists prepared by the sheriff under the Ontario Act for all polls for which lists have been prepared?—A. Part of the lists I had prepared myself and knew they were correct. I spoke to Norris and the sheriff about the others.

44. Q. So you simply mean you inquired of the men that did the work—they had already sworn they were correct?—A. Yes.

45. Q. You took no means to satisfy yourself whether these lists were correct on the date you certified to them—whether some of the men had not left the place?—A. No.

46. Q. The polls that you prepared lists for personally were what?—A. Maskode, Waboose, Searchmont, Curtis, Wilde, Jarvis, Hayden, Anderson and Gilmore.

47. Q. No lists had ever before been prepared for these places?—A. Not as separate polls. Some names had been taken and put on the Boulais bay list in 1901—some of those around Searchmont on the Algoma Central Railway.

50. Q. With that exception no lists had ever been prepared for any of these nine polls before?—A. Not to my knowledge.

54. Where is the township of Gilmore?—A. Up the Echo river—about ten or fifteen miles from Alex. Findlay's, that is about seventeen miles from here to Findlay's and about fifteen miles from there as near as I know.

55. Q. From Findlay's up there would be a lumber road?—A. Part of the way. About six miles up there is a settlement. From there it is a lumber road.

56. Q. Do you know any of the people in the township?—A. No.

57. Q. You have never been there?—A. No.

58. Q. Are you personally acquainted with any of the voters?—A. There are three or four men whose names I know.

59. Q. What are they doing—the three or four that you know?—A. I can't tell you.

60. Q. Do you know what they went up there to do?—A. I know they were up there last winter for McFadden & Malloy.

61. Q. And on the whole list there are only some three or four men whose names you recognize?—A. That is all.

62. Q. And all the men in that list are working in McFadden & Malloy's camp?—A. Yes, supposed to be.

63. Q. And there is not a single farmer or settler or anything other than a lumberman whose name is on that list?—A. I understand not. If there is I do not know of them—do not show on the list?

64. Q. And there are none so far as you know?—A. So far as I know.

65. Q. Take the township of Anderson—for what territory was that list prepared?—A. For the township of Anderson.

66. Q. And in that list there is not a single farmer or settler put down?—A. Not so far as I know.

67. Q. And there are none such there that you know of?—A. There is no one there except men working in the lumber camps.

68. Q. Do you know these men?—A. In all these lists there are odd names that I know.

69. Q. Where is this township?—A. Back of Garden river. I am told sixteen or seventeen miles, but I can't say, I have never been there myself.

70. Q. Nothing but a wood road from Garden river?—A. That is all.

71. Q. And Garden river is twelve miles from Sault Ste. Marie?—A. Twelve miles by the road and nine miles by the railroad.

72. Q. No public buildings of any kind in

that township?—A. Can't say myself—never was there.

73. Q. If the election was held to-morrow the only places where the polls could be held would be in the lumber camps?—A. So far as I know.

74. Q. Where is the county of Curtis?—A. North of Searchmont.

75. Q. How far from Sault Ste. Marie?—A. I don't know the distance from here to Searchmont—it is ten or twelve miles from Searchmont.

77. Q. In reaching the township of Curtis you go from here to Searchmont on the Algoma Central railway and then ten or twelve miles by road?—A. I believe that is the way—don't know myself.

78. Q. Do you know how many camps there are there?—A. I know of two but there may be three.

79. Q. Do you know how far these camps are apart?—A. I was told five to six miles.

80. There are just two trains per week on the Algoma Central railway?—A. So I understand.

81. Q. Whose camps are these in the township of Curtis?—A. Miller & McCool.

The member for Nipissing was in this thing.

82. Q. On the Curtis list there is not a single farmer or settler?—A. Not to my knowledge.

83. Q. There are no buildings so far as you know except camps?—A. That is what I was told.

114. Q. Take the list for Haydon station, township of Aweres—what territory is in that list?—A. Takes in township of Aweres.

114. Q. Where is that situated?—A. Up north a little piece.

115. Q. And under what authority did you prepare lists for the township of Aweres?—A. Well, the polling place is supposed to be held at Haydon station.

116. Q. You knew that a polling place had been established by order in council for the township of Aweres and was afterwards stricken out?—A. I did not know it was stricken out.

117. Q. Did you never see an order in council dated 17th August amending the previous order in council?

(Mr. Hearst shows witness a copy of the order.)

A. That is the first time I ever saw that.

That gentleman went to work and made up a polling list for a polling place which had been stricken out by order in council.

123. Q. Did you know that berth 10, range 3, had been cut out?—A No.

124. Q. Did you know berth 11, range 25, was cut out?—A. No.

125. Q. Berth 12, range 24?—A. No, did not know they were ever in.

126. Q. Did you know berth 11, range 25, was cut out?—A. No.

To get down to the basis upon which the enumerator made up the lists, I will read question 134:

134. Q. Now what law did you consider governed you in the preparation of these lists, Mr. Stevenson?—A. I followed the information contained in the telegram as near as I could.

That is the law that governed.

135. Q. The telegram gave you no information as to your mode of procedure?—A. No more than to have the enumerating done by a certain time, and I sent them out and had it done.

136. Q. But in the preparation of these lists did you consider yourself governed by any statute or any law of any kind?—A. As far as qualifications I followed the Ontario law. At least those were my instructions to the enumerators.

137. Q. What qualifications?—A. Qualifications in the Ontario statute with regard to residence in the province.

138. Q. What are they?—A. Nine months, I think.

139. Q. What would you consider the qualification for a voter in one of these lumber camps?—A. If he was nine months in the province.

140. Q. How long would he require, under your instructions to the enumerators, to be a resident in the electoral district of Algoma?—A. I cannot tell you now just what my instructions were—nine months in the province was the ground we worked on in the Ontario lists.

141. Q. You say in your affidavit you have many years' experience in preparing Ontario lists and you would be familiar with the qualifications?—A. Those are the qualifications.

142. Q. Have you not required any period of residence in the electoral district?—A. I can't tell you that offhand whether there is or not. I guess there is.

143. Q. Did you give these instructions to your enumerators?—A. I gave them the qualifications. I read them out to them from the statute.

144. Q. You know in the case of the man who spoke to you, he was not qualified?—A. I did not say he was on the list.

145. Q. What is his name and we can see?—A. I can't remember it now but I can get it.

146. Q. That was the only one you could give me any information on in the Maskode list?—A. Yes.

147. Q. You told me you followed the Ontario law with regard to the qualification, what law did you follow, if any, with regard to the preparation of your lists?—A. I did not post notices—just followed the instructions in the telegrams and sent out enumerators.

148. Q. You knew that under the Ontario law notices should be posted up for thirty days, setting forth the time and place at which the persons appointed for that purpose would make up the lists?—A. Yes, I know that.

149. Q. You did not give that notice?—A. No.

150. Q. You did not give any notice?—A. No.

151. Q. The enumerators did not stay at any particular place for the purpose of making up the lists?—A. No, that was my instructions.

152. Q. Your instructions to them were not to stop at any particular place?—A. To go

around from man to man and enumerate the voters.

153. Q. In other words, you practically instructed your men to take a census?—A. Yes.

154. Q. That was directly opposite to the course pursued by yourself under the Ontario lists?—A. Yes.

155. Q. How many deputies did you appoint?—A. Arthur, Glandville, Coulter, Nichols, Roseborough and the two McLurg boys.

156. Q. That was contrary to the provisions of the Ontario Act—the Ontario Act would allow you but three?—A. Yes.

157. Q. The Ontario Act would also prohibit the appointment of any officer of the government in the preparation of the lists?—A. I can't tell you about that. I didn't know that was in the Act.

158. Q. At least one of the enumerators, W. L. Nichols, is an officer of the Dominion government?—A. Yes, he is the Indian agent.

As a matter of fact he was not then the Indian agent, but the acting agent.

159. Q. Where did you post up the lists that had been made?—A. Posted them up in three of the camps at Maskode, one at Waboose station, sent two with the mail carriers, posted one at Searchmont and sent two into the camps, posted one at Wilde station and sent two into the camps at Curtis, and I sent two copies to Jarvis, posted one at Hayden station myself and sent two to Anderson by mail.

160. Q. So that the only lists that were personally posted by you were on the line of the railway?—A. Yes.

161. Q. And except what you did yourself, you don't know whether they were posted or not?—A. No. Under the Ontario law I did not have to post them there at all.

162. Q. Why did you not post up proclamations in conformity with the Ontario law as to when these lists would be made up?—A. Had no time.

He had no time to give the people of Ontario an opportunity of coming forward and having their names put on the voters' lists. This gentleman, whose appointment is to be perpetuated under this Bill by this government, had no time to conform to the law of the province regulating the preparation and the putting into force of the voters' lists.

163. Q. Your suggestions instructed you to do so?—A. Did not have them at the start.

164. Q. So then you took upon yourself, without any instructions, not to give these notices?—A. Yes.

165. Q. Now, Mr. Stevenson, did you make any attempt to fulfill the law as laid down by the Ontario Act for the preparation of voters' lists in unorganized districts?—A. No, I did not follow the Ontario law.

166. Q. You did not follow the Ontario law either in reference to the notices of appeal to be given?—A. I did that in accordance with instructions.;

He did not follow the Ontario law because he was instructed not to follow it.

167. Q. But that is not in accordance with the Ontario law?—A. No.

168. Q. And under your instructions, as you interpreted them, you adopted practically a different method for making up the lists?—A. Yes, I did the best I could in the time I had to do it.

169. Q. The voters' lists were in course of preparation as rapidly as possible under the Ontario law?—A. Yes.

170. Q. And there was no default on the sheriff's part in the preparation of them?—A. Not that I know of.

183. Q. When did the enumerators start out on their work?—A. Tuesday the 27th August, and returned on the 30th.—I think those are the dates.

195. Q. You knew that Mr. Boyce said you did not give him any information as to the time and places where the lists were made up, and I understood you to say that you would not know yourself?—A. I told him they were starting out to go to each poll.

196. Q. But that was all the information you pretend you gave him—that a man for instance was starting for Waboose?—A. That was all I could tell him.

So much for the evidence of the enumerator. We shall see what a judge of the High Court of Justice says upon these provisions. This is not the first time I have read this complaint to the right hon. gentleman. I read it two years ago to him. It is on the records of this parliament in 'Hansard.' In the face of what the judge of the High Court said and in the face of the fact that one of His Majesty's judges placed upon the responsibility of this parliament the duty of remedying this evil, the right hon. gentleman and his Minister of Justice bring down a measure and attempt to force it upon the people, perpetuating the same thing. That is a sample of the 'square deal referred to by my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Greenway). Again I put the question to the right hon. Prime Minister: Referring back to that time, bridging the last thirteen years and recalling him as leader of an opposition in this House clamouring for the rights of the people and demanding fair play for the minority, I ask him, does he think that now he is giving the people of Canada a square deal?

On October 1st, Mr. Justice Meredith, of the Court of Appeal, gave this judgment:

There are involved in this appeal two questions of considerable importance:

1. Whether the order in council in question is, or the proceedings of the respondent acting under it are, ultra vires, and if so

2. Whether this court has power to prohibit such proceedings.

One would have thought that, when the matter came up for consideration before this government upon the service of notice of motion of prohibition, the law officers of the Crown would have looked into the matter carefully to see what position to take. Mr. Barwick argued on the principle that there was no jurisdiction, and Mr. Moss argued also that there was no jurisdiction and, as far as possible within

the judgment of the enumerators, the provisions of the Ontario law had been complied with, though the enumerator swore he had not complied with them and did not intend to.

2. Whether this court has power to prohibit such proceedings.

The more correct way of dealing with these questions is to consider the latter first, because, if this court has no jurisdiction, it is better to express no opinion on the merits of the application: If there has been bad faith or any sinister or improper conduct such as has been charged, in matters quite within the power of those whose conduct has been called in question, they are answerable, not to the court, but to parliament, and parliament to the people: And any alleged wrong doing may perhaps also be the subject of investigation and of some measure of relief if established in the federal election court.

Then is there jurisdiction in this court?

If the circumstances which warrant the governor in council in acting under section 9 of the Franchise Act, section 398, never existed, I would have little doubt of such jurisdiction. One of the foremost duties of this court is the prevention of the exercise of wrongful judicial power. It can hardly be doubted that if any one, without colour of right, should usurp the judicial functions pertaining to the preparation of voters' lists, the power and duty to prohibit must rest somewhere; and I know of no other court than this in which such power and duty rest in respect to such an usurpation within this province.

But it is said that in the North Perth case there was a decision of a divisional court to the contrary. With that statement I am unable to agree. The two cases are widely different. When that case was decided there existed officers and courts appointed and constituted under federal legislation for the very purpose of dealing with the whole subject of voters' lists for parliamentary elections: the whole of that legislation has been repealed: no such officers or courts now exist. The holding in the North Perth case was that this court could not interfere with such federal courts in respect of such voters' lists. In this case the main question is does any federal court exist? Have the respondents any authority whatever in law for the exercise of any judicial function in respect of such lists? If not, there must be power somewhere to prohibit, and that power can be found in this court only.

Whether the respondents have, or have not, any such power depends upon the proper interpretation of section 9 of the Franchise Act, 1898. That Act entirely repealed the Electoral Franchise Act under which the federal courts were constituted. It changed completely the whole law in regard to the preparation of the voters' lists, adopting the provincial lists instead of having parliamentary lists prepared as provided for in the repealed enactment. But, to provide against the possibility of there being no sufficient recent provincial lists in some of the electoral districts, the 9th section of the Act was passed:

This I have read to the House. The judgment proceeds:

Mr. BOYCE.

For the district in question there are in existence no lists prepared at any regular intervals, but there are lists in course of preparation under a provincial enactment which requires their preparation at regular intervals.

The purpose of the section is to insure reasonably recent lists for parliamentary elections: it can, therefore, hardly mean that when a provincial enactment requires the lists to be prepared at regular intervals those lists only shall be used, no matter how long it may be necessary to wait until they are prepared: it means rather that where such lists exist—'are prepared' in fact—they shall be used, but where they do not exist the mode of preparing them provided in the section may be adopted. It was, therefore, in the facts of this case, within the power of the Governor in council to appoint all necessary officers for the preparation of the lists this making them—

Mark you, Mr. Speaker——

—this making them officers of a federal court, just as the revising barristers were under the federal enactment; but they are expressly required by the enactment to observe and follow as far as possible the provisions of the laws of the province regulating the preparation and revision and bringing into force of the provincial lists.

But it is said that the order in council appointing the respondents presumes to give directions to them in conflict with the latter statutory requirement. The answer to that is if it be so, the order, to that extent, has no effect, the statute, not the order in council is to be obeyed.

That is, the provincial law must be obeyed, and this government cannot lay violent hands upon the rights of the people of the province of Ontario under their own law.

That it is urged that, assuming the appointment of the respondents to be valid, they are not proceeding in some respects in accordance with the statute, but are acting to some extent in contravention of it. The answer to that,—if it be so—is the answer which was given to the applicant in the North Perth case. The subject is one affecting matters peculiarly within the exclusive powers of parliament; they are answerable to parliament, not to this court, in such an application as that.

A point of some importance—not argued—is whether parliament has, in section 9, delegated to the Governor in Council the constitution of a federal court, and if so whether there was power to do so. The answer is there is no such delegation, that this enactment itself constitutes the court and prescribes its procedure, and that to the Governor in Council is committed nothing substantially but the appointment of the officers, the putting in motion of the provincial machinery operated by federal officers.

Now, the right hon. Prime Minister had that decision read to him two years ago and placed upon the records of parliament. Does he still insist in pressing upon this House section 2 of the Bill which provides identically the same machinery, the same

way of making up the lists as that covered by this decision of the judge? If so, what may we not expect of him? What respect has he for his position? What respect has he for law, order and decency? He might have found shelter prior to the decision, behind a question of interpretation. But here is the judicial interpretation from which there has been no appeal, placing upon parliament the duty of remedying this wrong. And how does he remedy it? By bringing in a Bill which contains the very same provisions, which provisions he proposes to make law. The right hon. gentleman has seen what has been done, and how this clause has operated to the benefit of his party. It has been used, not only as an engine of tyranny, not only as an engine of oppression, but as an engine by which the people of Ontario have been deprived of their franchise. Take, for instance, the settled portion of the district of Algoma. There, rolls are made up upon which the voters' lists are prepared; but the hon. gentleman gives his orders, and away back in the bush where no one can get to them, he opens polls and makes a voters' list, and 500 voters are put illegally on that list. There were 343 struck off. Of what use are the votes of the fifty good men who have gone into that country, of what use is their franchise, when 343 names without the slightest qualification were put on the list to overbalance their bona fide votes ? I say that the right hon. gentleman has laid violent hands upon the franchise of the people, and the people resent it very much indeed.

To sum up. The provincial law is required to be observed as far as possible. Let us see how it was observed. It was ignored altogether. There was no sheriff appointed to make the lists, there was no proclamation or notice of any kind before making the lists. They were made up and sworn to, and the enumerator had to accept them prima facie as the lists of voters. No adequate provision was made for appeal. The time for appeal was cut down to six days, from thirty days which was the provincial requirement at the time, and they began to run from the date that the lists were posted up in a distant polling place. The reviser of the list under the provincial statute, the judge of the district, was deprived of his office by the interference of this government, he was deposed in favour of an appointee of this government, who was afterwards appointed returning officer, and who, for those services, has been made commissioner of police on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

Now the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues, when they were in opposition, took very high moral ground in favour of the observance of the sanctity of the ballot, of the sanctity of the franchise in this country. He spoke eloquently, his words sounded well, and they read well. The right hon. gentleman and his colleagues took the highest ground of public morality. He argued that the government should not interfere in the making up of voters' lists to which members of parliament owed their election ; that it should not be possible for any government to appoint an officer or henchman to make up these lists ; that it was contrary to parliamentary and constitutional doctrine, and would ensure the continuance of a government in power which had lost public confidence. The right hon. gentleman and his colleagues insisted on the right of the provinces to make up their lists, and that upon these lists members should be elected to the House of Commons. At that famous convention in 1893, when that magnificent Liberal platform was constructed, there was no more important plank in that platform than the repeal of the Franchise Act as it stood at that day. Those were the pretensions, that is what the right hon. gentleman theorized should be done, and which he promised would be done if he came into power. Well, he came into power, and that promise is the only one that the right hon. gentleman has kept to the people of this country up to the present time. One by one the planks of that platform have become separated from it, they have been cast into the drift on the turbulent sea of political expediency, they have been wrenched from their fastenings by the demands and exigencies of his political friends, by the necessity of continuing in power. Up to the time this Bill was introduced, the right hon. gentleman had just this one cord by which his political tabernacle was held down to the ground ; and now, by his insistence on this Bill, that cord is cut, and his political tent now flutters in the breeze. No longer can the right hon. gentleman say that at least he has observed one of the planks in that platform, and that he has repealed the Franchise Act. It is true that he repealed the Franchise Act, and he repealed it upon the promise that he would give the people a better system of franchise. But what did he do ? He brought down in 1904 a measure which provided for all the iniquities, all the enormities and all the atrocities I have detailed in my remarks. And now in 1908, in the closing session of this parliament, he has brought down and proposes to force through this House a measure which will perpetuate all these iniquities. Sir, I assert my right as an independent member of this House to object, and to continue objecting to the right hon. gentleman taking any such course as that. I will say in all solemnity, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, that had I known when my right hon. friend asked for a vote of one-twelfth of the Supply Bill, that he had behind it the intention of forcing upon this House a measure so

iniquitous, one which so absolutely violates the rights of the people of this country, I certainly would have been here night and day to oppose that vote, and I would not have consented to its adoption. I do not consider that the right hon. first minister treated this House at all fairly in asking that vote. I may be wrong. I may be carried away by my earnestness at this moment, but I say that from the experience I have had, from the evidence which there lies and which cannot be controverted and from the working of the measure I am satisfied that it would be an enormity to perpetuate such legislation as that. I desire to refer to one more section. That is section 17:

Provided that no ballot paper shall be rejected on account of any writing, number or mark placed thereon by any deputy returning officer.

There was an agitation many years ago in this country, at the time of open voting, for a ballot, and that ballot having been accorded to the people it was urged that the secrecy of the ballot should be preserved at all costs. Tampering with the ballot, or the non-secrecy of the ballot, or the permitting of any mark upon the ballot by any person, puts a premium upon bribery and electoral debauchery. We have had that demonstrated before in this country. My hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) read some of the evidence in the London election case and the very thing which was done by Pritchett and O'Gorman in that case illegally this government propose to allow them to do under this section and to do it lawfully. It is proposed to allow a ballot to be counted if it has any mark upon it at all. As my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) said, it is possible for me to write on the back of the ballot, 'This is Boyce's ballot' and the ballot is counted good. Any writing, any number, or any mark on the ballot does not invalidate the ballot. Does the right hon. First Minister not see the extent to which that provision will be taken advantage of? Surely he can see what that means, surely he can see that it will mean that the man who is bribed, the man to whom it is said: You will get $10 if you write the number '2' or any other number on the back of your ballot, can in this way indicate the manner in which he has voted. Does he not see that this is assisting that kind of work? Does he not see that it is assisting the government contractor in coercing and intimidating all those whom he employs to go and vote for the government candidate? Does he not see—I venture to think that he sees it quite well—that all the employees of the Grand Trunk Pacific and all the employees on other great works will be kept in order and made to know that that mark which can be legally placed upon the ballot will serve as a sign of identification and will disclose whether they have voted right or wrong. What about the civil service? Are they going to be left free to vote as they like? According to all human nature the civil servant will know that if there can be placed a mark on the ballot somebody will know how somebody has voted and then there will be trouble for somebody. What about the homesteader in the Northwest, the man who perhaps has not performed all his settlement duties and is probably asking for an extension of time, or who has some application before the government inspector in regard to the inspection of his homestead? There is the gentleman who has got a larger quantity of seed grain than he should have received or who wants an extension of time in which to pay for it. That gentleman is asked: How are you going to vote? I want you to vote so-and-so. Very well; I want to tell you that I shall know how you have voted and whether you have voted for the government candidate or not. Do you understand that, Mr. Debtor? Do you think that is a method which should be employed throughout this country? The hon. Minister of Justice talks about an engine of tyranny. An engine of tyranny forsooth! What greater engine of tyranny could there be than this provision of the law? The people want a secret ballot. They demonstrated that by the popular vote in the province of Ontario. There was a ballot in Ontario that had a number upon it. It was defensible upon certain grounds and to a certain extent, but there is absolutely no justification for the iniquitous clause which the hon. Minister of Justice seeks to force upon this country now. If we are to have open voting let us have open, honest voting. Do not let us have a sinister, miserable attempt, the hypocritical profession of secrecy which is contained in this Bill under which we know there will be actual openness and a knowledge of how every vote is polled. The number on the ballot was bad enough, but this is ten times worse. It is an engine of oppression which permits certain cabalistic signs to be placed upon a ballot. If the law had permitted only a number to be used that might have been used or it might not have been used. It might have been used by those in power, by the government, but this can be used by government contractors, government servants, homesteaders and all the army of government agents who are active at the time of a Dominion election.

I might occupy the time of this House with other clauses of the Bill but other gentlemen will doubtless give them further consideration. I wish to say in conclusion, that it must appear to the House and to the country that when the right hon. gentleman delayed giving to this House a Bill for the suppression of electoral corruption last year he had some object in view

in keeping that back. His Minister of Justice, the hon. gentleman who now occupies that position, was then but a short time in office and he had not got well seated in the saddle. He perhaps did not possess the amount of experience which the right hon. First Minister felt would be necessary before he could be entrusted with the preparation of just that kind of a Bill that the right hon. gentleman wanted for use at the next general election. We were, therefore told, notwithstanding the speech from the Throne last session, that we were not to have an election Bill last year. This year we were again told that we were going to have a Bill for the suppression of electoral corruption. Well, we have a Bill, but if any gentleman can say, after he reads the two clauses on which I have touched, that these are clauses which tend to suppress electoral irregularities and corruption, then, I say he is a very extraordinary man indeed. The right hon. gentleman has doubtless come to the conclusion that some drastic measure is necessary, some peculiarly strong engine is required in order to again sway the people of Canada in his favour the next time he appeals to them for a renewal of their confidence. At the last election it was the Grand Trunk Pacific and a number of other matters that swayed public opinion. At this coming election my right hon. friend must necessarily, he feels, owing to the weakening of public confidence, have something with which he can sway, aye, even force a majority of the votes in his favour.

How was he to get it ? There have been revelations here of graft, irregularities, departmental corruption and debauchery in government contracts, revelations of his own commissioners, a lifting of the lid which disclosed a most awful state of affairs in the Department of Marine and other departments, and he knows that public confidence in his government is waning and has been waning for some considerable time. In this House and during this parliament it has been demonstrated to the right hon. gentleman that he has graft to right of him, graft to left of him, graft behind him and that every one wonders. Every one wonders how he is to justify himself before the country, how he will appeal to them. I would quote to him some of the votes which he has given in this House, for instance where a public official had stolen money and was convicted and the right hon. gentleman voted to retain him as a public servant of this country. We wondered what he was going to do about that when he appealed to the country ; but he knew what he was going to do, he called his Minister of Justice, a gentleman whom he had put there for a purpose, to do that which Sir Charles Fitzpatrick would not do ; he calls in this Minister of Justice, this sapient, grave and reverend seigneur, this gentleman who would do no wrong, and the result is this mixed-up election Act which we have to-day. That is the measure by which the right hon. gentleman expects not only to appeal to this country but to coerce the people of this country to sustain him in power. Where is all his profession of high policy ? Farewell to those professions, farewell to all his high principles, farewell to his electoral promises, farewell to the pledges he gave to the people. He has abandoned them all, all the pledges he gave to the people of Canada in which they showed their confidence by placing him in power. He bids farewell to all, he casts them behind, grasping greedily at a Bill supplied by the hon. gentleman who sits behind him, put there for a purpose, supplied by that gentleman in the form of his election Bill which will be undoubtedly the means by which the right hon. gentleman will seek to retain power. The greed for power from which the right hon. gentleman has been suffering has carried him to great lengths, but I never thought it would carry him to this length, that it would carry him to the length of allowing violations of the constitution, the taking away of the franchise, the violation of the laws of the provinces. But he has used it, he has sacrificed his loftiest aims, his highest ideals and principles, for power. Power he wants, power he must have, power he will have. His high principles, his good name politically, his political kingdom, all he will give for a renewal of power.

Mr. JAMES CONMEE (Thunder Bay and Rainy River). Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend who has just sat down has made my task rather easy. If the hon. gentleman has proved anything. if his argument is sound, he has justified the passage of this Bill. I think I will be able to convince him of that in a very few minutes. Before taking that up I wish to correct a remark which he made. I asked him a question and in reply he stated that I had recommended certain of the enumerating officers in West Algoma, which constituency he has the honour to represent. In that he is entirely wrong. I never had anything to do with the recommendation of any of the officers in any manner whatever in connection with that election, in fact I never knew, until I heard from him, just who those officers were.

Mr. BOYCE. Does he suggest that I said or thought he had anything to do with the appointment of the officers in West Algoma ?

Mr. CONMEE. You did say so.

Mr. BOYCE. I had no intention of doing so. I meant his own riding. I beg his pardon if I conveyed the other impression to him.

Mr. CONMEE. I accept the explanation. I presumed at the time he did not mean

what he said, but he gets a little excited once in a while and this is one of the occasions. The argument of my hon. friend, in my opinion, has justified the passage of the Bill. What are the conditions? He has pointed out that a condition of law exists which is very bad according to his story. I expect that this measure will remedy that condition. What occasioned the interference with the provincial law of which the hon. gentleman has made such strong complaint? I apprehend that it was the fact that the provincial lists were more than a year old in his riding. I represent a riding in northern Ontario. I think the hon. member gave the House to understand that the same condition that existed in Algoma existed elsewhere. That is not entirely correct, we did not have any revision of the lists in Rainy River district for the reason I have just stated, that the lists were not over a year old and therefore the provincial lists prevailed. If that is an evil, then it is an evil with which this parliament should deal.

Mr. BOYCE. Does the hon. member say that the lists were not made up in his riding under the law at the last election?

Mr. CONMEE. Yes, I have made the statement that there were no appeals.

Mr. BOYCE. I am very much surprised to hear it.

Mr. CONMEE. I was the candidate and I have no knowledge of any lists being made under Dominion officials, that is appeals taken.

Mr. BOYCE. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. CONMEE. That is a matter of evidence. All I can say to my honoured friend is that there was no complaint about the lists and I am quite positive that I am right. I do not think the lists could be made up in that way without my having some knowledge of it. I refer to revisions. The evil the member complains of, if it is not remedied, will be repeated. It will altogether depend on when the provincial government makes its list or when this government may appeal to the country. It may be that in a great many constituencies we will have the application of the Act of which the hon. member has so strongly complained. Which position does he choose to take? Does he want a repetition of what happened in Algoma, or does he prefer that we should have a law, fairly well worked out, under which there will be proper machinery for the preparation of such lists. On his own argument he has made out a strong case in favour of the Bill. But that is not the only point on which the hon. member has rather assisted the argument of this side of the House. He criticised the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) for having made reference to conditions that existed in the province of Manitoba some four years ago, and the hon. member himself took up more than two hours of this House in telling us about his election that took place four years ago.

Mr. BOYCE. If my hon. friend will read 'Hansard,' he will see that several pages of the records of this House were devoted to this very matter three years ago.

Mr. CONMEE. That makes it all the worse. My hon. friend to-day went over what happened four years ago, doing what he found fault with another hon. member for doing in a less degree, and he has repeated what he said previously in this House. If he thinks that good judgment or an argument in favour of the defeat of this Bill, I shall have to leave him to his own opinion. All I can say is that it does not look very reasonable to me.

Now, I do not intend to discuss the Bill at any great length. I did not rise for that purpose. I merely rose to give reasons why I am prepared to support it. I am not going to say that the Bill is perfect as introduced. There may be improvements made. I have no doubt but that the hon. member who has introduced the Bill is quite willing to accept any fair suggestion that will improve the Bill. His closing words were these—that they wanted a square deal and an honest election. My hon. friend rather sneers at that. Let me tell my hon. friend and other hon. gentlemen opposite that if I chose to take up the time of this House in detailing the iniquities of the Conservative party with which I have had to deal in elections in my riding, I think I could make every honest man on that side of the House hang his head in shame. But I am not going to do that, because I do not think any good purpose could be served by so doing. As I understand the situation, the Liberal party is not committed entirely, without consideration of conditions, to the provincial lists. I quite agree with the previous history of the Liberal party in that respect. I quite agree with the statements made by my leader, not only in this House but throughout the country on that great question. But, Sir, this Bill does not propose to break the record; it does not propose to withdraw from the provincial lists. In the great majority of cases they are not interfered with; they are accepted. What are the cases in which they are not accepted? In the case to which this Bill applies, I think there is a justification for the course which has been adopted, and it is quite time that this parliament should deal with the question. At the time of the repeal of the Dominion Franchise Act, under which revising barristers appointed by the government in power made up the lists, not only in certain sections of the country where there were no municipal organizations or in provinces where the provincial lists were

not considered to be fair and just, the position that was taken was well stated by the Minister of Justice yesterday, and I may be pardoned for referring to his words :

It was pointed out at that time, in answer to an observation by the present hon. leader of the opposition, that if, notwithstanding the fears which he then expressed, the time should come when any provincial government or provincial legislature should by its legislation, or by its administration of that legislation, so interfere with the course of the preparation of the voters' lists in that province, or if there was not an acceptable list, or there was ground for belief that the list so prepared was not of a fair and satisfactory nature, then this House always had it in its power, this parliament at any time could rescue control over its own lists and over its own franchise, and prevent the apprehended evil from taking place.

That was the position of the two parties at the time of the Dominion Franchise Act, or the Revising Barristers' Act, as it was generally called, was wiped off the statute-book ; and I submit that the time has now come and the conditions have now arisen, not only in Manitoba, but in other provinces, including the province of Ontario, when it is right and proper that this parliament should intervene in order that there should be a fair list that would be satisfactory, not only to one party, but to both political parties in this country. My hon. friend has made reference to the Ontario law. He has pointed out the machinery of that law, as applied to the unorganized territory, by which the enumerator posts up his list, and has to give a certain length of time for hearing the cases of any who have been wrongfully left off or wrongfully put on, as the case may be. When he prepares the list, he sends it to the clerk of the peace. It is then open to an appeal by any who may not be satisfied. After it is printed, it is posted for thirty days in order to give an opportunity to those who have been improperly left off to be put on and those who have been improperly put on to be struck off. The hon. gentleman said that thirty days was not too much. That law provides that the judge, after the list goes to him, shall give thirty days in which parties can appeal ; then he shall hold his court, and give notice of the time and place of holding it, in order that appeals may be heard. The hon. member protested strongly that thirty days was not too much and said he knew it very well from the experience he had had in the new section. If his argument be good—and I submit it is on that point—then I ask him to direct it against the provincial government of Ontario because they have violated every principle, they have set aside every protection that Act gives the people in those new districts, and they have brought in a measure, which is now in force, that robs the people of the rights they formerly possessed with regard to the preparation of the lists. To illustrate what I say, let me read an article from the Port Arthur 'Chronicle' of May 2 :

The conditions surrounding the preparation of the voters' lists in the unorganized districts are even worse than we stated yesterday.

The editor was there referring to a previous issue of his paper, in which he had pointed out that having regard to the time limit between the posting of the printed lists, the return of the lists to the clerk, and the posting of the notice previous to appeal, it would be physically impossible to hold the elections at any time in June, and that if the provincial government persisted in holding them at the date announced, those constituencies would be disfranchised.

It has been thought that fifteen days was allowed after lists had been prepared in which to make appeals, but this is not so.

I may say, with regard to the fifteen days, the statute provides for thirty days, but in its last few days of sittings, the Ontario legislature passed a new Act revising the law, by which they gave power to the Lieutenant Governor in Council to issue a proclamation reducing the time, and I believe it was reduced to fifteen days. Of that, however, I am not certain, but that is the statement made here.

According to the Act passed in the last hours of the legislature, it is provided that no appeals can be made after the 15th May. According to this paper, as the enumerator will not have his preliminary lists prepared in several cases, possibly a majority of cases, it will be seen that there is practically no appeal possible from the lists as prepared by the enumerator.

According to the new Election Act, certified copies of the voters' lists must be in the hands of the clerk of the peace before the date of the writ calling an election and there must be an interval of at least sixteen days, after the date of the writ, before nomination day. It is a physical impossibility that the law can be complied with in either this riding or the riding of Fort William, so that if the government persists in holding the elections on the 8th of June as announced, it must smash its own laws to smithereens and disfranchise practically the whole country.

I believe, from what little knowledge I have of the operation of the present preparation of the list in these ridings, that that statement is substantially correct, but I give it just as it appears here, and there may possibly be some difference. But even if the statement be not correct, even if a shorter time, even if ten days, nay if one day were given for the appeal, it would be physically impossible to have a properly prepared list by the 8th June. It would be impossible because the enumerators have not yet completed their lists. Here is a letter from a gentleman giving me the

dates of the sittings of the enumerator for holding of their courts for the preparation of the lists. He gives a number of places, and I notice one sitting is at North Lake on the 29th May. It will be clearly understood that if the hearing is on the 29th May and the list is to be printed and has to go to the clerk of the peace and from him to the judge and the judge gives any appeal at all, that cannot be done before the 8th June, and the list cannot be in the hands of the returning officer before the day of nomination if the case is as stated. There can be no doubt about that. Some time ago I gave my opinion to certain members of the provincial legislature that there was no intention on the part of the Ontario government to hold the elections in the new ridings on the same date as they would be held throughout the province. Mr. Whitney was cornered by the leader of the opposition and he made the statement that the elections would be held on the same day. I ask hon. gentlemen to take note—I give my opinion for what it is worth—that the elections will not be held in the new ridings on that date, Mr. Whitney to the contrary notwithstanding that is upon a fair list. They will discover that irregularities exist, and that the lists are not prepared, and will find ways and means of holding these elections after the date fixed for the general elections. I have it from very good authority, from a gentleman I believe to be in the confidence of the Conservative party, that such was the intention, and I leave hon. gentlemen opposite to deal with their own friends in regard to that matter.

If that condition of things exists in all sections of New Ontario, involving seven or eight constituencies represented in this House, I want to ask fair-minded men if it is not a reasonable proposition which is contained in this Bill. Not that new lists be prepared, because that is not the purport of the Bill, when the election comes on if there is a reason for making an order for a revision, the provincial lists are taken as the basis for the Dominion list. The names on that list are still entitled to vote until it can be shown before a court of competent jurisdiction that they are not, and any names omitted on that list of men entitled to exercise the franchise can be put on. Why should they not? Will any hon. member opposite tell us that men who are entitled to the franchise should be disfranchised because there is not machinery provided by either provincial or Dominion parliament to prepare a proper list? The voter is not to blame for that. His inalienable right is to exercise the franchise, and it is the duty of parliament, whether Dominion or provincial, to see that every man has a fair opportunity to exercise that right.

My hon. friend laboured considerably to show that in this hurried way the list was prepared in his riding last time. Well, that was a peculiar circumstance which never occurred before in the history of this country and I do not think it ever will again. If I am not mistaken, the officers of this government learned only at a late date that the lists were beyond the date. There could be no legal election held upon these lists. If the elections in these ridings were to be held upon the same day, then the lists had to be prepared hurriedly, and it appears that the officers did their best. Now, I think that my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) did not do himself credit, I do not think he advanced his standing in this House or in the country, by the course which he pursued this afternoon in one particular. He repeatedly stated that the revising officer was a servant of the Ross government, an appointee of the Ross government. That is not correct. The revising officer was Judge O'Connor. Associated with him was Mr. Quibell, who was police magistrate at that time, if I am not mistaken. Why should that not be the case? It is the case in the revision of every list under the provincial law in the province. The judge is appointed, and side by side with him sits some other gentleman who may be named. I have been in Judge Johnston's court when he was conducting these hearings, and with him sat Mr. W. H. Hamilton, barrister, of the Sault. That is the position Mr. Quibell occupied, practically it may have been a silent one, speaking generally; the judge was the man who conducted the revision. And yet the hon. member misled this House in statement after statement that this revision was carried on by an official of the Ross government. I do not think that was fair criticism. My hon. friend spoke strongly; I have no doubt he felt moved. He thought that some injustice had been done him, perhaps, and on that score he may be excusable for remarks he made on this point.

Mr. Speaker I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business tomorrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Same thing.

At six o'clock the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, May 7, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

INSURANCE COMMISSION.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto). Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House, I beg to move:

That the clerk of the House be authorized to remove from the file of exhibits of the Royal Commission on Insurance, exhibits Nos. 381, 383 and 385, the same being Dr. Elliot's report, Mr. Pipe's report and Mr. C. W. Macdonald's report, and return the same to the owners of the said reports, the Commercial Travellers' Mutual Benefit Association; certified copies of the said exhibits 381, 383 and 385 to be filed in place of the said exhibits among the exhibits of the said commission.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. MACDONELL. These are three exhibits that were filed with the Royal Commission on Insurance in the city of Toronto. They are actuarial reports of the three persons mentioned in the motion. They were filed by the Commercial Travellers Mutual Benefit Association who own them. They now require these originals back in their possession and they ask the House to allow them to have these returned to them, they depositing certified copies in their place with the clerk of the House. The clerk of the House has now certified copies in his possession which he is willing to retain in lieu of the originals.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

PAYMENTS UNDER SUPERANNUATION AND RETIREMENT ACTS.

Mr. BLAIN—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked:

What amount was paid each year for the three years previous to the repeal of the Superannuation Act and the amount paid each year under the Retirement Act?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

The Act to provide for the abolition of the Civil Service Superannuation Act and for the retirement of members of the Civil Service (chapter 17 Statutes 1898) came into force on the 1st July, 1898.

The amount paid on account of superannuation each year for the three years previous to that date was:

1895-6	$311,231 79
1896-7	307,792 66
1897-8	340,185 67

The amount paid each year under the Retirement Act was:

1898-9	$ 6,434 88
1899-1900	1,755 69
1900-1	4,195 56
1901-2	2,750 02
1902-3	4,986 84
1903-4	8,837 24
1904-5	8,138 61
1905-6	11,260 76
1906-7	12,206 68
1907-8	15,178 21

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS.

Mr. LAPOINTE asked:

In which provinces are the new experimental farms for which an appropriation of $40,000 is placed in the estimates for 1908-9 to be established?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). The Department of Agriculture is now negotiating with the governments of the provinces of Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia with regard to experimental farms, and it is also considering applications from various parts of the province of Quebec, the province of Saskatchewan, and the province of British Columbia. It is hoped that some or other of these establishments will be arranged for this coming season.

ST. PETER'S INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette) asked:

1. Has a petition been received by the government from the Indians of St. Peter's reserve, Manitoba, in reference to the holding of an election for chief and councillors?
2. Is it necessary to receive the consent of the government before such an election can take place?
3. What is the term of office they are elected for, and when does the term of the present chief and councillors expire?
4. Will the surrender of the St. Peter's reserve interfere with the holding of their election?
5. What reply, if any, has been made by the government to the petition?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes; a petition, dated 7th of January, 1908, has been received from the Indians of the St. Peter's reserve in reference to the holding of an election for chief and councillors.

2. It is considered necessary that the consent of the government should be received before such an election can take place, as the Indians of the St. Peter's band are not legally entitled to an election, the elective system, under section 93 of the Indian Act, not having yet been applied to that band by order in council.

3. Although, as stated in answer No. 2, the elective system has not been applied to the St. Peter's band, those Indians have been allowed to hold an election every three years. Consequently, the last election having been held on 4th of July, 1905, the present term would naturally expire on 4th of July of the present year (1908).

4. No; as the surrender has already been taken.

5. On the 16th of January, 1908, the Indian commissioner was reminded, with reference to the petition referred to, that the elective system under section 93 of the Indian Act not having been applied by order in council to any Indian band in Manitoba,

the Indians of St. Peters have no legal right to that system, but that on the other hand, as they have for a long time been allowed the privilege of holding an election every three years, they might now consider that they have a moral claim to the privilege; but that, as it was then five or six months before the usual date of holding the election, there was time for further consideration of the matter.

QUEBEC BRIDGE COLLAPSE.

Mr. ROBITAILLE—by Mr. Armand Lavergne—asked:

1. What are the names of the parties who formed the coroner's jury investigating the Quebec bridge collapse?
2. How many and who of these gentlemen are shareholders of the Quebec bridge?
3. Upon what were the jurymen expected to report?
4. How many men were killed and injured?
5. What was the verdict of the coroner's jury?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The government has no information about this matter.

MR. PETER LYALL.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Daniel—asked:

1. Is the Peter Lyall, who presided at the banquet to Hon. Wm. Pugsley in Montreal, the same man whose firm some days later secured the contract for the erection of the National Transcontinental terminal at Winnipeg?
2. Is the said Peter Lyall the same man who locked out the workmen on Young Men's Christian Association building in Ottawa, for the erection of which he or his firm is the contractors?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The reply to this question scarcely comes within the purview of the government, and I submit that the source of information is as open to my hon. friend as it is to me.

DOMINION ARSENAL.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked:

1. Is the Dominion arsenal or cartridge factory, or any portion of the building or buildings, situated on any part of the land leased to the Ross Rifle Company at Quebec?
2. If so, has any correspondence or communications of any kind taken place between Sir Charles Ross or any official of the Ross Rifle Company and the government, or any member or official thereof, in regard to the same, and what was the nature of the correspondence?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence):

1. Yes, one small building, the Fulminate Factory, is situated on the land under lease to the Ross Rifle Company.

Mr. OLIVER.

2. There has been no correspondence other than that included in a return to an order of the House of January 23, 1907, for copies of all documents and correspondence concerning the erection of the Ross rifle factory on the Plains of Abraham, Quebec; which return was laid on the table of the House on Thursday, March 14, 1907.

QUEBEC TERCENTENARY.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked:

1. Have any regiments, city or rural, of the Canadian militia, intimated in any way to the government or Department of Militia and Defence their unwillingness to attend the Tercentenary celebration at Quebec, under the terms laid down in an order issued by the Department of Militia and Defence governing such celebration? If so, what has been the nature of the protests?
2. What regiments have signified their intention of not taking part in the celebration or protested against the terms of the order?
3. Has the government or the Department of Militia and Defence under consideration better terms of payment for troops taking part in the celebration?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). In view of the fact that nothing has yet been definitely settled as to what regiments will be mobilized at Quebec, at the time of the Tercentenary celebration, it is undesirable in the public interest that this question should be answered at present. Full information will be communicated to the House when arrangements have been completed.

BRITISH COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEAL.

On the order:

Resolved, that in the opinion of this House it is expedient to make provision for the payment of annual salaries to judges to be appointed to the Court of Appeal in the province of British Columbia, as follows:—

The Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal, $7,000.

Three Justices of Appeal, each $6,000.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I ask the permission of the House to withdraw this notice of motion with the intention of resuming it in a slightly different form

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS OF PRIVILEGE—'LE SOLEIL.'

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Before the orders of the day are called I rise to a question of privilege. In a paper published in Quebec, the 'Le Soleil,' which passes to be the organ of the government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Passes?

Mr. BERGERON. There is an article published in this paper which I looked upon as humorous but it might be taken seriously by the readers of that paper and to that article I want to call the attention of the House. It is a long article, but to save time I will translate a summary of its contents: It says that on the motion made by the leader of the opposition last Thursday which was directed against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries because he is a French Canadian, all the Conservative French Canadian members except one left the House so as not to vote, and it would imply that they left because they dissented from the motion of the leader of the opposition. The article also says that I spoke upon the question although I did not vote. I want to say that I did not vote because I was engaged outside of the House, but I was paired with my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) and if I had been here I would certainly have voted for the amendment of the leader of the opposition.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I am glad the hon. gentleman from Beauharnois brought this matter to the attention of the House because I intended to do so myself when I had the article translated.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the hon. gentleman rising to a question of privilege ?

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Yes, the same question of privilege as that brought up by the hon. member for Beauharnois. The article says that I also shirked the vote because an attack was made on Mr. Brodeur as being a French Canadian and that therefore I did not want to vote. I have to say that I did not vote because I did not want to vote, but at the same time I want to say that I have no belief in the statement that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was attacked because he is a French Canadian. I certainly disapprove of the article in 'Le Soleil.' Here is a paper which is trying to raise a racial cry in the province of Quebec——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is proceeding to criticise the general course of a newspaper and that is hardly a proper subject for discussion on a question of privilege.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I have pointed to the allegation in the article and I desire to state my position.

Mr. SPEAKER. What is the question of privilege that the hon. gentleman desires to speak to.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. The question is that the article is false and I want to show it is.

Mr. SPEAKER. There must be something personal to the hon. member in his capacity as a member of the House to entitle him to speak to a question of privilege.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. My name is twice mentioned in the article and that makes it personal. I wish I had the article here so that I could read it to the House. I think I have the right to bring to the attention of the House any attack made by a newspaper or any campaign made by any newspaper in any part of the country. This newspaper has been trying to raise racial prejudices——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not taking the proper course to discuss a question of this kind. If there has been something said which the hon. member thinks reflects upon him and which he desires to explain or controvert or deny, he is quite within his rights in discussing that as a question of privilege, but he cannot in this way proceed to discuss the attitude of a newspaper on any question.

Mr. TALBOT. The hon. member admits it.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I thought I could explain a newspaper article in which I was referred to by name.

Mr. SPEAKER. There seems to be at times quite a misapprehension in the House as to what a question of privilege is.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Therefore I do not know when I can bring the question before the House, if it is not a question reflecting on a member.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Going into Supply.

Mr. BUREAU. 'Le Soleil' accuses you of not voting and you admit it.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I said I did not vote.

Mr. BUREAU. It said you shirked the vote and you admit it.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I admitted that I did not vote.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—MR. MONK.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Speaking on the question of privilege, I understand that I am mentioned in 'Le Soleil' in practically the same manner as my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). I do not often read 'Le Soleil' because I find it contains news generally three weeks old, but if I am so mentioned I desire to express my protest. I was paired that evening with my hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Black) and I do not take much stock, and I do not think any one in my province does, in this racial question or the racial character of the attack on the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, because it is too ridiculous.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—MR. BOYCE.

Mr. BOYCE. I also wish to speak on a question of privilege and I am sure the House will agree that if I can deny successfully the statement made by the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Commee) I am justified in rising at this time. I am not objecting to any reasonable criticism of that hon. gentleman, but when he accuses me openly on the records of misleading the House, I think that is too serious to pass without comment. In his concluding words the hon. gentleman said :

Now, I think that my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) did not do himself credit, I do not think he advanced his standing in this House or in the country, by the course which he pursued this afternoon in one particular. He repeatedly stated that the revising officer was a servant of the Ross government, an appointee of the Ross government.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly object to that statement and in order to justify myself in the eyes of the House, the country and of my hon. friend from Thunder Bay and Rainy River (Mr. Conmee), who I am sure will be able to set the matter right, I shall read what I did say. At page 8209 of 'Hansard' I said :

Now I will refer to the result of that appeal. The appeals were directed against 513 names, and instead of having the senior judge of the district to perform his usual functions with regard to those appeals, we had a board of two. You see the sinister motive of that. Instead of having one judge whose duty had been for years to revise these lists, who knew the law, who knew what the qualifications were, who knew all the tricks of getting men on the list and making an improper list, who was the one man who was competent to sit on these lists, this government deposed him and got two. And why two? So that in case of a disagreement the names should stand on the list. That is the law. If Judge O'Connor differed with the police magistrate with regard to the right of John Jones to be on the list, and the judge said he had no right to be there, and the magistrate said he had a right to be there, he is there, and his name remains on the list.

I do not think I could have put the matter more fairly or more fully. I thought that I had occupied sufficient time to make myself plain, and I strongly protest against being accused, under those circumstances, of misleading the House in that particular.

RESIGNATION OF MR. GOURDEAU.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I beg to make an inquiry of the government respecting two statements which I cannot quite reconcile. On the 1st of April the Prime Minister, referring to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, made this statement :

It is only just to the deputy minister of that department that I should say in this connection that on two previous occasions he tendered his resignation to the minister and this morning again pressed his resignation, and that matter is in the hands of the minister for consideration.

I inquired twice in the House as to whether or not that resignation had been accepted. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was not present and by some strange fatality he seems to be absent to-day. Yesterday when I asked the question again the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries made this statement :

The deputy minister has not tendered his resignation but has asked for leave of absence and for superannuation. His request in regard to leave of absence has been granted and the other request is engaging the attention of the government.

Might I ask the Minister of Marine or, in his absence, the Prime Minister, which of these two statements we are to accept ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries I can only say that I understood it to be the case that Mr. Gourdeau had tendered his resignation and had asked for superannuation. I have not seen the resignation myself, but I understood from conversation with my colleague, that he had tendered it asking at the same time for superannuation, and that while the minister had agreed to his resignation the matter of superannuation was under consideration. I understand also that he has in the meantime asked for leave of absence. But the information which I obtained was simply from conversation with my hon. friend the Minister of Marine. I cannot see at the moment if there is a real contradiction between the two statements. I will have to look at them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In one place it was stated that the resignation had been twice offered.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is what I understood.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister yesterday said the resignation had not been tendered.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If that be so I have been misinformed. I will have to inquire about it.

SPRING FLOODS.

Mr. BERGERON. Has the Minister of Marine sent an engineer, as he promised the other night, to examine the broken dam at Valleyfield, and if so, if a report has been received from that engineer ?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). An official of the Railways and Canals Department has visited the scene of the trouble to give instructions to

make all repairs that could possibly be made under the circumstances.

POLICING GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC LINE.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I ask what policy is being pursued in the matter of appointing police magistrates or persons to carry out the law against the sale of liquors along the line of the eastern extension of the Grand Trunk Pacific ?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I am not sure whether that would come under my department or under the Justice Department.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I understand the inquiry to be what provisions have been made for the enforcement of the prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquor along the line of the Transcontinental Railway. In reply I have to say that at some period—I am not certain as to the time, but more than twelve months ago—a proclamation was issued covering the strip of territory on either side of the line from Quebec to Winnipeg, through the provinces of Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba. Mr. W. A. Quibell was appointed police magistrate for the portion of that territory extending from Winnipeg to the boundary between Ontario and Quebec. Mr. Lucien Pacaud was appointed police magistrate for the portion of that strip through the province of Quebec. Subsequently, upon the construction of the line between the Quebec bridge and Moncton being undertaken, a similar proclamation was issued constituting a belt of territory. I think ten miles in width, on either side of the line from the south shore of the St. Lawrence, to the city of Moncton, a territory within the provisions of the statute. The same gentleman, Mr. Pacaud, was appointed magistrate for so much of that belt as is within the province of Quebec. Recently the appointment has been made of a third police magistrate for the portion of that belt in the province of New Brunswick. The gentleman appointed is Mr. Farris, of White's Cove, New Brunswick.

Mr. SPROULE. Has that police magistrate the power to try any other cases except in connection with the sale or distribution of liquor?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I cannot reply categorically without referring to his commission. My impression is he has all the powers of two justices of the peace.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I ask the hon. gentleman to bring down the commission?

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Minister of Railways bring down one of these commissions? That will give us the power.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will bring down a copy.

Mr. J. D. REID. Do they sell liquor on the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Intercolonial Railway does not sell liquor. One of the difficulties, so other railway companies tell us, in managing the cafe department of the Intercolonial Railway, is that all others make a large profit out of that part of their business while the Intercolonial Railway does not sell liquor and is consequently deprived of that profit.

REPRESENTATION OF VETERANS AT TERCENTENARY.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Minister of Militia made any progress in connection with the request made to him by the Prime Minister and supported by myself in respect to the war veterans of Canada having representations at the Tercentenary celebration at Quebec?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am communicating, as was suggested by the First Minister, with the commission. In the meantime I would like to say that whatever is done in a military way at Quebec is proposed to be done out of the vote for the active militia for annual training. I do not see how it would be possible for the Militia Department to spend money in the particular way mentioned. I have read the letter which my hon. friend sent me from Mr. Collins, representing the veterans. I would like to say that although the veterans paraded most creditably at Toronto before the Prince of Wales, then Duke of York, it did so happen that that was done without any expense whatever, because it was only the veterans in the city of Toronto and vicinity who paraded. When I receive an answer from the commission I will communicate it to the House.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT—AMENDMENT.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Aylesworth for the second reading of Bill (No. 115) to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

Mr. JAMES CONMEE (Thunder Bay and Rainy River). At six o'clock yesterday I was making some remarks with respect to the Bill before the House, and I may refer for a moment to the remarks which have fallen from the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Boyce). He thinks that in the remarks I passed upon him yesterday he was somewhat misrepresented. I desire to say that I had no intention of misrepresenting him, and I thought that I stated fairly his position, and it is within the judgment of the House as to whether the remarks I made were quite justified. The hon. gentleman throughout his speech referred to the revising officer as Mr. Quibell. He mentioned the name of the judge on two occasions—one when he read the order appointing the

enumerator, and again when I asked him if Judge O'Connor was not one of the enumerators. Generally speaking the hon. gentleman, whether he noticed himself doing so or not, did refer to the revision being entirely in the hands of Mr. Quibell, and when an hon. gentleman opposite said: 'An official of the Ross government,' my hon. friend assented. Under those circumstances I do not think that the remarks I made were out of place. But I do not wish to tie the hon. gentleman down to that. I am quite willing to accept his explanation that such was not his intention.

Mr. BOYCE. Does the hon. gentleman think that anything I said warranted his accusation that I had misled this House?

Mr. CONMEE. I think so. I am in the judgment of the House as to that. I do not say that my hon. friend did it intentionally, but that was the impression his remarks gave me, and if any one is responsible, it is my hon. friend. I wish to say that Judge O'Connor, who was appointed revising officer in my hon. friend's riding, is the junior judge of that district, and Mr. Quibell was associated with him in that revision. As these courts are so conducted throughout Ontario, both officers sit together at times. My hon. friend shakes his head. It is quite possible that in the hurry of the election to which he refers they divided the work. But I say that, generally speaking, they sit together.

Mr. BOYCE. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Conmee) allow me a moment? I can set him right, I think. It is under the manhood registration Act that there is a board of appeal judges, but under the Ontario Voters' List Act there is only one appeal judge, and that is the district judge.

Mr. CONMEE. Unless two are appointed.

Mr. BOYCE. They are appointed by statute, the district judge is persona designata under the statute.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) is speaking of the Ontario Act.

Mr. BOYCE. Of course, that is the Act I was speaking of.

Mr. CONMEE. But this was not under the Ontario Act, this was under the Dominion Act. I am not going to argue whether my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) is technically correct or not; I am dealing with the impression given me by the language of the hon. gentleman, and I am in the judgment of hon. members as to whether I understood his remarks or not. I do not think my hon. friend has any complaint to make with regard to Judge O'Connor. Judge O'Connor is a Conservative. I think he is a competent man to conduct such a revision. I think also that Mr. Quibell is a competent man to conduct such a revision. I do not think the hon. gentleman has made out a case against either of these officers. The hon. gentleman found fault on the ground that Judge Johnston had not been made a revising officer while Mr. Quibell was appointed to that duty; and he said that Mr. Quibell was an appointee of the Ross government, the inference suggested being that he was a partisan more or less. My answer is that, if the hon. gentleman will canvass his own town of Sault Ste. Marie, he will find that the majority will say that Mr. Quibell is less partisan than the hon. judge to whom he made reference. Mr. Quibell, who has been referred to, was not an official in the ordinary sense of the word. He was a police magistrate, and therefore quite a competent person to be appointed to the position of revising officer.

Now let me point out to my hon. friend the difference between the system followed by the Ross government, and the Liberal government, when in power, and that followed by the present government of Ontario. I made some complaints yesterday of the manner in which the voters' lists are now being prepared in the riding which I represent in this House. The course followed by the previous government was to appoint as enumerators in charge of making up the lists, certain officers,—the sheriffs were appointed, as far as I know, and they are responsible officers. But what do the hon. gentleman's friends in power in Ontario, do to-day? They do not appoint the sheriffs for this work, but they choose the strongest partisans. My hon. friend talks about 'ward heelers,' meaning thereby, I take it, the most extreme partisans. Well, the most extreme partisan in the town in which I live has been appointed the enumerator. And this gentleman is the agent of the Conservative candidate, so that the enumerator's office and the office of the Conservative candidate are the same. I have here a newspaper—to be fair I must say that it is a Liberal newspaper, but I give its statement to the House because I believe it to be true. I will not give the name, but it states, concerning this enumerator that he is well known to be very active in politics and is the agent of the Conservative candidate, that his office is the office of the Conservative candidate, that he will not deny that he is the employee or partner of the Conservative candidate and that he is actively advocating the interests of the candidate during the time he is acting as enumerator in the riding. Of course, I know, my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) is not responsible for all this, I merely point it out to show the spirit that exists. It is about time, I submit, that some law was passed to correct these evils, some system adopted better than the system we have. If the yesterday's argument of my hon. friend pointed to anything, it was to the fact that the existing Dominion law in regard to the preparation of these lists was defective. He

made out a very strong complaint against it. But, if this is so, I would ask him why he is not prepared to join in improving the law by enacting desirable amendments ?

Mr. BOYCE. With the hon. gentleman's permission, I would like to ask a question, as I do not wish to misunderstand him. Do I understand him to say that the enumerator appointed by the Ontario government is an employee or partner of the government candidate there ?

Mr. CONMEE. Yes.

Mr. BOYCE. And does the hon. gentleman say this from his personal knowledge, or does he merely give what this newspaper says ?

Mr. CONMEE. I believe it to be the case.

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. gentleman has not read the name. I happen to know the name of the gentleman appointed there ; it is Joseph G. Ashford.

Mr. CONMEE. That is right. I am glad the hon. gentleman mentioned it, for I can tell my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) all about it. Joseph G. Ashford was appointed enumerator, but never acted, never was called upon to act. And why ? Because he is an honest man ; he is a Conservative, but a straightforward, honest man. And I stated to some of my friends when Joseph G. Ashford was appointed, 'They will never let him act, for he is not the kind of man the machine can use.' And they never did let him act ; they held him back ; they never gave him instructions. One of the enumerators, Mr. Eool, completed his list, and yet Mr. Ashford never got instructions to go on. Later, Mr. Hogarth—I will give the name now—who is employed as book-keeper and office man of the gentleman who has been nominated by the Conservative party, whether he is in partnership with him or not I do not know, has been appointed the enumerator and another man with him, whose name I have not before me, but, in any case, it is not Mr. Ashford. Had Mr. Ashford carried out the work of making these lists, I venture to say there would be no complaint and no occasion for appeal, as he would have done what was fair. But what did they do at Fort William ? If my hon. friend wants to force me into a discussion of this question, I have no objection to discuss it, but I am sure that, when we are through, he will have a worse opinion of his friends in Toronto than he has now. I do not like to mention the names of men who are not here, so I will not give this gentleman's name.—The enumerator appointed at Fort William started out in his work. He was a man that did not have a wide acquaintance, he can hardly be spoken of as a well-known man. Well, the law says that the lists should be posted up at every schoolhouse and every separate schoolhouse, but, in this unorganized territory, there are no schoolhouses—or very few and at great distances apart. In any case the facts are, that this gentleman had posted up his lists, that thirty days had elapsed after he had posted them up and that he had gone out on his second round holding his courts, before any Liberal knew anything at all about it, or had any idea that any lists were being prepared. There were no advertisements in the papers, no notices that really conveyed the information. When the matter was inquired into it was found that this gentleman had posted up on the door of his residence a notice that he was posting up the lists. Well, nobody thought of going to this man's house to find out. Nobody knew that he was the enumerator. Nobody knew that he was doing anything, it was entirely in the dark. That list has been completed a considerable time ago, I have a copy of it. Yet Mr. Ashford never got instructions to go, and why, I leave it to my hon. friend to say. I gave an opinion last night that I did not believe there was an honest intention on the part of the powers that be at Toronto to hold elections in those ridings on the same day, and leave it to my hon. friend to judge what was meant by holding back Mr. Ashford and then supplanting him by another enumerator who was clerk and agent of the candidate. What I said yesterday I repeat, that in my opinion they cannot hold the elections on the 8th of June, if they have a proper list. The Liberals are up against this difficulty, that they have either got to accept the lists such as they are with out an appeal, or they have got to run the risk of having the elections thrown over and having by-elections, which always places the party in opposition at a disadvantage. I submit that is not fair, and I submit that that is a justification for this Bill we are considering. This Bill is brought forward in order that there may be proper machinery, that there may not be that haste my hon: friend complained of so bitterly yesterday. He says the Bill provides that the list is to be prepared just as the previous Act did. That is not quite correct. It does say that the preparation of the list may be made by order in council after the writs are issued, but it goes on to say that the order in council may be passed at any time. Now I submit that if the government are charged with the responsibility of preparing the lists, it is reasonable to assume that they will give proper time. The last time the proceeding was new. I was informed, I do not know how corectly, that they did not discover that it was necessary to make these lists, that it was not known that certain of the provincial lists would be more than a year old, early enough to afford more time and that it was advisable to have recently prepared lists in order that there might be a fair representation of the electors, and that those who were en-

titled to vote might have an opportunity of voting. Therefore there was perhaps some haste the last time. In the riding I represent, I stated yesterday, that I did not think any revision took place. I find on inquiry that I was mistaken ; there was a revision in the Thunder Bay district, but there was no revision, or no appeal at all events, in the Rainy River district. There appears to have been an appeal in the Thunder Bay district. Just why that was so I cannot now remember, but I have no doubt it was because our Conservative friends, knowing they had a judge who was a little extreme in his political leanings—I think the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) knows the gentleman to whom I refer—thought that it would be a good thing to have an appeal and a revision, and therefore they did so. I am not finding fault with that, I am only calling the attention to it of the hon. member for Algoma.

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. gentleman says that under this Act that evil will be remedied. I say that under subsection 1, when the writ is issued the proclamation can go out for making the voters' lists. I would ask him to state how that would permit the Ontario law being complied with which requires sixty days to make up the list and allow appeals ?

Mr. CONMEE. If the hon. gentleman will read the law he will find it states that the revision may take place at or after the issue of the writ. He will find also that the Governor in Council may at any time issue a proclamation, may do it six months before the writs are issued, or whenever he pleases. Therefore I think the Act is wide enough to meet the objection which my hon. friend laboured so hard yesterday to set forth. I hope he is satisfied now. Now I want to make some reference to further remarks of the hon. gentleman. He took up considerable time in discussing what he had already discussed in this House on previous occasions, that is, the injunction which he took against the proceedings in regard to the making up of the voters' lists He did not take that on behalf of anybody, he took it as an elector of the riding. Now the hon. member referred in the course of his remarks to the finding of the judge. He cannot assume that Judge Meredith, in view of his general standing, would not be eminently fair to my hon. friend if there was a justification. The finding of the judge was that the proceedings instituted by the federal authorities were perfectly legal. Now what was the position of my hon. friend ? I think he made a mistake on that occasion, perhaps he does not realize it now, but I think he will realize it. What did he undertake to do ? He undertook to disfranchise a large number of voters, he undertook to prevent a preparation of new lists in order that lists more than a year old should be used at the elections, and that a large number of men who were entitled to vote should be deprived of their franchise. Well, I do not think that was a proper course for the hon. gentleman to take, but I suppose he used his own judgment in that regard. Now I just wish to read to the House some of the questions which the hon. gentleman read yesterday, and which he asked this enumerator. Before I do so, I may say that the impression the hon. gentleman left on my mind, and perhaps on the minds of other members was that he did not think that a lumber camp was the proper place to hold the polls, he did not think that a labourer in a lumber camp was entitled to vote. If he was a farmer or something of that kind, he might be put on the list. But holding a revision, sending out an enumerator in order to give the lumbermen a right to vote and holding a poll where they could cast their votes, why that was an enormous thing. If the hon. gentleman's argument had any point at all, that was the point to which it tended. Now here are his questions :

Do you know any people in the township?

Mr. BOYCE. That is in the examination which I quoted, I did not conduct that examination.

Mr. CONMEE. Then I will have to direct my remarks to the man who did. Somebody conducted this examination on behalf of my hon. friend. But my hon. friend fathered it ; he approved of it for he read it to us yesterday as a condemnation of the Bill. I do not see how he can escape. If he repudiates it now I will give him credit for having good common sense for once.

Q. Do you know any of the people in that township?—A. No.

Again :

You have never been there.

Again :

Are you personally acquainted with any of the voters?

Again :

What are they doing?

Again :

Do you know what they went up there to do?

Again :

And on the whole list there are only some three or four men whose names you recognize?

Again :

And all the men in that list are working in McFadden & Malloy's camp?

Again :

And there is not a single farmer or settler or anything other than a lumberman whose name is on that list?

Again :

And in that list there is not a single farmer or settler put down?

Again :

And there are none such there that you know of?

Again :

Nothing but a wood road from Garden river?

Continuing the same line of questions :

Q. Whose camps are those in the township of Curtis?—A. Miller & McCool.

Then my hon. friend directs his remarks particularly to my hon. friend from Nipissing (Mr. McCool). What are we to infer from these questions ?—that the gentlemen who were labouring in these camps were not entitled to the franchise, are not many of them farmers' sons very largely and the residents of towns and villages, some of the very best citizens of this country, men who compose largely our volunteers and who, if we were involved to-morrow, would perhaps be the first upon the firing line. Are they to be deprived of their votes, or are they to be belittled in the manner in which they are in these questions ? Does the hon. member want this House or the country to understand that because that kind of a man was trying to get his name on the list and was trying to poll his vote this government is to be condemned and this measure is to be defeated because they gave him the opportunity ? Well, I will leave that for my hon. friend to reflect upon.

Now, I wish to discuss for a moment another clause of the Bill. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) took strong exception to clause 17 on account of the words in the section that a ballot should not be rejected because of any writing, number or mark placed thereon by any deputy returning officer. The hon. member went on to make a strong statement and he said that :

—we are face to face with this situation; that when it is desired that the vote of any particular elector shall be known, and the manner in which he marks his ballot shall be known, the deputy returning officer can mark upon it, 'This is John Smith's ballot,' and that will be an absolutely good ballot.

I differ from my hon. friend in that regard. I can hardly believe that he was in earnest. Does he really believe that the returning officer can write such a declaration upon the ballot, that it would be permitted, that he could escape punishment and that the ballot would be held to be a good ballot ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What can he write upon it ?

Mr. CONMEE. He cannot write anything upon it. I do not think my hon. friend believes he can write anything upon it.

Mr. BOYCE. What does the Act say ?

Mr. CONMEE. The Act does not say so.

Mr. BOYCE. Does it not say any writing ?

Mr. CONMEE. It is not to be construed in that sense. It means any inadvertent word or mark.

Mr. BOYCE. If my hon. friend would read the Act——

Mr. CONMEE. I have read the Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not see that the word 'inadvertent' was used in the section.

Mr. CONMEE. I did not say that it is. but I say that any person reading it and exercising ordinary judgment, such as the hon. gentleman usually does, would read it in that way.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If it means that would it not be better to say that ?

Mr. CONMEE. Well, if it meant that or if that was the intention, but I cannot argue it on that ground because I cannot assume that that was the intention. We are face to face with a difficulty as the hon. gentleman has stated. What is the difficulty ? The difficulty is to get a secret ballot. I claim that this is a secret ballot. I want to point out to my hon. friend that there is a very great evil existing. I do not think he is so innocent that he does not know of hundreds and thousands of ballots have been destroyed in this country because a mark was put on them. Now, is that right ? Is it right that the returning officer should have it in his power to make a mark upon his ballot and disfranchise my hon. friend. Suppose he went into a polling booth and a returning officer chose to put a mark on his ballot with the result that his ballot would be thrown out ? There is an abundance of evidence that this has been done, that it has been done to a very large extent and done by friends of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I think I can give him a little piece of evidence about that. If I am not mistaken there is a name, or two, here that some of my hon. friends will recognize as soon as it is mentioned. The manner of conducting elections heretofore under the Franchise Act, even at the time when the lists were prepared by the revising barristers when the party of the hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, was most unsatisfactory. A great many frauds were committed, thousands of ballots were destroyed and thousands of men were disfranchised because of the dishonesty or carelessness of the returning officers. The object of this section is to do away with that evil. If hon. gentlemen say that the remedy is worse than the evil that is a matter for discussion but it is not fair criticism to argue that any officer could deli-

berately make a mark by which any man's ballot could be identified. If that is not a criminal act at the present time, it would be our duty, in passing this Act, to make it so and put a stop to that kind of work in elections. I think that hon. gentlemen opposite will remember Mr. Freeborn who has a history in the province of Manitoba. He went to that province and gave certain instructions, and I shall not detain the House to narrate his exploits in the Manitoba elections, but they were aired in the court and this gentleman was punished for wrong-doing in the election in that province in regard to how ballots might be destroyed by a little lead pencil fastened under the finger nails with beeswax, how a mark upon the ballot made when the scrutineer's eyes were not on him would spoil a ballot, and how marked ballots for the Conservatives could be substituted for Liberal ballots when the boxes were taken home. Now, I might make a comparison between the number of spoiled ballots in the elections of 1896 and the number of spoiled ballots in the election of 1900, and it will be remembered that the election of 1896 was conducted under the Conservative government and the elections of 1900 under the Liberal government. Here are a few of the results as to spoiled ballots.

	1896.	1900.
Spoiled ballots.		
Durham East	591	6
Elgin East	99	32
Essex North	96	38
Grey North	125	37
Hastings East	70	25
Hastings West	80	27
Huron South	70	8
Kent	189	47
Kingston	215	33
Lambton West	70	19
Lincoln and Niagara	135	47
London	296	47
Middlesex South	100	23
Muskoka and Parry Sound	175	58
Perth South	129	14
Prince Edward	115	25
Russell	72	22
Simcoe East	93	23
Victoria South	78	29
Waterloo South	164	28
Wellington South	101	31
Wentworth South	304	50

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the hon. gentleman who spoiled all these ballots?

Mr. CONMEE. That is just what I am leading up to. I will tell my hon. friend who spoiled them. I will not say the deputy returning officer spoiled them all, but I ask my hon. friend if he believes that this number of ballots was spoiled by the electors.

Mr. BLAIN. I would suppose so.

Mr. CONMEE. Well, the hon. gentleman is more innocent than I thought he was. Perhaps he has not the experience in elections that I thought he had. I submit that the disparity in spoiled ballots between 1896 and 1900 is too great to lead to the assumption that these ballots were accidentally spoiled. I think any one will admit that. Now, there is a case in Wentworth I think, where for the want of the initials of the returning officer a member lost his seat in this House, a new election had to take place, the courts had to be appealed to, and all kinds of difficulty occurred in connection with the ballot papers. I have not studied very closely the Bill before the House, but I submit that the franchise law of this country should enable every man who wants to cast an honest vote to do so without it being in the power of any officer whether honest or dishonest to spoil his ballot and disfranchise him. I do not need to argue that evils exist in our elections. A man can draw upon his imagination, and he can assume that all kinds of trickery and—to borrow a word from my hon. friend from North Toronto—all kinds of deviltry may enter into these elections.

Mr. PATERSON. Did you say that?

Mr. FOSTER. It is an expressive word.

Mr. CONMEE. If I wished to take up the time of the House I could go on to show county after county where friends of the Conservatives have perpetrated irregularities and worse; and where the courts have pronounced in the most decisive manner against the acts done by them. Take the case of South Ontario where Mr. Smith admitted he had expended $1,200 for bribery and when his solicitor remarked to Mr. Justice Osler that Mr. Smith's evidence was candid, the reply of the judge was that it was brazen; and the judge condemned in the strongest manner Mr. Smith who was an ex-Conservative member of this House. I do not pretend to say that there have not been Liberals here and there who have misconducted themselves in elections, for we know that men will go to greater extremes in these times than under ordinary circumstances, but I do say that the records of our courts show that more Conservatives than Liberals have been unseated for corruption. So that our friends have not such great honour to take to themselves in that regard. I believe that a case for the passage of this Bill has been made out. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) has shown us that 400 men were disfranchised by the manipulation of the officials. I do not know just who is responsible for that but it seems to me that the responsibility rests largely on the administration of the province of Manitoba. We have seen from the records the very great evils that have grown out of the present system. There is the fact of the preparation of the lists at the present moment, in regard to the provincial elections, in the unorganized territories in Ontario. My hon. friend will

hear more about that later on. There is the case as against the operation of the present law which was made out by the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Boyce). He makes the strongest complaint against it, that the time was not sufficient, that there was not that responsibility which there should have been, and in other ways that great injustice might have been done on that occasion. I think the hon. member was fairly successful in showing that there was a delay, but he did not state to the House, whether he believes it or not, that the revising officers did not act fairly, that names were improperly inserted or that men were left on who should have been struck off.

I wish to say something about another election to which our hon. friends are fond of referring, that in West Elgin. It seems there was something wrong there. I am not condoning anything that was wrong in West Elgin or elsewhere, but let me say that there is a black page in our history and in the records of the courts in connection with the King's county election in Nova Scotia. That was the greatest piece of political wrong-doing to be found on our records. It will always be a black page in the history of the Conservative party because it was not the work of a few misguided individuals at the time of an election in a particular constituency ; it was the leaders of the Conservative party in this House who, by deliberate action, unseated the man who had a majority of 160 and for two sessions or more kept in the seat the candidate who had been defeated at the polls by that large majority. If the records of this country show anything, to use the words used yesterday, of such enormity as that, I have yet to learn of it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I never heard of that in King's county, N.S.

Mr. CONMEE. I may have made a mistake, it should have been King's county, N.B. Perhaps the hon. member would like to make a little lawyer's quibble about the name of the place.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is everything in a name.

Mr. CONMEE. I do not blame him a bit for wanting to escape from it. I do not know whether he was responsible for it or not but if he was he is all the more to blame. I have here the record of that case.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. member must lay on the table of the House the document from which he is about to quote.

Mr. CONMEE. I have no objection to giving my hon. friend the document if he wishes to see it. It may do him good, he may have forgotten. Perhaps he would like to have this other document laid on the table as I am now referring to an election in Algoma between the Hon. William Macdonald and S. J. Dawson in 1892.

Mr. HAGGART. Oh, oh.

Mr. CONMEE. I notice the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) is amused. He thinks that is going back a long way. Perhaps it is, but we have to go back, our honoured friends have had no chance for this kind of rascality of late. They are just as willing, I believe, as they were then. I do not think my hon. friend has repented, if he has I would be glad to know it. I do not see any hon. gentlemen opposite sitting in sackcloth and ashes because of their sins of the past.

I shall repeat a statement I made in the legislature a good many years ago in regard to that election, that the conduct of that election was one of the greatest outrages that could be perpetrated upon the rights of the citizens of any electoral district. What was the condition ? The contractors had control of the trains between Winnipeg and Port Arthur. On the west end of the line there was a contracting firm, Manning, Macdonald & Company. On the east end, there was a company, Purcell, Ryan, Genty & Marks. The election came on and these contractors would not permit any scrutineers to go on the trains. There was no such thing as a list up there, that would have been too much trouble. The returning officers were taken up, the navvies were gathered up, and they polled them first at one polling booth and then at another, over and over again. One persistent man did turn up as a scrutineer at one of the polling booths and as he was asserting his rights and there was some difficulty in getting rid of him, they adopted another plan ; they picked up the poll books and the returning officer, they put the returning officer on the train, left the scrutineer at the booth alone and went to another camp and polled the votes up there. But that is not all, they resorted to the old practice of the Conservative party. At Rat Portage, now Kenora, they brought in about 300 men who formed a circle around the poll and unless the voter was going to vote Conservative, he did not get through the circle. The only way the Liberals got their vote in was by forming in bodies and forcing their way through That was under the auspices of Manning, Macdonald & Company. I think the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) could tell the House and the country who comprised that company, it was stated that he was a member of it. I do not, of course, pretend for a moment that he had anything to do with this affair at Rat Portage, in fact I know he had not and that he was not there; but the fact remains that these were the tactics used on that occasion. That is not, I admit, an argument much in favour of the passage of this Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CONMEE. Or against it. What I want to point out is that if my hon. friends wish to attack administrative action and wrong-doing of this kind in the past, they must remember that they are not invulnerable, they are living in a glass house. Just as much if not more scandal can be directed to my hon. friends than can be directed to this side of the House. I submit that sufficient grounds have been shown to warrant the passage of this Bill. There is a sufficiently strong manipulation of wrong conditions of affairs to warrant the passage of this Bill. In the western provinces there are no lists at all prepared, and nobody has so far contended that there should not be lists there. In Manitoba, the manipulation of the lists under the present local government justifies our interferences. In Ontario I submit the same condition exists. Then there is the desirability of recently prepared lists. Under these circumstances, therefore, the enactment is, in my humble judgment, perfectly justifiable. I do not say that the law as submitted is perfect; I have only glanced over it slightly, but I say that an enactment of that kind is timely and necessary, and when the measure comes before the committee, no doubt the minister who introduced it will be quite prepared to accept any reasonable amendment. I can only say that I hope hon. gentlemen will realize that the Bill is not intended to place power in the hands of any set of officials and enable them to do wrong. But of course if the returning officer is dishonest, if the scrutineers will violate their oaths of office, if the men appointed to conduct the poll will perjure themselves, no ballot system you can devise will be perfect. I do not know what machinery you can devise which will make men honest, and hon. gentlemen opposite assume that the officials appointed are bound to act dishonestly. I submit, however, that the record of the Reform party in Ontario has been such that as a whole the elections conducted under their administration have been honestly conducted—that they have been purer under Liberal than under Conservative administrations. And I have sufficient confidence in the present government to believe that if this Bill be passed and the machinery provided by it put in motion, we shall have much better opportunity for free voting than we would otherwise. I cannot conceive that any administration would fail to use every precaution to see that the Act is fairly administered and that above all things there is a fair and equitable arrangement for getting voters upon the lists and having the lists revised by independent officers, against whose conduct there can be no ground for fault-finding. That is the condition of things which we ought to have, and which I think we will have when this enactment comes in force.

Mr. CONMEE.

Mr. WILLIAM J. ROCHE (Marquette). I have followed with great interest the various speeches delivered on this Bill—presumably on this Bill—by the members on the government side and have listened in vain to find them point out any provision in the Bill before us which is going to remedy the grievances which they claim now exist in connection with the preparation of the lists, more especially in British Columbia and Manitoba. Thus far I have failed to find that any hon. gentleman on the government side has pointed to one expression in any section of the Bill now before us which will in any way remedy those grievances, and we must only conclude that they are largely the figments of their own imagination. I have failed either to find out myself within the four corners of that Bill any remedy for those so-called grievances. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Conmee) might himself have discussed that Bill with possibly some advantage to the House had he felt so inclined. Of course, he accused my hon. friend who preceded him (Mr. Boyce), and who had pointed out fraudulent practices in connection with the preparation of the lists in unorganized districts of Ontario, especially his own constituency, of having made statements which he could not back up with substantial proof. Surely, he asked, if all this crookedness had taken place I would have been aware of the same. Well, I am confident that the hon. gentleman is pretty well acquainted with anything of that character which has taken place, but there may possible have been on some occasions some things that may have escaped his observant eye.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken. The remark I made was that I was not aware of any wrong-doing with regard to the revision of the lists in my own riding.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Then the hon. gentleman was aware of the other wrong-doing referred to?

Mr. CONMEE. Not at all, I did not make any remark with regard to that. The hon. gentleman has quoted me wrongly.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). That was the impression he left on this side at any rate. Nor can I see any provision in this Bill to prevent any member of a local legislature resigning his seat, or at any rate handing in his resignation, for the purpose of contesting a Dominion election, and then after having been rejected by the people in that election returning to the local legislature, acting in collusion with the powers that be, and having his resignation not acted upon and being thus dispensed from submitting his candidature to the people again. That is a serious omission which I am sure the hon. gentleman regrets very much. Nor do I see any provision which will prevent a member slipping out

of the House when question time comes on and embarrassing questions may be asked with reference to a certain guarantee in connection with the Soo district, out of which contractors are supposed to be paid.

Mr. CONMEE. I rise to a point of order. I think the hon. gentleman has referred to myself. If he has, his statement is untrue, and I want him to withdraw it.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I have not said anything about the hon. gentleman. I said that there was nothing in this Bill to prevent any member slipping in and out of the House to avoid embarrassing questions.

Mr. CONMEE. It is clear that the hon. gentleman was referring to myself, and I ask him to withdraw the statement.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). If the hon. gentleman desires to take it to himself, I cannot prevent him. He has seen fit to bring in the name of Mr. Freeborne who has visited Manitoba. I am not here to defend the character of that gentleman, but whatever his character may have been prior to his alliance with the Liberal party, it certainly did not improve afterwards. During the elections in 1896 in Manitoba, acting in concert with one of the deputy returning officers, a Mr. Saunders, he tried to levy blackmail on the Conservative party and failed. And when he was arrested, who was his bondsman? It was Mr. J. G. Rutherford, the Liberal candidate, who went bail for this person of such very low character as depicted by the hon. gentleman.

It is true, he was wise enough to withdraw his bond prior to the bringing of Mr. Freeborn to trial. This same gentleman who had been so closely connected with the Liberal party was accused in the city of Winnipeg of having surreptitiously taken certain articles to himself out of a wholesale drug firm, and was allowed to leave the country—in fact advised to leave the country—with the intimation that if he did so no proceedings would be taken against him by the government led by the present member for Lisgar. I think it comes with a very bad grace from a gentleman who has been supporting the Ross administration in the legislature of Ontario to bring up in this parliament anything about ballot-switching, pencil-lead-under-the-finger-nail and that kind of thing. It was these notorious practices in Ontario that turned the Ross government out of power. They actually had training schools of experts in ballot-switching, ballot-box stuffing, ballot manipulation of every kind; they had men whose duty it was, on the eve of a political contest, to move about from constituency to constituency to train the deputy returning officers in the very practices enumerated by the hon. gentleman. And it was because of these practices that the rightous indignation of the people of Ontario at last rose to flood light, straightforward Liberals joining with Conservatives, and swept that government from power. I am sorry to see the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) is not in his place. But it is a practice of that hon. gentleman, after relieving himself of a speech in the House, to immediately leave his seat and seldom appear for the next week for fear of being set face to face with his own assertions. He did that on the occasion when the voters list question was up in this House a few years ago. And he is doing the same thing now. I should be glad if he were in his place, because there are certain questions I would like to put to him. There are certain transactions of his own when he was leader of the government of Manitoba which I shall discuss whether he is present or absent. His speech on Tuesday was largely a series of reckless assertions, absolutely unfounded in fact. His daring was only surpassed by that of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) in accusing the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) of having filled pages of 'Hansard' with quotations and then himself going on with, not the same kind of quotations, but quotations bearing falsehood on their face, quotations that he should have been ashamed to read in this House—quotations that I mean to refer to before I take my seat.

Now, I would like to ask the government what particular reasons have thus far been assigned by either the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) or any of his colleagues why this Bill should become law? Why disturb the existing condition of affairs, especially in the province of Manitoba? What particular motive have they? What animates them in this driving at the province of Manitoba? It seems the same old practice of this government is to be repeated. Ever since this government came into power, the little province of Manitoba has been subjected to indignities; and, to cap the climax, they are bringing down this nefarious measure, which, I say, and have no hesitation in saying, meets with the condemnation of honest Liberals of that province, as well as of Conservatives. You will search in vain in the speech of the hon. Minister of Justice—who, more properly should be designated the Minister of Injustice—for anything to show the real object of this Bill. There was not a word about that. The hon. gentleman said it was introduced to prevent the recurrence of the 'Thin Red Line' transactions which took place in Manitoba in the elections of 1904. He said that there was overlapping of certain constituencies and that this Bill was designed to remedy the difficulty. But there is not a line in this first section which refers to the overlapping of constituencies; that is dealt with in an entirely different section. The Minister of Justice did not, by one sentence or one word, refer to the

real aim and object of the Bill, namely to take the preparation of the lists entirely out of the hands of the provincial authorities and put it into the hands of their own partisans appointed after the issue of a writ. There is one reason that has been assigned—one of which not much is heard in this House, but which is more often discussed outside the House and by the Liberal party in their press in Manitoba. There are very few of the Liberal newspapers backing up this Bill. Of course, there is the 'Free Press,' the Siftonian organ, the organ of the gentleman whose fine Italian hand can be seen back of this Bill, and who endeavoured to foist on this parliament in 1904 a measure calculated to have the same effect. But we had then, I am glad to say, a Minister of Justice who had more regard for the dignity of his position and was too fair-minded to slaughter the Conservative party in Manitoba as that Bill was intended to do and objected to having such a measure brought before this parliament. And the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) must have acquiesced in the decision of his Minister of Justice of that time or the Bill would have been introduced. It is said that the lists in Manitoba are not up to date. But in that province we have, and have had for years, an annual revision. If the elections take place this autumn before November, what will happen ? As pointed out by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) the elections will be held, so far as Ontario is concerned, upon the lists of 1907 : but in the province of Manitoba we shall have lists prepared up to July, 1908. That punctures the argument with reference to having lists up to date. It has been said also that the lists are not made by municipal clerks, and this is given as a reason why the preparation of the lists should be taken in hand by the Dominion government. Does this Bill provide that the lists shall be prepared by the municipal clerks ? Is that grievance going to be remedied, if grievance it be ? Where is the section of this Bill that provides for the compilation of lists by municipal clerks ? I defy any one to point it out. Why, under this Bill, the lists are to be prepared in the same way as provided shorty after the Franchise Act was placed on the statute-book—not exactly the same, because the Greenway administration was in power at that time and provided the way in which the lists were not prepared. But the lists were not prepared by municipal clerks. Only in one election in Manitoba were the lists so prepared, and that was in a by-election, this method of preparing lists being directed by the Greenway government themselves as an experiment. In the Portage elections, the lists were prepared by the municipal clerks. And the provincial premier of that time, the present member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway), stated, both in the legislature and on the public platform that we never had as bad lists in Manitoba as those that were prepared by the municipal clerks. That is the testimony of the hon. member for Lisgar, and I am surprised—well, perhaps I had better put it that I am not surprised that the hon. gentleman did not defend that way of preparing the lists ; for he was manly enough to state that he desired to see the lists for the whole Dominion prepared under the direction of the Dominion authorities. We are not taking exception to this principle as laid down by the hon. member for Lisgar ; and it is useless for the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) to quote what the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) said some years ago, when the present Franchise Act was adopted by this parliament, that we were in favour of having lists throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion prepared under Dominion supervision. So far as I am concerned, I do not think that the Conservative party has receded from that position. We believe that the Dominion lists should be prepared under Dominion authority in every province in the Dominion. But we do not believe in having ostensibly a system under which the lists are prepared by the provincial authorities and then singling out provinces where the Conservatives are in power, and in these provinces taking the lists under the purview of officers appointed by the Dominion government. It has been stated, stated outside this House, I understand, that some members of the government party are none too anxious to see this Bill pressed. They do not invite discussion, they see that they are placed in an awkward position, they object to hearing quotations from the speeches of their leaders, as my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) quoted the other day. These quotations are very embarrassing, they show what a volte face they are making in connection with the preparation of these lists ; and overtures, I understand, have been made that if we will only allow this Act to apply to the province of Manitoba, the provisions relating to British Columbia and the unorganized districts of Ontario and Quebec will be dropped. What then becomes of their argument about the lists being made by municipal clerks ? Are they made by municipal clerks in the province of British Columbia? Where they made by municipal clerks in 1898 in either of the provinces? It shows the animus, it shows the object, it shows who is behind the Bill, when they are not willing to drop the provisions in respect to Manitoba but are willing to drop them in reference to the other provinces.

It has been stated that we have not sufficient registration booths in the local ridings at the time of the revision of the lists. Let any person take up the Manitoba 'Gazette' of this year and he will see that they have splendid conveniences afforded. I will not

say that in every local constituency there is a registration booth in every polling division, but in almost every polling division there are one or more places for registration in nearly every local constituency. There are from six to twenty places provided in each constituency throughout the province containing those forty constituencies. Some person, I think it was the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) stated, though he did not state it of his own knowledge, I think the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Jackson) stated, that people had to travel 100 miles for the purpose of registering. I challenge that statement. I have gone over the lists, I have taken the map, in company with my colleagues, and we have marked the places where there are registration booths enumerated in the Manitoba 'Gazette' of 1908, and we find there are registration booths situated as far north as the Berens river, within 30 miles of the northern boundary of the province, and north of which, according to the last census, there were only 10 people living in the province. Why, that place is splendidly provided with registration booths. But I will refer to this later on.

The hon. member for Lisgar stated that there were great difficulties in dividing the lists according to the various constituencies. Taking his own constituency of Mountain, he said that the post office addresses were not included there ; and the Minister of Justice also said there was no proper designation, that is, they were not enumerated as to where their residence was. I have before me the local electors' list for the constituency of Mountain. It is true that in many instances there are no post office addresses given, but the section, the township and the range of every man on that list are put down. What better designation would you have ? The section, the township, the range and the occupation. And the registration clerks are local men, not men such as were used in the West Elgin contest, bearing fictitious names, assumed names, going in there to act in a wrongful manner ; but they are local men, who are acquainted with local conditions, who know the people, who know their post office addresses in these local constituencies, and there is very little trouble either in notifying those who are on the list, or in dividing the list according to the constituencies as put down by section, township and range. For instance, here is James Armstrong, resident in section 21, township 1, range 11. John Jones, residence, Crystal City, occupation, blacksmith, post office, Crystal City. Robert Black residence, section 14, township 2, range 11. And so on, every name being designated on the list according to where he resides, his post office or section—in every instance the section, but not in every instance the post office. But even that has been remedied by the present Act, which provides that in every case in the future the post office shall be given. That was done last year. I have here the registration that took place last year in the various constituencies of the province. Here are the voters' lists, with the additions and subtractions last year. Every man on the last year's list, every man who is going on this year's list, it is provided in the Act must have his residence, his occupation and his post office address stated.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Does the hon. gentleman say that on last year's list the post office address of every man is given?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I have the list here, one after another.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. It is only those who are added.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Well, the revision took place last year.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Only those that were added, though.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). You do not want those given who were taken off, do you ? Look at the additions and the subtractions. We have now almost a complete list, a complete new list. The hon. member for Lisgar dwelt on that subject yesterday ; he said our list was so many years old. But looking at all the additions subtractions that have been made last year, the year before and this year again, we will have almost a complete new list.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Not one-tenth of them.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I do not think the hon. gentleman has examined the list very closely. Now the Minister of Justice has stated as a reason why this Bill should pass, that we have in Manitoba ten constituencies for the Dominion and forty constituencies for the provincial legislature, and that there must be of necessity overlapping. Did not this occur when the Franchise Act of 1898 was adopted, only more so ? Then we only had seven seats for the Dominion, but we had forty provincial constituencies all the same. Do not they have the same thing in British Columbia ? Do not they have the same thing in the province of Ontario ? You will find overlapping in the old province of Ontario, you will find it in the constituency of West Hastings, you will find it in the city of Toronto, you will find it in Hamilton. If you are going to use that as an argument for new lists, then you would have to apply it to almost every province in the Dominion. Why then do you single out Manitoba ?

The Minister of Justice stated that the trouble arose from the registration districts in the province of Manitoba, that these differ from the polling subdivisions, and that therefore there would of necessity have to

be a dividing of the lists, and of necessity some errors would creep in. Even that which he claims to have existed formerly, and which he failed to say does not exist to-day, has been done away with. The registration districts, in almost every instance, admitted by the Minister of Justice, were coterminus with the polling subdivisions. To-day we have no registration districts as provided for originally, but the registration takes place according to the provincial polling subdivisions. So there can be no grievance whatever on that score, no excuse whatever for an Act of this character.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I propose for a few minutes to refer to the provisions of the Act as it was when the present government came into power in Manitoba, and compare it with the provisions of the Act as they exist to-day. How were the lists prepared in days gone by when the hon. member for Lisgar was premier of the province? In the first place, there were registration clerks, partisan appointees of the government, just as this government intends to provide partisan officials to revise the lists if this Bill becomes law. Who were those registration clerks? Were they the very best men that would be found in the various local subdivisions? Not at all. They were men selected because of their party services. They were selected because they were the political henchmen of the government and some of them had to fly the country for the country's good. That is the class of men they selected to act as registration clerks in the various subdivisions of that province in days gone by. They also took the power of appointing revising barristers who were members of the Liberal party sent out to the various constituencies and they did not even have to take an oath that they would discharge their duties faithfully and well, but they went out through the country and acted in the most arbitrary manner in many instances—I will not say in all because there were amongst them some straightforward men and they afforded some few exceptions to the general rule. But the government of the day had the lists prepared entirely by these registration clerks and revised by their own revising barristers. Now, the registration clerk of that day differed from the registration clerk of to-day in this way: The registration clerk then prepared or made up the lists. The registration clerk to-day does not do anything of the kind. I am going to prove that before I take my seat. The registration clerk, under the law as it formerly stood, had to take the last provincial list, the last Dominion list and the last municipal list and from these compile a new list. The power was given to him to compile a list but it was under a later provision in the law that he did his funny work and which enabled him to avail himself of 'such other information as he can secure.' He was to take these various lists and 'such other information as he could secure' to make up the new lists. How did that work out? He took the provincial list, he took the Dominion list and he took the municipal list, he put down the names of those whom he pleased and men who had been old residenters, men who had voted in municipal, provincial and Dominion elections for years were left off the lists by the various registration clerks in different constituencies. The registration clerk could not be punished for doing that. He did that and in my own constituency my experience was this: I handed in a statutory declaration stating that the names of certain qualified electors should be included in the list and notwithstanding the fact that these sworn declarations were put in in some instances the names were left off. The law provided that parties desiring to add new names to the lists could do so by submitting statutory declarations. How in practice, did it work out? A liberal could go and hand in a list of names as long as your arm without accompanying it by a single statutory declaration. I know that of my own personal knowledge. When these hon. gentlemen claim that we have not sufficient courts of revision, there being only one court of revision in each constituency, I may tell them that there was only one court of revision in my constituency in 1899 and that there were not as many registration booths as we have to-day under the Roblin Act. The registration clerks took the lists handed in by the Liberals and the Liberal candidates and they put the names on the voters' lists without asking for any sworn declaration whatever, but the name of no Conservative could be got on those lists without having it accompanied by a sworn declaration, and, in some instances, even then we could not have names put on. A revising barrister, a lawyer from the city of Winnipeg held the court of revision in my constituency and, having tried to have certain names put on and these names having been left off, I asked an explanation from the registration clerk. I said: Was it not your duty to take the last lists, to compile your lists from these and to take any statutory declarations that were handed in? Yes, he said, but the Act also told me that I was to secure any other information I could. I said: Where did you get this information? I pointed to the Liberal candidate and I added: There is the author of the information you got and you took this gentleman's word that the persons whose names we had tendered were not qualified electors before you would take a statutory declaration. The revising barrister had to condemn this proceeding in my presence and in the presence of the Liberal candidate and other members of the Liberal

party. He could secure any other information! the Liberal candidate, or some of his friends, would tell the registration clerk that certain of these names should be left off and he left them off ignoring the statutory declaration. That is what we were up against in days gone by and still the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) rises in his place in this House and, in stentorian tones, condemns the administration of the present Act and condemns the Act almost in its entirety. The revising barristers of those days were, with a few exceptions, partisan officials, largely Liberal lawyers, sent out from the city of Winnipeg, or from some other portion of the province.

An hon. MEMBER. Was there no appeal ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). No, there was no appeal whatever, the revising barrister had the last say and once these names were on the list it was almost impossible to get them off, loaded up as the lists were with fictitious names and loaded up with names of men who were in many instances non-existent. Why, when you went up against the revising barrister what did he say ? Have you served notice on these men that you are appealing against ? —and if we could not prove that we had served notice on a man who did not live in the constituency at all, or on a man who was non-existent, if we could not prove that these people had received personal notification that an appeal had been taken against them, the revising barrister would not strike them off the list. So you see what a difficult proposition it was to get names struck off when once they were on the list. The elections of 1892, of 1896 and of 1899 held in the province of Manitoba were all on lists of that kind. No wonder that the Conservative party were in the minority on each occasion ! The Liberals of Manitoba carried those elections upon those three occasions with stuffed voters' lists and yet the hon. gentleman who was in power when this system was in operation comes here and condemns the present method which is as fair to the Liberals as to the Conservatives, a fact which will be testified to by the honest Liberals in the province of Manitoba. Why, Sir, in the province of Manitoba in the year 1899 what do you suppose it cost the Conservatives to purge the lists ? We set out with the idea that we would have clean lists in that province at all costs and thousands and thousands of dollars were spent by the Conservative party in order to purge the lists that were made by these registration clerks. One gentleman in public life in Manitoba has estimated that it cost the Conservative party, in 1899, $30,000, which appears a fabulous sum but I can readily understand why such an amount of money had to be spent in order to secure evidence to get the names of qualified electors on the lists and to secure the removal of names improperly on the lists. During that time how many names do you suppose were struck off by the Conservative party at the courts of revision notwithstanding the difficulties that we encountered ? No less than 5,446 names were struck off at the various courts of revision after the lists were made up by their registration clerks and they at the same time knocked off 1,925 names. What a wonderful difference that was ! No wonder that we were in opposition for so many years when voters' lists prepared in the manner I have described were used at the elections and when we did not conduct ourselves with so much energy at the courts of revision as we did upon that occasion. I will give an instance of how it resulted in one constituency. In the city of Winnipeg, the Liberal registration clerk was supposed to take the last lists and take the names of all those who were qualified electors in compiling the new list. It happened that in the employ of the Ogilvie Milling Company there were thirty-three men and that in compiling the new list the names of thirty of these employees were left off and the names of three employees were placed upon the list. The three were Grits and the thirty were Conservatives. The thirty Conservatives were left off out of thirty-three employees and when the registration clerk was taken to task and asked before the revising barrister for an explanation of how he got these three names and how he excluded the thirty he had to admit that he took an old scrutineer's book which had been marked in favour of the Liberal candidate at the previous election. That is the character of their Act. It permitted them to take not only the municipal, Dominion and provincial lists but also to take scrutineers' books as they had been marked in favour of a Liberal candidate and to use them in the preparation of the lists. I am going to read to you what took place in the constituency represented by the present member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows):

In that constituency there were I presume more flagrant practices than in almost any other constituency. The Conservatives brought the matter to court but the court decided it had no jurisdiction. On two occasions at least in that constituency they loaded up the voters' lists, and on one occasion they brought in railway navvies who were not competent to vote according to law, and it was impossible to get these names off. The Conservative organizer was sent out to examine into the condition of things that existed in that constituency and what did he find ? He was interviewed when he returned to the city of Winnipeg and I will read an extract from the 'Winnipeg Telegram,' of May 24, 1899 to show the practices in that constituency.

W. H. Hastings, the organizer of the Liberal-Conservative party, returned to the city last evening from Dauphin, where he had been called by the local leaders of the party to confer regarding the remarkable course taken by the registration clerk of that district in preparing the local voters' list. Mr. Hastings was seen by a representative of the 'Telegram' and asked for a statement regarding the causes that have led the Conservatives of that district to object to the action of the clerk, and in reply stated that he had gone to Dauphin at the express request of the party there to ascertain the exact state of affairs, and, he continued, 'while I expected to hear that the clerk had acted in partisan manner in the preparation of the lists, I did not expect to hear of such outrageous conduct upon the part of a public official, acting in direct contravention of the statutes under which he was appointed; the partisan conduct of this official was, judging from the reliable information I received, of such a nature that the Conservative party of that district will not rest until they have obtained or at least gone to the extreme limit in endeavouring to obtain, from the courts of the province, a decision which will place them in a position to get something like a fair and honest list for that district.

'Abundant evidence can be produced,' Mr. Hastings said, 'to show that the clerk when he first opened his office, made a start at making up a list, but after working on it, at short intervals, for a couple of days, he suddenly ceased working, and with the single exception of one day, when he added a few more names, the list remained in that unfinished, almost unstarted condition, at midnight on May 16, when he announced the list closed. Evidence can also be produced to prove that the clerk put in his time, during office hours, reading novels and absolutely refused to add names to his list, even when the sworn applications were handed him and requests made to place the names upon the list. It can also be shown that when parties called at his office and requested to have their names added to the list, he would ask the party if his name was on either the last local or the last municipal list, and if he received an affirmative answer he would say to the party "all right, your name will be on the list," but he did not upon such occasions, search such local or municipal lists to ascertain whether such name was on or not; he did not enter the name of such applicant upon the list, did not take applications from them, and made no notice or memorandum regarding such person's request.

'It can be proven that upon one occasion a qualified elector demanded that the clerk add his name to the list and upon the clerk refusing to do so, the elector intimated that he would stay until his name was added, to which the clerk replied "If it was four o'clock I would throw you out of this office." Another party, living in the town of Dauphin, made personal application to have his name added, and told the clerk he did not want any mistake made in regard to the matter, as he had been left off the list upon two previous occasions. In reply he was politely informed by the clerk that he was sure his name would be on all right, as Sandy McPherson was making up the town list and would, no doubt, put his name on; but the clerk made no entry, took no application, or gave the party any further satisfaction than "the town list was being made by Sandy McPherson." McPherson, by the way, was the registration clerk four years ago, and made himself famous at that time by spending the hours from 4 p.m. until midnight of the last day for receiving applications secreted in a hay-mow, in order, it is said, to avoid meeting Conservatives who might have some sworn applications to hand him.

Mr. Hastings stated several other questionable movements, one of which was that the clerk made no attempt during office hours to make up a list, except as previously mentioned, and he publicly stated that he would not make up a list until after May 16, and in the meantime all he would do was to receive applications from those who wished to file such with him. He kept all applications filed with him in a large tin box, and every night this tin box, or the contents thereof, were taken over to the office of the local member, Mr. Burrows, where the Grit committee met in nightly conference. Further that the Liberals put in no formal applications with the clerk during office hours from the time the office opened until three minutes to midnight on the last day, when a large bundle, alleged to have been a bundle of applications, were handed to the clerk. The Conservatives present demanded the right to inspect this bundle to ascertain if it contained applications or not, but the clerk refused this request and placed the whole bundle with the applications that had been previously filed by the Conservatives, and a very few that had at intervals been made out by the clerk. At 12 o'clock midnight he declared his list closed, when asked 'where is your list?' he replied placing his hand upon the bundle of alleged applications filed with him three minutes previously, and said 'this is my list.' On the 17th of May, Mr. Hastings said the clerk removed his office to another building and obtained the services of four well-known Grits and started to work making out a list and they are still employed upon that work. The clerk handed over each day's work to the printer, but the Conservatives are not allowed to inspect the work, nor do they know who is on or who will be left off. What he will attempt to impose upon the district of Dauphin as the printed copy of the list of electors, continued Mr. Hastings, is unknown. In fact, one of the men he has employed, when asked what they were doing, replied that they were making up the voters' list now, while the clerk himself has publicly stated he did not intend to make up his list until after May 16.

The action of the clerk in this district had been such that the Conservatives of Dauphin will not submit to it in silence, and Mr. Hastings intimates that an action will, without doubt, be taken by them to have the whole list set aside, and from the result of this action the public will be able to judge whether there is anything like fair play and justice to be had in the preparation of a voters' list under the Manitoba Election Act, which has been placed upon the statutes by the Greenway government, especially when a clerk makes up his mind, as the Dauphin clerk evidently did, that Conservatives or in-

dependent men should not be endowed with the privilege of exercising the franchise.

That is the manner in which these lists are made up during the time of the Greenway regime.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What year was that.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. In 1899.

Mr. BURROWS. Was not that list printed and published and was it not revised afterwards ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Certainly, and as I said a few minutes ago the lists were revised by Liberal revising barristers and the lists were so loaded up with fictitious names that it was impossible to get them off.

Mr. BURROWS. Was not the list published and a court of revision held ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I am not denying there was a court of revision held presided over by a Liberal partisan, but it was impossible to serve many of these men with these notices because they were non-existent and could not be found.

Mr. BURROWS. Was ever a complaint made by any citizen of Dauphin against that list as not being a fair list ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I am sorry I have not the list that was made out the next year because the House would see the vast difference between the two lists and the hundreds of names that were struck off that list to purge it and make it right.

Mr. BURROWS. When the election took place I had 103 majority in the town of Dauphin, and there was no complaint made about the list and there was no reason for any complaint.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. There was so much complaint that in 1899 the provincial legislature annulled that list, and there was a special revision in which there were hundreds of names stricken off that list. The hon. member for Lisgar stated yesterday that what he termed certain grievances which he enumerated should be wiped off the statutes, and I say that any law that would permit the kind of thing I have here referred to should be wiped off the statutes. Hugh John Macdonald pledged himself all through the province in 1899 that one of the first acts of his administration would be to wipe out the Franchise Act and Hugh John Macdonald, honourable man that he is, kept his word and did so the first session. This was not condemned by Conservatives alone. There was in the legislature at that time a gentleman named Fisher. Who was he? He was a gentleman who had contested South Perth, Ontario, on at least two occasions as the Liberal candidate, a gentleman who for a long time was president of the Provincial Liberal Association of Manitoba, a gentleman who broke away from his party in the legislature because of just such transactions as this. When this law was being placed on the statutes, he condemned it and termed it a monstrosity of monstrosities. That expression came not from the lips of a Conservative but from the lips of a friend of hon. gentlemen opposite. There is a plank in the platform of the Liberal party dealing with the franchise which I wish to place before the House. That plank, adopted in the year 1893, in convention assembled in the city of Ottawa, reads as follows :

Oppose the Dominion Franchise Act—favour the Provincial Franchise.

That the Franchise Act since its introduction has cost the Dominion treasury over a million of dollars, besides entailing a heavy expenditure to both political parties;

That each revision involves an additional expenditure of a further quarter of a million;

That this expenditure has prevented an annual revision, as originally intended, in the absence of which young voters entitled to the franchise have, in numerous instances, been prevented from exercising their natural rights;

That it has failed to secure uniformity, which was the principal reason assigned for its introduction;

That it has produced gross abuses by partisan revising barristers appointed by the government of the day;

That its provisions are less liberal than those already existing in many provinces of the Dominion, and that in the opinion of this convention the Act should be repealed, and we should revert to the Provincial Franchise.

I defy any hon. member of this House who has any regard for his word to go over, plank by plank, the platform adopted in 1893 and point to one single plank that has been implemented by way of legislation in which they have kept their faith with the people save and except the Franchise Act, and now they are going to break that, they are bringing in an Act to partially abolish it. Their supporters, especially from the west, were really astonished that they should have attempted to implement this one plank of their platform by legislation and to keep faith with the people even in one instance. I shall quote an expression of opinion from a leading public organ in regard to the Franchise Act of Manitoba of years ago. I quote from the 'Free Press' of Winnipeg before it came under the sinister influence of the ex-Minister of the Interior. In the issue of July 11, 1892, I find :

The registration clerk at Morris has compiled a fraudulent list in the interests of the government, most probably at the direct instance of the government, and doubtless in the expectation that his rascally work would be aided and abetted by the revising officers. The registration clerk in Beautiful Plains in suspicious harmony with the action of his Morris confrère has deliberately refused to enter a large number of names that have been lawfully

tendered him. Names by the scores have been left off the lists of the three Winnipegs through the arbitrary action of the registration clerks, and others put on that it is alleged had no right to be registered. There have been frauds of a similar nature in other constituencies. It is expected that the opposition will quietly submit to the outrages. Is there any great sin in raising a clamour over the frauds themselves, or the men who are guilty of them?

These registration clerks, who are appointed to perform the necessary clerical labour in preparing the lists, are assuming the functions of revising officers and deciding for themselves what names shall go on. They are doing this, not because they believe they have the right of judgment in the matter, but because if they were not to do it, there would be no opportunity to play their tricks and bedevil the lists. They are forced to take upon themselves the authority of revising officers, in addition to their own, in order that they might decide against the reception of names now and again, in order to weaken the enemy. If the lists are to be stuffed and otherwise manipulated, it must be done in the preliminary stages of registration. Clerks who are up to what is expected of them must therefore, refuse applications, even if attested by affidavit, while there is absolutely no check whatever, except their own consciences, to the addition of improper names. Such work as this could not be left to the revising officers. The lists must be doctored before they reach the courts of revision, hence the necessity for unscrupulous clerks, who do not hesitate to usurp the functions of a court, supposed to be for the purpose of insuring honest lists.

The Act never contemplated that discretionary powers, such as have been exercised, should be given the registration clerks. Their duty is to enter all names known to themselves as duly qualified electors, and to receive and enter all applications supported by affidavit.

Should there be any errors in the preparation of the lists, the work of rectifying them belongs to the revising officers, who are appointed for that sole special purpose. This is the plain meaning of the Act, and it is impossible that registration clerks or any others can mistake it. The fact therefore, that clerks have gone out of their road to doctor the lists, is evident of fraudulent intent.

Let the opposition everywhere be vigilant against these frauds. It is an outrage they should thus be forced into the defence of their rights—rights that should never be assailed but so it is, and until better methods prevail, they must make the best of it. Should there be the least disposition on the part of the revising officers to refuse them the amplest justice then if they be men determined not to be trampled on, they will know how to protect themselves. Fraudulent lists must be purged. Let the cost be what it will.

This was the impression at that time of the 'Free Press,' then an independent paper, not the slavish organ it now is of the present party in power.

On June 13, 1892, that same paper published with big headlines the following warning:

ALARMING.

The number of electors left off the lists in the Winnipegs is simply alarming. Immediate attention is necessary if you wish to vote.

In the 'Free Press' issue of June 14 a list of electors left off in South Winnipeg, aggregating 500 names is published.

In the issue of June 15, Winnipeg Centre list is published showing 750 names left off the list.

In the issue of June 16, Winnipeg North lists are published, showing 500 names left off, or aggregating 1,700 names left off the lists of the issue of the three Winnipegs.

I have other extracts of a similar character did I wish to impose them upon the House, but I shall not do so. I have here, however, some of the results of the revisions that took place in 1892, 1896 and 1899 for each separate constituency. After the revision had been made in 1892 by registration clerks appointed by the Greenway government there were added at the Court of Revision 1,637 names and there were struck off 1,875.

In the revision prior to 1896 there were added at the court of revision after the returns had been completed, 2,008 names and there were struck off 1,180. In 1899, the year when I say it cost the Conservatives of the province such a great deal in order to purge the lists, there were struck off 5,446 names and added 1,195.

Take the small local constituency of Beautiful Plains and we find that between those added and those struck off there were 107 names. In Birtle, in my own constituency, in 1899 there were, between those added and those struck off, 196, and having got a clean list by the expenditure of a great deal of time, labour and money the Conservative party attained the position it should have reached seven years before if it had had similarly purged lists.

In Gladstone there was a difference of 223 names; in Kildonan, a difference of 135; in Killarney, a difference of 159 names; in Lansdowne, a difference of 210 names;

In Lorne	170
Minnedosa	126
Morgan	179
Morris	198
Mountain	170
Norfolk	171
Rhineland	139
Rockwood	185
Turtle Mountain	153
Virden	318
Winnipeg Centre	1,119
Winnipeg North	692
Winnipeg South	967
Woodlands	325

These are a few I have selected out of many to show the large amount of work required to be done in adding on names and striking them off at these courts of revision and checking the lists prepared at that date. In North Winnipeg, where there are 3,654 names on the list, attempts were made to put on 649 or one for every

five. In South Winnipeg, where there were 3,636 on the list, attempts were made to add 505 bogus voters or one for every three and a fraction. In Winnipeg Centre there were 3,923 names on the list; 971 were struck off as fraudulent, or one bogus vote for every four and a fraction bona fide votes.

So you will see the character of the lists in force in all these districts when the present administration came into office. Let me compare the method of preparing the lists with the methods of to-day. When the new Act was adopted by the Conservative administration at the outset the government appointed the judges as a board of registration. There were five county judges appointed by this government. These judges formed the board of registration and they appointed all the registration clerks and all the revising barristers. The government had absolutely nothing to do with naming one registration clerk or revising barrister. That was the Act placed on the statutes immediately after the Conservative government took office. Whom did the judges appoint? I have here a list of the revising barristers they appointed, and I find that they appointed nineteen Conservatives and sixteen Liberals. Did you ever hear of a Liberal administration in that province appointing such a number of Conservatives as their revising barristers ? Did you ever hear of them appointing one Conservative as registration clerk? Why, the government placed the power entirely of preparing the lists in the hands of the judges and these judges appointed the registration clerks and revising barristers. They took five constituencies themselves, and for the other thirty-five they appointed nineteen Conservatives and sixteen Liberals. Let me give you some of the names. They appointed Mr. H. A. Robson, a man I am well acquainted with, a strong Liberal. They appointed T. L. Hartley, of Winnipeg, for the electoral division of Cypress. For Deloraine they appointed Mr. P. A. Macdonald, of Winnipeg. For Gilbert Plains they appointed Mr. D. A. Macdonald, of Portage la Prairie, now a judge on the bench of that province. For Hamiota they named Mr. S. E. Clement, of Brandon. For Kildonan and St. Andrew they named Mr. T. G. Mathers, of Winnipeg, now judge of the province. For Lakeside they named Mr. D. W. McKerchar, of Winnipeg. Manitou, Mr. W. F. Ellis ; Minnedosa, Mr. J. G. Harvey, of Dauphin ; Mr. Harvey was then an ardent supporter of the hon. member for Dauphin, but has seen the error of his ways and has gone back on him. For Norfolk they appointed Mr. J. H. Haverson, of Carmen ; St. Boniface, Mr. T. Seton Ewart, of Winnipeg ; South Brandon, H. H. Goulter, of Virden; Turtle Mountain, T. L. Metcalf, of Winnipeg ; Virden, E. Henderson, of Brandon; Winnipeg North, G. H. West, of Winnipeg. These are samples of the revising barristers appointed under that Act as administered by the Roblin administration. It has been said that there was no annual revision at the time the Franchise Act of 1898 was in vogue and the lists prepared in Manitoba. That is very true. The government of that province came to the conclusion that having once started out with a basis of a list compiled by honest officials, having divested themselves of every power and placed it in the hands of the judges and having once got a clean list —because no one could get on that list without taking the sworn declaration—they thought it would be a hardship to require these people afterwards to come up personally and be sworn again. The Act originally provided that these people who had been old residents and once registered should be compelled to come forward at the next election and register again. The government amended the Act so as to provide an annual revision and allow those once registered to remain on the list unless they became disqualified by removal or otherwise. No one could get his name on the list unless he made a sworn declaration. That is the law at present. You can find that in the 'Gazette.'

Mr. S. J. JACKSON (Selkirk). Give a list of the Liberals revising the lists at present.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). They are not appointed.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. They are in the 'Gazette.'

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). No, I have the 'Gazette' here.

Mr. E. J. JACKSON. I mean the registration clerks.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Notwithstanding the present Act provides that the revising barristers shall be the judges or shall be appointed by the judges, in practice the last two years the judges are doing the work entirely and did it last year. Here are the questions which have to be answered before a man gets his name on the provincial voters' list:

1. What is your Christian name, surname, place of residence, occupation, and post office address? (Street and number to be given if possible, if in a city, town or incorporated village. If in a rural locality, section, township and range, parish name and lot or other description to be given).

So that there is no trouble identifying an elector after he subscribes to a list of that character.

2. Are you of the full age of 21 years?
3. Are you a British subject by birth or naturalization, and which?
4. Have you resided in the province of Manitoba for one year prior to the date of

this your application to be registered an elector within this electoral division?

5. Have you resided or had you your chief place of abode in this electoral division for a continuous period of three months prior to the date of this your application to be registered an elector within this electoral division?

6. Are you in any respect disqualified from being registered an elector in this electoral division under the Manitoba Election Act?

7. Do you now reside in the electoral division for which you apply to be registered an elector? On what premises do you reside?

8. Is your name at present on the list of electors for this electoral division?

9. Have you applied for and been registered an elector in any other electoral division in the province during the current period of registration?

10. Is your name on the list of electors for any electoral division in the province? If so, give the name.

I, , do solemnly declare that the foregoing answers in writing to the above interrogatories are true and correct in substance and in fact, and I make this declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

That is sworn to before the registration clerk and there are present in that registration office representatives of the Liberal party who inspect every one of those declarations and can have an appeal ready in case they do not consider the man is telling the truth. So that it is impossible for any one to get on the list at present without committing perjury.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the hon. gentleman say what becomes of the applications ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). These are sent to the revising barrister, to be passed upon. For, recollect, the duties of the registration clerk are purely clerical. He accepts the sworn declarations and transmits them to the judge, who is the revising barrister, and the revising barrister passes upon each and every one before the name can be placed on the list. If it is appealed against, the parties have to be notified in order to be present at the court of the revising barrister.

Mr. AMES. Is the sworn application taken in the office of the registration clerk?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Certainly, right in the presence of the representatives of both parties. And how does that work out ? Why, both parties are on an equality. What advantage has the Conservative party over the Liberal party in getting names on the list ? Every man must put in his sworn declaration, be he Conservative or Liberal. There have been no charges against the registration clerks since this Act was placed on the statute-book.

Mr. BURROWS. What about the three men at Morris put on without a declaration ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Burrows) has been drawing his inspiration from a very polluted source. He has been reading the editorial utterances of the Manitoba 'Free Press,' than which there is no more unreliable organ in the Dominion of Canada. Now, what is this case to which the hon. gentleman refers ? There is a provision in the Act—I cannot quote it as I have not it under my hand at the moment—that, in cases of unavoidable absence or illness, of a party a declaration may be made on his behalf by another——

Mr. BURROWS. It must be a sworn declaration.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Yes. A Mr. Parker handed in the names of three neighbours, bona fide electors, who were unable to be present—put in a sworn declaration—

Mr. BURROWS. No.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). He himself has shown, by letter that was published, that he filled out the wrong form. He is a farmer and not acquainted with the technicalities of the law. The registration clerk accepted the declaration. Of course, the names were not put on the list until after the judge passed upon them. They were transmitted to the judge. And what happened at the court of revision presided over by Judge Prudhomme ? The Liberal lawyer appeared there and took the ground that these men should not have their names on the list because the proper form had not been filled in.

Mr. BURROWS. There was no form at all.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burrows) has not read all the correspondence. I have seen a letter written by Mr. Parker and published in the newspapers stating that he had put in an application, but it was on the wrong form. The judge asked the Liberal representative there, 'Are these men qualified electors ?' And the lawyer had to admit that they were.' The judge said, 'I will not allow any technicality to disfranchise them.' So, it was the judge who placed them on the list, and not the registration clerk ; for, as I have said, the duties of the registration clerk are merely clerical. These applications were handed in to the judge, who, when the evidence was adduced, declared that he would not allow a mere technicality to prevent the placing of the names on the list.

Now, let me draw attention for a few minutes to the provision of the law as to the parties who may be present at the registration. I do this to show that one party has

equal facilities with the other. Here is the section :

Who entitled to be present at registration sittings.

28. The following persons shall be entitled to be present at sittings of the registration clerks for the purposes of this Act: (a) The candidate or candidates at the last election for the electoral division;

(b) Any person who considers himself to be a prospective or probable candidate at the next ensuing election to be held in the said electoral division;

It is pretty wide.

(c) Any person desirous of being present as a spectator; provided that no more than twelve persons, other than the persons mentioned and officers in attendance, shall be entitled to be present at the same time;

(d) The registration clerk shall strive as far as possible to allow the representation of all political parties in the place or places of registration to be fair and equal.

And that is exactly what is followed out in practice. One political party is exactly on an equality with the other ; there is no discrimination in favour of the Conservative as against the Liberal party. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) stated that, when the registration is over, the only notice given is that the registration clerk walks outside and tacks up the list at the door of the registration booth. But the hon. gentleman did not state the whole case. There are the representatives who look after their several parties and can notify any who are interested of alleged omissions from the list. In addition to that, certified copies are furnished to all people applying for the same by the registration clerk. These facts the hon. gentleman did not bring out. Moreover, a severe penalty is imposed on the registration clerk for any violation of the provisions of the statute. No fault has been found by the people of Manitoba, or by anybody except disgruntled politicians whose term of office is drawing to a close and who seek to rob the Conservative party of their franchise by enacting the unjust law here proposed. I say that no fault has ben found with the provisions of the law. During the last provincial campaign I had the privilege of speaking on platforms in four different constituencies in Manitoba, and I can say here, on my honour, that in not a single case did the speaker representing the Liberal party on any of these occasions make one complaint against the Manitoba Franchise Act. Do you suppose that this Act could be open to the objections which these hon. gentlemen try to persuade the Prime Minister and this parliament that it is open to without the Liberal party making the most of it in a provincial contest ? Why, their leader, Mr. Meikle, who is expected to oppose your humble servant at the next election, stated in his place in the legislature that he was willing to admit that the present lists, as prepared under our provincial law, were the cleanest lists we ever had in the province of Manitoba. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot deny that. I am sorry the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is not in his seat, for I feel sure that, to use a colloquialism, he has allowed these gentlemen to stuff him with a lot of declarations that they cannot substantiate. Let him appeal to Mr. Meikle for his opinion. The only complaint that Mr. Meikle made was that, from a provincial standpoint, it was too expensive to have annual revisions. But the people of Manitoba are not complaining of the expense ; on the contrary they are satisfied with the law and with the government under which it was enacted. On the other hand, during my visit at Easter I did not find a single Liberal who upheld this Aylesworth Bill, which is introduced to perpetrate such great injustice.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). At six o'clock I was comparing the Franchise Act as it stood on the statute-book prior to the advent of the Conservative administration of Manitoba with the Act as it exists today, and I was also dealing with some objections offered by some of the Liberal members of this House to the provisions of the existing Franchise Act. I have to come all the way down to Ottawa, hundreds of miles from my adopted province, to learn of the serious drawbacks and serious objections that exist in the minds of some of these hon. gentlemen in reference to that Act. It seems very strange that, though session after session of the Manitoba legislature has been held since the adoption of the present Act, on no occasion have the Liberals of that body been noticeably active in offering a single amendment to that Act. Now, it is a poor tribute to the intelligence of the Liberals in the legislature of Manitoba that, if all these grievances and all these faults existed in this Franchise Act, the local members should not have bestirred themselves and have taken at least some action in order to remedy those grievances and those complaints which the Liberals of this House are now making in regard to that Act. On the contrary, the only objection that has been urged, the only fault that has been found so far, has been by a gentleman named Campbell, who represents the constituency that the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) represents in this House, and he put his foot in it so badly that I do not think that he will try it the second time. He charged that certain names that were struck off at a court of revision were afterwards found on the list

and he accused the government of being a party to this fraud. But when the original list was produced on the table of the local House it was found that his charge was absolutely without foundation; that the lists had been revised by Judge Ryan at Portage la Prairie, a gentleman who possesses the esteem and the respect of Liberals as well as Conservatives in that province; nobody could impeach that gentleman's honour, and Mr. Campbell had to retract his statement and apologize to the House.

Now, we are told by the hon. member for Lisgar that the time for making up these lists under the existing law is entirely too short, that there is not sufficient time allowed for registration and not sufficient time allowed for the court of revision. All proclamations, according to the present Act, have to be issued by the 1st of May in each year; these proclamations mention the dates and places where the registration is to be held. Ten days' notice at least must be given by the proclamation before the first court of Revision can sit. They sit for a number of days in each constituency, every facility is afforded at every registration booth, and then at least five days must elapse between the last day of the registration court and the sitting of the court of revision, that is the minimum time. Now, if the Liberals have any grievance whatever, they may select one or two isolated cases where there is a short time given between the last day of registration and the first day of the court of revision. But if you take the 'Gazette' as published on the 25th April, 1908, you will see that out of 37 rural constituencies in that province, but three provide for less than ten days. Moreover, it is not as essential that there should be so long a time between the courts of registration and revision under our laws as it was under the law which existed prior to 1900, because at that time, as I have pointed out, the registration clerks practically made the lists. Under the present law the registration clerks do merely clerical work, accept sworn declarations and pass them on in the presence of the Liberal representatives at the courts of registration, to be passed upon by the different judges at the courts of revision. Ten days, I say, must elapse before the first court of registration is held, and then after they are over, at least five days must elapse before the first court of revision is held. The hon. member for Lisgar selected an isolated case in the constituency of Springfield, within the Dominion constituency of Selkirk, and he said: Here is a large constituency, and there is only one court of revision provided and that court sits six days after the last registration sitting. He left the impression, or endeavoured to leave the impression, that that was the general rule, the general practice, that there were only six days in each constituency of that province, and that they only had that time to make an appeal. But I have here the Manitoba 'Gazette' of April 25, 1908, and it contains all the courts of revision and all the registration courts. I have looked through it and counted the number of days allowed for registration in each individual constituency and the time elapsing between the last day of registration and the first day of the court of revision, and I am going to read to you in each constituency the time elapsing between the two. In the constituency of Arthur there are 8 places for registration. Arthur is a small constituency. Many of those constituencies are small and compact and do not require many registration booths and do not require more than one court of revision. There are eight places to register in Arthur, and the interval between the last day of registration and the first day of revision is 24 days, not 6 days as the hon. member for Lisgar tried to make you believe. Then there is the electoral division of Assiniboia, with 10 places for registration, and 20 days of an interval within which they can get their appeals in. Then there is the constituency of Avondale a small constituency, with 6 places to register in and 24 days of an interval, not 6. Now, here is one where I am willing to admit there may be a grievance. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) may have a grievance, and it is in connection with his own local constituency. I will point out exactly what occurs there. In the constituency of Beautiful Plains there are 9 places to hold registration courts and there is only 3 days interval between the last day of registration and the first day of the court of revision. But, Mr. Speaker, in that constituency, in the principal town, Neepawa, with only about two thousand of a population, they have three days of registration given them. But the representatives of the Liberal party are present to see every application sworn to and handed in to the registration clerk. They can take the names that they object to and appeal them; they can object to none that are handed in unless they can prove that the party had perjured himself. There are only three days of an interval, but, as I have said, there is not the necessity for the same length of time for appeal. Now, Sir, I am willing to pledge my word as a member of this House, and I think my colleagues from Manitoba will assist me in saying that, feeling that is one instance in which there should be more time, we will do our best, acting in concert with our Liberal friends in the province of Manitoba, to have that time extended, and I am confident that oversight, for it is only an oversight, will be rectified. Hon. gentlemen on the other side, because they can show one or two isolated instances in which the time may be a little short for appeal, notwithstanding there is not the same necessity for appeal that there was in the days of the

Greenway regime, hold that up as an example of a grievance, just as if one swallow made a summer.

In the constituency of Birtle, in my own constituency of Marquette, there are six places of registration and twenty-three days interval between the registration court and the court of revision. In Carillon there are eleven places of registration and nineteen days interval between the two courts. In the constituency of Cypress there are twelve places of registration, two courts of revision and there are intervals of nineteen and twenty days. In the electoral district of Dauphin there are fourteen places of registration and twelve days of an interval between the last day of registration and the date of the court of revision, and there are two days of registration in the town of Dauphin. In Deloraine there are ten places of registration and twelve days of an interval between the two courts. In Dufferin there are fourteen places of registration and thirteen days of an interval. In Emerson there are twelve places of registration and fourteen days of an interval. In Gilbert Plains there are no less than 21 places of registration. Why ? Because it is a very large constituency with outlying points though not thickly populated ?—and every opportunity is afforded the people to register. There are twenty-one places of registration and sixteen days of an interval before the meeting of the court of revision. In Gimli, in the constituency of Selkirk where there are a large number of those foreigners that the hon. member for Lisgar stated that we, on our part, were most anxious to disfranchise and to prevent from registering, there are no less than twenty registration courts open from May 18 to June 8 and two courts of revision. In this constituency in which so many foreigners are located whom we are so anxious to disfranchise, according to these hon. gentlemen, they have two courts of revision sitting on June 16 and June 23. In Gladstone there are twenty places in which the electors may register and they have eight days of an interval between the two courts ; Hamiota eight places to register and twenty-eight days interval ; Kildonan and St. Andrew's also in Selkirk thirteen places to register and an interval of fourteen days and the most northern court is in township 39 range 3 and there are only fourty-four townships in the whole province. This is within thirty miles of the extreme northerly bounds of the province. In Killarney there are seven places to register and fourteen days of an interval. In Lakeside there are nine places to register and eight days of an interval.

Mr. ALCORN. These registration courts are not all held on the one day ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Not at all. They are held on successive days from May 16 to the end of the month.

Mr. ALCORN. So that the people will have a much longer time in which to appeal than the actual interval between the meetings of the two courts.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The people have a chance of appealing for a week prior to these four, five, six or any other number of days as the case may be. In some instances they have upwards of a month in which they can get their appeals in. I am only quoting the minimum time from the last day of the sitting of the court of registration until the first day of the court of revision, but from the first day of the registration they have at least a week longer than the time I have given.

Mr. AMES. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the order followed by the revision judge is the same as the order followed by the registration clerk ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I am not quite sure of that. One of the reasons why the interval in Beautiful Plains and one or two other constituencies may appear short is, that, as I understand, it is the intention to have county court judges to act as revising officers without calling in any lawyers whatever and they have found a little difficulty in making the dates to suit their own engagements and therefore there are one or two instances in which there is a shorter time than would otherwise be allowed. In Lansdowne there are twenty-one places of registration and twelve days of an interval between the last day of registration and the first day of the court of revision ; La Verandrye, nine places of registration and thirteen days of an interval ; Manitou, eleven places of registration and seventeen days of an interval ; Minnedosa, eleven places of registration and sixteen days of an interval ; Morden, ten places of registration and twenty-five days of an interval between the last day of registration and the first day of revision ; Morris, seven places of registration and twenty-five days of an interval. In Mountain, a local constituency within the district of Lisgar, there are eleven places of registration and two courts of revision. The hon. member for Lisgar was not fair enough to quote an instance in his own constituency, but he went to the constituency of the hon. member for Selkirk in order to get an extreme case to lend point to his argument. But, he did not take a case within his own riding in which there is a preponderating Liberal vote. There are two courts of revision and fourteen and twenty-one days respectively of an interval between the last day of registration and the first day of revision. In Norfolk, which is in the constituency of Portage la Prairie, there are nine places of registration and the hon. member cannot find fault in this case because there are twenty-eight days between the last day of

registration and the first day of the court of revision. In Portage la Prairie, the town practically, there are three places of registration and fifteen days of an interval in which they can get their appeals in. In Rhineland there are five places of registration and thirty days of an interval; Rockwood, twelve places of registration and fourteen days of an interval. This is also in the constituency of Selkirk. In Russell there are fourteen places to register and seventeen days of an interval. In St. Boniface, represented by the hon. member for St. Boniface, in this House, (Mr. Cyr) there are ten places of registration and twenty-one days in which to get their appeals in. In South Brandon there are nine places of registration and twelve days of an interval. In Springfield, and this is a case quoted by the hon. member for Lisgar, there are eleven places of registration and six days between the last day of registration and the first day of the court of revision. They have in these eleven places of registration from May 21 until June 6. In Swan River there are eight places of registration and ten days of an interval; Turtle Mountain, ten places of registration and thirteen days of an interval; Virden, seven places of registration and sixteen days of an interval and these registration clerks sit in their offices from 9 o'clock in the morning until 12 o'clock at noon and from 1 o'clock until 6 p.m. and in the cities they sit after 8 o'clock in order to accommodate the workingmen who cannot lose the time to go and register during the day. So that, of these rural constituencies in only three of them is the interval below ten days as a minimum and it runs all the way from that to thirty days and upwards. I do not think that hon. gentlemen have very much to complain of in reference to the time in which they can get their appeals in.

Now, the hon. member for Lisgar has complained, and, I think unfairly complained about the action that was taken by the clerk of the executive council, I presume, who, with a revising barrister, in 1903, held an adjourned court of revision. The names were printed in order to allow the Liberals an opportunity of fighting or testing the case in the court if they desire to do so and because these names were not allowed to go on the corrected voters' lists he denounced the parties to that action. Let me explain what occurred on that occasion. The judges constituting the registration board appointed sixteen Liberals and nineteen Conservatives and they appointed a very strong and active partisan, Mr. Heap, of Selkirk, to revise the lists in this particular constituency. The commission issued to Mr. Heap limited his jurisdiction to a certain date.

He held his court of revision at the time and place stipulated in the proclamation; he completed his labours and he then took it upon himself illegally to adjourn the court of revision to another time and place, the time being beyond the date fixed in his commission. He had no authority to act as revising barrister after the date of his commission had expired and he was informed by Judge Walker, chairman of the registration board, that he was acting contrary to law, and Judge Walker notified the government that this court of revision was taking place illegally. Some twenty names were put on the list by Mr. Heap after his commission had expired but all of those were not the names of Liberals by any means. Mr. Heap held his court of revision contrary to the direction of the judge and the government had nothing whatever to do with it. I have already shown in this House that Judge Walker did not sign the same certificate for these illegal lists that he signed for every other revising court in the province. He did not certify as he did in the case of the others that the list of electors was legal and held under the authority and power of the statute, but he gave a certificate merely stating that these names were added at an adjourned court of revision. These names did not appear on the list on polling day and rightly so and if the Liberals thought they had a case they could have tested it in the courts, but none of them attempted to do so. Now, I regret to say that so many Liberals in this House are ignorant on the question of the Manitoba electoral lists and the reason is that they will not stay in their places in this chamber and listen to the truth. They have whispered into their ears by some of their friends from Manitoba, statements that cannot be substantiated. They have been told, as if it were a practice, that electors have been standing at the door of the court of revision and that when the hour for revision expired by law the revising barrister closed his court and allowed those men to be disfranchised. I challenge them to point to one single partisan act on the part of a single revising barrister. In the case of the court of revision presided over by Mr. Bonner, a lawyer of the city of Winnipeg, it was the judges and not the government who appointed Mr. Bonner. Only a very short time prior to that Mr. Bonner was an ardent Liberal. Mr. Bonner held his court and the law read that he should hold his court up to a certain hour and when the hour expired he took it upon himself to close the court although there were quite a few present, and mark you it is safe to say that there were not any more Liberals than Conservatives waiting. He did not discriminate against one party or the other and even the 'Winnipeg Free Press' has not had the hardihood to accuse Mr. Bonner of having acted in a partisan manner. But, the government of Manitoba have taken precautions that such a thing shall not occur again. The

prme minister of Manitoba has time and again invited the Liberals to point out any defects in the law or to suggest any improvements and that he was ready to place on the statute-book any thing that would improve the election law or that would meet any contingency that could possibly arise. The government did not approve of Mr. Bonner's action in interpreting the law so strictly and at the very next session they brought down this amendment :

> The registration clerk shall receive all applications of electors for registration, the striking off of names of electors from the list and for the correction of names on the list, who are present for that purpose at the time fixed for the conclusion of the registration sittings, notwithstanding that such applications are in point of fact received by the registration clerk after the hour of closing the registration sittings aforesaid.

Therefore, if the time arrives for the closing by law of the registration court and there are any electors present the law compels him now to prolong his sittings until each and every one of those present has the privilege of registering, and a similar provision applies to the court of revision.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What statute is that ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I am not certain whether it is the amendment of 1904 or the amendment of 1903.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Did the hon. gentleman complete the reading of that clause ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I read it to the end and I will read it again. This appeared in the 'Manitoba Gazette' of February the 20th, 1904.

Mr. BURROWS. Where do you find that provision with regard to the court of revision ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I have not the section at hand now but I will find it. I therefore say that if the Liberals had any grievance in reference to Judge Bonner's court of revision that grievance cannot occur again, and that was the only isolated case that occurred in connection with the revision of the lists throughout Manitoba. That was several years ago and no fault has been found with the annual revision since. I repeat, that last session the prime minister of Manitoba told his opponents that if they had any suggestions to make in reference to the perfection of the present law he would be only too willing to adopt such suggestions, and yet not an amendment was brought in by a single member of the Liberal party in Manitoba. I am afraid the Prime Minister is not being well informed by his supporters in this matter. Let him apply to Hon. Charles Mickle, leader of the opposition in the local legislature, who is on record as having stated that our present lists in Manitoba are the cleanest we ever had in that province.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. In what year did Mr. Mickle make that statement ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). About two or three years ago, and our law has been very much perfected since then. He was twitted with it in the legislature not later than last session and had nothing to retract, the only fault he found was the expenditure from a provincial point of view involved in the annual revision. But, as I said, the people of Manitoba do not begrudge a fair expenditure on their voters' lists, in order to have it purged from dead men, non-existant individuals and those not qualified to be on the list. Here is the section that I wish to quote to the hon. member for Portage la Prairie, section 11 of the Manitoba Elections Act, chapter 52 :

> The revising officer shall also receive and deal with the applications of all persons to be registered as electors who shall be present at the time fixed for the closing of the court of revision notwithstanding that the time so fixed shall have elapsed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Is that the statute of 1904 ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). This is the Manitoba Elections Act, chapter 52, with all amendments down to 1906. Hon. gentlemen opposite were trying to harp on the question of the hours during which the booths were open simply because there was an isolated case of trouble in connection with Mr. Bonnar's court of revision. There the hours are set and the appeals are necessarily few when every man who wrongfully gets his name on the list must commit perjury to do so. If the hours are not long enough they are extended by the statute I have just read. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) has stated that there are many names on the list that should not be there, and that many names that should be there were omitted, but he failed to mention any of these names. He was challenged to do so by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). He stated that he had been in that province for 30 years and knew almost every individual voter and yet he could not name a man who had been left off the list in his own constituency or one who had been improperly placed on it. He was going to do so but failed, and if he were here I would challenge him again to name one individual wrongfully left off or placed on the list. If he gives such a name we will find out whether or not he is correct.

The hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) struck a mare's nest. He thought he had discovered three names that had been put on the wrong form and which the judge stated were names of qualified electors, adding that he was not going to allow any legal technicality to interfere with their

franchise. He thought if he could only show that these three were put on wrongfully, his case had been proved.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The fact is that when these names were objected to the judge asked the Liberals if the men had been notified that they were to be objected to. On being answered in the negative, the judge said they were illegal, but that he could not strike them off without notice.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The judge asked the Liberal representative if they were qualified electors, if they were entitled to vote, and the Liberal representative had to admit that they were. Then said the judge, I am not going to see the men disfranchised, I waive all formalities. But who was to blame for putting them on the list ? The registration clerk did not put the names on the list, he took their declarations handed in by Mr. Parker, transferred them to the revising barrister and Judge Prudhomme put the names on the list. If anything is wrong they must blame the county court judge, the very men whom they want to revise the list under the present Bill. It seems very strange that names could be improperly placed on or omitted from the lists. Where were the Liberals ? They had the privilege of having representatives at the revision booths. Their representatives were there, every one who was put on had to hand in an affidavit. How did they come to allow these men to hand in false affidavits ? Why did they not appeal and have them struck off. The statements are ridiculous and the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) was indulging in generalities, he could not give a specific case.

But the hon. member for Lisgar excelled himself when he found fault with the qualifications under the present Franchise Act of Manitoba. He said : I take my stand as against insisting on 12 months' residence in Manitoba before allowing a man to vote. Consistency thou art a jewel ! Who placed the qualification upon the statute ? The Conservative government went out of power in 1888. Under them 6 months' residence in the province and one month in the local constituency was all that was required. The hon. member kept that on the statutes of the province until 1894. He assumed office in December, 1888, but maintained those qualifications up to the year 1894, and when I find in the statutes of Manitoba of that year, an Act to amend the Manitoba Elections Act, assented to March 2, 1894.

Section 12 of chapter 49 of the Revised Statutes of Manitoba, being the Manitoba Election Act, is hereby amended by striking out paragraph (d) thereof, and by substituting therefor the following:

(d) who is, at the date of the issue of the proclamation appointing the registration clerk and has been for three months——

Not one month——

Mr. W. J. ROCHE.

——immediately prior to the said date, a resident of and domiciled within the said electoral division and has been for one year immediately prior to said date a resident of and domiciled within the province.

Not six months as he found it when he came into power, and this is the statute that has been on the statute-book ever since, this is the law that exists to-day ; it has been perpetuated by his successor, and yet the hon. member, forgetful no doubt in his old age of what he did when he was Prime Minister of Manitoba, comes here and condemns the provision requiring 12 months' residence in the province.

The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) is also out of his seat. Well, he is seldom in his seat but when he does come I am very sorry he does not acquit himself a little more creditably than he did on the occasion of his last speech. He devoted a considerable portion of his time to quotations, reading some unpronounceable names and affidavits, which affidavits bear on their face the impress of untruth. I am surprised that the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) who has always been looked upon as a respected resident of that city, should come up here and read those affidavits. He even expressed regret that he was forced to do so by reason of the fact that he was a representative of the city. He gave that as an excuse for reading a lot of untrue and scurrilous evidence against residents of Winnipeg who are eminently respectable—evidence intended to smirch their character. By this evidence these men of high repute are accused of having been accomplices in fraudulently putting on names on the voters' lists or causing to be secured false naturalization papers and having them rushed through the county court for the purpose of naturalizing Galicians and other foreigners, not in the country long enough to take out their naturalization papers, thus implicating the clerk of the court in the fraud. While on the one hand he contends that these are the very people the Conservatives want to disfranchise, on the other he trots out those spurious affidavits in order to prove that the Conservatives were so anxious to get their names on the voters' lists that some of the Conservative officials even descended to making themselves accomplices in this wrong doing. I caught one name—the name of Rudneski. I had heard that name before. I had met the gentleman bearing that distinguished name. At one time he was associated with the Conservative party as a worker among his fellow countrymen. While with the Conservatives, I never heard that he had been guilty of any wrong doing. He was then engaged in legitimate work. But no sooner did he sell his services to our opponents than his descent began in the moral scale. What do we find ? I knew that he had been accused in Win-

nipeg by his fellow countrymen and in my own constituency of some very grievous wrong-doing. The story was circulated in Marquette when he went among his countrymen to help in the Conservative cause—the story was circulated by the Galicians who supported the Liberal candidate, that prior to coming to this country this man had been guilty of wife murder in his own country. I do not know whether there was any truth in that story or not, but that is what his own fellow countrymen said against him. I am not going to vouch for the accuracy of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). But here is something that I will vouch for. I know, as a matter of fact, from reputable citizens of Winnipeg, that he has been guilty of crimes something like those for which Philip Wagner was convicted, that he has defaulted his countrymen right and left, that cases have proceeded against him, that he has been in jail accused even of forgery, and that to-day he is a criminal who has fled this country. In order to refresh my memory and have something to substantiate my statements, I telegraphed to Winnipeg to Mr. Rogers, who was acquainted with that gentleman.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. He is not a very good authority.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). He is just as good as the hon. gentleman. If the hon. gentleman, who makes sneering reflections upon him, bore as good a character himself, he would not be quite so ready to interrupt. It is not likely this telegram would be sent me by Mr. Rogers unless there was truth in it. I will read it for the edification of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues.

Winnipeg, May 7, 1908.

To W. J. Roche, M.P., Ottawa.

Rudneski served considerable time in the common jail here. Had to skip the country last year.

Is there anything in that which the hon. gentleman can contradict? If so I would like to hear it.

Rudneski made by himself and others eight affidavits and sold the same to George Walton, Liberal organizer, for $25. I hold the original cheque.

Does the hon. gentleman dispute that?—

I hold the original cheque given by Walton to Rudneski in payment of those affidavits. The same will be published in to-night's paper. The original cheque will be mailed you at Ottawa. Do not lose cheque as I want to get it cashed some day. Affidavits from all the parties named by Bole or Rudneski will appear in to-night's or to-morrow's paper to show that statements made by Bole or Rudneski are absolutely false. Insist on Bole reading the other five affidavits for which Rudneski was paid by Liberal organizer.

R. ROGERS.

These hon. gentlemen thought they had discovered something fine when they trotted out those affidavits made by those Galician residents of Manitoba. But anyone reading them would see that they bore on their face the impress of untruth. Here is something that will appear in the public press of Winnipeg to-morrow; and if Mr. Walton finds he has a libel action, he will have the opportunity to enter the courts against the author of that telegram or the authors of the affidavits published in the city of Winnipeg. This is the character of the evidence which has been read in this House in order to try and influence the Prime Minister and his associates and induce them to inflict upon us this Aylesworth Bill calculated to deprive the Conservatives of Manitoba of their franchise. Why the very thing incorporated in those affidavits, the charge of illegally naturalizing hundreds of foreigners who are not long enough in the country, is the very thing these hon. gentlemen themselves were guilty of at the last election. If my memory serves me correctly, we had some of those men in court for having got some of the poor deluded Galicians, who were not long enough in the country to understand our laws, our customs, our institutions, our language—for having got them naturalized and they had to answer for that in the court. When I was at home during the Easter holidays the very thing they accused us of having done in these by-gone days is what I heard they were doing very recently throughout the Galician colony. They were getting out naturalization papers, getting blanks signed in some cases, getting these foreigners to sign affidavits of the contents of which they were ignorant, so that the very thing they charge against the Conservatives in those spurious affidavits, they are doing themselves at present.

It seems to me very strange that this provincial law, which is held up to so much odium, is the law which the Minister of Justice says he follows out in its entirety in the revision of the lists as provided for in his own Bill. After denouncing the provincial law as unfair in every particular, they are going to follow it in its entirety. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) also referred to another matter, and I marvel at his ingratitude. He referred to the placing on the lists the names of some seven electors who had been left off the lists at one time. But before going further, I wish to say further in connection with the Rudneski affidavit.

It seems strange, as the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) stated, that this affidavit should be in possession of the hon. member (Mr. Bole) for twelve months and

that he should wait until he got to Ottawa and read it in this House in order to prejudice members against the law existing in his own province. Mr. Walton, the Liberal organizer, the gentleman accused in this telegram of having bought these affidavits for $25 had not the manliness, or rather I should say he was too manly, to utilize them. And he is a member of the legislature and was there during the recent session, yet he did not mention or read these affidavits in the legislature where he could be met by the premier, and others who are in possession of information to controvert them. He could not do it; he was ashamed to. I have no doubt he felt that this was $25 wasted. But he transferred these affidavits to the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole), who is now a resident of Montreal, and is not to receive renomination in his present constituency, that that hon. gentleman might do work to which Mr. Walton would not stoop to do in connection with his legislative duties.

Now, the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) spoke about the Balsam Bay electors. He said, referring to the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden):

1. The hon. gentleman said that this Manitoba government which takes such care of the voters was good enough upon one occasion to solemnly pass an Act of parliament to place certain individuals upon the list in order that they might vote. Well, I have that Act here. An election was coming on and I suppose somebody suggested that perhaps they were going to be shy a few votes in that county and they had better make a few.

That is, the Conservatives were going to be shy a few votes and they were going to make votes by legislation.

2. Now, this was a premeditated mode of doing business and I am going to show how they made the voters. I am told in reference to this, but I do not know as to the truth of it, that the registration clerk had omitted to put 25 names on the list, but there are not 25 mentioned in this Act of the legislature.

This he reads, and proceeds as follows:

3. And the names were added and somebody went to try and find them and they could not, and the only time they had ever been seen was upon polling day.

Now what is the history of that? There is a point called Balsam Bay, on the eastern shore of Lake Winnipeg. A court was held there for the registration of electors. Balsam Bay is an outside point and it was difficult to find a man competent to discharge the duties of registration clerk. A man whose name, if I remember well, is Gilbert Dennett, was selected. There were 26 who applied to have their names placed on the list, handing in the regular applications, and being personally present. For some reason or other, Mr. Dennett misinterpreted his duties under the law—not with any criminal intent, I believe—at any rate, he refused the applications and did not place on the register the names of these 26 men. In addition to this, there were seven others present who did not hand in any applications after these 26 had been refused. The Liberals heard about this, and they sent a man, a Mr. Campbell, to investigate the condition of affairs. He stated in a letter to the Manitoba 'Free Press' the facts as he had found them—that 26 names had been handed in, but the registration clerk had failed to put them on the register. When the court of revision was held, presided over by the judge, the Liberal-Conservative lawyer and the Liberal lawyer were there to represent their several parties. The formal applications of these 26 men were handed in. Not a man of them was present at the court of revision. Every man of them could have been legally kept off the list if Mr. Hastings, the Liberal-Conservative lawyer, had chosen to exercise his right of objecting. But he did not exercise that right. He knew that the registration clerk had not done his duty. And here is what took place, as I am told by the gentleman who appeared at the court:

I inclose you herewith a clipping from the Manitoba 'Free Press,' of June 16, 1906, in reference to the Balsam Bay poll of the Kildonan and St. Andrews district, in which Mr. A. C. Campbell, the commissioner who went out to Balsam Bay for the Liberal party to secure applications, makes a statement showing that by the action of Mr. Dennett, the registration clerk, seven names were left off that polling subdivision and he also makes the statement that these seven parties were all Liberals.

Not a Tory among them. But the Conservative government were not looking for a few votes; they did not need them.

This vertifies the statement made by Mr. Campbell, the attorney general, on the floor of the House the other day and also the statement of facts which I wrote you fully about and for this Act regarding the passing of the special Act in the session of 1907, to place the names of these seven men upon the voters' list for that electoral district. From my previous information to you I stated that there were some fourteen or fifteen applications made which I consented to allow their names to be placed upon the voters' list as aforesaid, but Mr. Campbell in his statement inclosed herewith says there were twenty-six such applications and I have no doubt Mr. Campbell is correct in that assertion and therefore the number of names I consented to let on the list at the court of revision that day, instead of being fourteen or fifteen was twenty-six.

The Liberal-Conservative representative raised no objection. He knew that the registration clerk should have placed these names on the list. And, though not a man of them was present as required by law, Mr. Hastings said, 'We do not want to disfranchise these men; put on their names.' And they were put on.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Does the law justify that ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). No, it does not justify that. But Mr. Dennett had exceeded his jurisdiction, and are you going to wipe off the statute-book every law merely because you find one man appointed under it who fails in his duty ? But Mr. Dennett met his punishment, for the provincial government refused to pay him a single cent for the work he had done at the registration court. They did not treat him as this government treated Leach, they did not give him a place worth $3,000 per annum. He had done wrong, and they refused to pay him a single cent, and he met with a very severe reprimand for having done an unwarranted thing. But the point is that not a man was disfranchised. The prime minister of that province, speaking on the public platform in my own town, declared that, notwithstanding that these men were not present at the court of revision, and notwithstanding that they had not made application, they should not suffer any injustice. Mr. Campbell, the Liberal commissioner, had reported these men were Liberals, that they were present at the registration court and had not applied because others were refused. It was for this reason, Mr. Roblin explained, that he had a statute passed, placing the names of these seven men on the list. Did you ever hear of Mr. Greenway, when prime minister of the province passing a special Act to do justice to an opponent ? On the contrary it would take a large volume to hold the names of those who were disfranchised by the operation of the law under Mr. Greenway as premier of that province.

And now, I come to a discussion of the 'thin-red-line.' We are not afraid to discuss this, as the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) seemed to think we should be. What does the 'thin-red-line' mean ? The voters' lists sent by the clerk of the Crown in Chancery to the various returning officers in Manitoba previous to the last Dominion election were mutilated, and mutilated illegally, and scores and hundreds —how many it is impossible to say—of Conservatives were disfranchised by Leach and his associates through the mutilation of these lists. Now what had they to do ? The Dominion Act provides that where there is an overlapping of constituencies the returning officers should have power to divide the lists, but only in those places, and in no places in the interior. That is the Dominion Act, section 25, and I will read it :

Where any provincial polling division, as constituted at the time of the receipt by the returning officer of the writ for an election lies only partly within the electoral district for which such election is to be held, the part thereof within such electoral district shall, for the purpose of that election, form a separate polling division, or it may be attached by the returning officer to an adjoining polling division, and the returning officer shall, as soon as possible after the receipt of the writ, prepare from the existing voters' lists a separate voters' list containing the names of the persons entitled to have their names placed on the list for such part of such polling division.

There was the statute under which the returning officers were supposed to act. But did the returning officers do this ? Where they did that, Mr. Speaker, there has been no complaint from the representatives of those constituencies. But whom did they transfer their lists to ? To the Liberal organizer. Does the statute say that the returning officer shall hand over his voters' lists to the organizer of a political party ? Not at all. And still we have this Minister of Injustice trying to make this House believe that it was perfectly justifiable on the part of the returning officer to divide and carve up the list among the constituencies and hand them to the Liberal organizer, who employed a staff in some rooms in the McIntyre Block in the city of Winnipeg, doing that work for weeks, mutilating the lists. He did not confine his operation to the border constituencies where there was an overlapping, but he went throughout the length and breadth of the province, disturbing many polling subdivisions in almost every local constituency. Why, I venture to say that in the polling divisions, two-thirds of them were not border divisions at all, were not in border constituencies at all. Let the Prime Minister or his Minister of Justice point to a single provision in the Act which will empower the returning officer to interfere in any way with polling subdivisions save those that are border subdivisions where there is overlapping. If the hon. gentleman can do that, then there will be some force for his contention, but it is impossible for him to do it. Now, let any person who has any reputation as a lawyer on that side of the House read from any statute of this parliament anything that will justify an interference with the lists in other portions of the constituency except those where there is overlapping.

Now, Mr. Leach was the Liberal organizer for the province. He had been a strong party man. He had a staff working for months prior to the election, giving out what he called canvassing books, sending out duplicates, carving out the province, getting reports from his agents throughout the province, and in accordance with these reports he set out certain polling divisions differing from those used for holding the provincial elections. When these lists were returned to the returning officer it was found that scores and hundreds of names were scored out by means of the thin red line, not, as I say, confined to border constituencies, but two-thirds of them were polling divisions within the limits of the local constituencies. We are told that it was a necessity to do

this. Not a Liberal on that side of the House has tried to leave the impression upon this House and the country that the interference took place in connection with polling subdivisions in the interior of these local subdivisions. Their whole argument was to leave the impression that only because of overlapping was there any necessity for the thin red line, and that the thin red line was operated only in those particular instances. I challenge anybody to prove that it took place only in those border constituencies. In my own constituency there was very little overlapping, just a small portion of three municipalities, one of which is in the unorganized district. And still there was 1,900 names through which the red line operated. I am not going to say that those 1,900 names were absolutely disfranchised. It was impossible for me to tell. We did not have an investigation in the constituency of Marquette, and why? I knew the returning officer was an honourable man, he was a personal friend of my own, and he himself could not stoop to anything of this character. Where he erred was in transferring, by the direction of somebody, the voters' lists for the constituency to the Liberal organizer. The latter did the work, he did the disfranchising. I entered my objection to having that gentleman arrested with the other returning officers, because I knew that personally he was not responsible for the operation of this red line. Now we will take an illustration. Some of these gentlemen say, Oh, but there is no oomplaint from Brandon, the Minister of Justice says there is no complaint from Dauphin, no complaint from Portage la Prairie. The Minister of Justice stated why there was no complaint in Dauphin, because there was no election, it was acclamation. The member for Dauphin is very astute, he knew he had not the ghost of a show had his election come on on the regular election day; therefore he pulled the wires with his brother-in-law, the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) and got the cabinet to postpone that election a week. But I venture to say, and I think the future will show that my prophecy is correct, that the member for Dauphin will not be a candidate at the next election for Dauphin if it is held on the general election day. I say there is one abuse that is not provided for by this Act; all the elections should be held on the same day. There is no provision in this Act to prevent anything of the kind, and unless the member for Dauphin succeeds again in having his election postponed, and he pretends that the returning oofficer has not sufficient time to post up his proclamation, he will not be a candidate for that constituency.

Mr. BURROWS. Is it not a fact that part of the county of Dauphin never had an election that was not deferred until after the date of the general election?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The constituency of Dauphin is a pretty large constituency, and I am willing to admit that the present government postponed that election one week, following the precedent of their opponents. But I am not justifying that at all. Admitting for the sake of argument that in Dauphin you cannot get around in the one week to post up the proclamation, cannot that be remedied? Because the provincial government under Mr. Greenway or Mr. Roblin has postponed this election, is that any reason why we should do it? In 1896 when that whole constituency was in Marquette, when I was a candidate, the election was held the same day. Now the Minister of Justice said in reference to myself that all the complaint I had was about ten men in my constituency who had not been disfranchised, but who had been transferred to another list—as if that was all the fault I could find. Now here is what the Minister of Justice said:

> The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) though he spoke in general terms, made the charge, so far as anything specific was concerned, simply that ten names in one polling division had been put in the wrong township. The hon. members for Brandon, Winnipeg and Dauphin made no complaints whatever; and there could be no complaint in Winnipeg or Dauphin, because in Dauphin the election took place by acclamation and in Winnipeg there was no readjustment because the bounds were conterminous between the one constituency and the other.
>
> So that we have seven of the ten Manitoba constituencies accounted for at all events by their representatives in this House on the occasion to which I have referred. And the aggregate of the complaints from those seven constituencies was twenty votes—twenty men misplaced, not twenty disfranchised, but twenty put upon the lists in a wrong polling subdivision or a wrong township.

Now, the impression that the hon. Minister of Justice intended to convey by that was that that was the only grievance we had to complain of in the constituency of Marquette. Why did I take these ten names? He took that expression of mine from 'Hansard' of May 30, 1905, when I spoke as follows:

> In my own constituency, the returning officer is an honest, straightforward man, a fellow citizen of my own. He is above doing anything of a dishonest character. But he received instructions from some person. The law states that a returning officer shall prepare, or cause to be prepared, a list which he shall supply to the deputy returning officers and which he shall certify as correct. Did the returning officer for the constituency of Marquette do that? No. My agent waited upon him and saw the lists brought into his office and unpacked. He saw the red line scored through the names and asked the returning officer what explanation he could give of it. The returning officer admitted candidly that he did not do it. My agent asked where the lists were prepared in this way,

and the returning officer answered that he presumed that they were erased in Winnipeg. My agent called his attention to eleven names in a certain district where the voters were wrongly described.

And this district was known to the returning officer because it was in the immediate neighbourhood of my own town. Scores and hundreds of names—1,900 names, as I said a few minutes ago—were erased by this thin-red-line operation, but in this particular district the returning officer knew each of these men and that is why his attention was called to it.

For instance, a man living in township 15, range 17, was given as township 16, range 17. And, because of that, red lines were scored through the names. Of eleven names thus wrongly described, ten were those of Conservatives, and all had been scored out. One was a Liberal, and there was no red line through that name——

Of the eleven names wrongly described ten were scored out and the ten were Conservatives. One was a Liberal and notwithstanding the fact that he was wrongly described he was permitted to vote under this description.

—although the description was wrong as in the other cases. My agent asked the returning officer: How can you certify these lists to be correct as required by law? And the returning officer answered: I will take good care not to do anything of the kind; I will write 'certified,' not 'certified correct.' And, if you will look at the Marquette list, which I moved to have laid on the table, you will find that that is the way it is certified. It was a quibble, I grant you; but the returning officer would not take the responsibility of certifying the lists to be correct, because he knew that they were not correct. These lists were scored before they came into his possession and scored in the office of the Liberal organizer in Winnipeg.

It was by that quotation that the Minister of Justice attempted to show that that was the whole source of complaint in the constituency of Marquette. It would be impossible, without getting all the voters' lists from the various deputy returning officers, to show to what extent the lists were tampered with. In the investigation which took place into the way in which the thin red line operated it was impossible in many instances to get the lists. They were destroyed. They were not returned. The deputies mutilated them and destroyed them. They did not return them to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. So, we were face to face with serious difficulties in endeavouring to prove our case by reason of not being furnished with the lists. But we did manage to get hold of the list in connection with the Beausejour poll. What took place at the Beausejour poll? This was not a border poll, so that the difficulty which hon. gentlemen opposite state existed in harmonizing the boundaries of provincial and Dominion constituencies did not exist. It was within the provincial constituency of Springfield and the provincial constituency of Springfield was entirely within the Dominion constituency of Selkirk. There was no justification for striking off the names. But, no less than forty-one names were scored out by red ink. Of those forty-one, twenty-three were not transferred to any other list.

Mr. BERGERON. They were disfranchised?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). They would have been if something had not taken place at court. They were not transferred to any list. They were scored out of the lists applicable to their home polling subdivisions where they had been accustomed to vote. They were old residents, and men who had been qualified to vote. Twenty-three out of the forty-one absolutely appeared on no list at that poll. We got the list for that poll and that is the reason that we were able to prove this case. The Minister of Justice rises up in his place in this House and tells us that it was merely transferring voters from one poll to another, but we proved that twenty-three out of forty-one were not transferred to any other poll. Of the twenty-three, eighteen were pronounced Conservatives. What happened? These men appeared at the poll to cast their votes. They were refused ballots. The deputy returning officer stated that his instructions were to give ballots only to those whose names were not scored out. These gentlemen had their names scored out. They hung around the polling subdivision and almost raised a riot. They kept their places all day until about four o'clock in the afternoon and then, becoming desperate, they tendered their ballots and insisted on the deputy receiving their ballots and it was only when he was threatened with the demolition of the polling booth that he consented to receive their ballots and he did receive them and put them in a separate envelope. These eighteen Conservatives, as I say, actually had to threaten the deputy returning officer with violence before he would accept their ballots. He accepted them and put them in a separate envelope and made a separate return. When these eighteen ballots were counted that evening sixteen of them were marked in favour of the Conservative candidate and one had to poll his vote as an agent on certificate. That is the case that the Minister of Justice referred to. He said that no harm was done, that this man had voted at his own poll and that the only difference was that he had to vote on certificate as an agent. Of the two voters who marked their ballots in favour of the Liberal candidate one afterwards admitted that

he had marked his ballot in mistake for the Liberal candidate. The other ballot was marked by a gentleman from Toronto who came in at the last hour to cast his vote and had not time to go to a more distant poll. Of these eighteen ballots, sixteen were marked in favour of the Conservative candidate, one was inadvertently marked in favour of the Liberal candidate and one voter had to mark his ballot as an agent of the candidate. That would have been shown to have been prevalent at many polls if we had had the time and the opportunity to prove it, and if we had had the assistance from this government that we were entitled to have, they being responsible for the prosecution of these cases.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What reason or pretence of reason was assigned for interfering with the lists in polling divisions which were wholly within the boundaries of a federal electoral district ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). There was absolutely no reason or pretence whatever except that these gentlemen thought they had a perfect right to go on and mutilate the lists without warrant, and they had no warrant at all. The Dominion Election Act provides that they shall adopt the provincial polling subdivisions. I have here the Act. The Dominion Election Act, chapter 6, section 24 provides that :

> The polling divisions shall, except as herein otherwise provided for, be those established by or under the laws of the province for the purposes of provincial elections within the territory comprised in the electoral district for which the election is held.

So, in the face of the statute these returning officers, or at least, Mr. Leach, acting on behalf of the returning officer, mutilated, divided up, carved up the lists for the province of Manitoba notwithstanding that the provision of the statute is that they should adopt the provincial polling subdivisions. Had they adopted the provincial polling subdivisions there would have been no ground for complaint save in these border constituencies, and I have no doubt that matters could have been arranged to the satisfaction of everybody. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) says that there was no complaint in his riding. Why ? Because Mr. Leach did not mutilate the lists. He did not transfer the names ; they had a returning officer who did that work and if what the hon. gentleman states is correct, I presume he did it honourably. We are told there were no complaints in Brandon and elsewhere, and why ? Mr. Leach himself swore he did not touch either of these constituencies. It is only where the returning officers handed over their lists to the Liberal organizer, and this is significant and certainly not accidental—it is in these cases that the lists were worked to the destruction of the Conservative electors and to the disfranchisement of no doubt hundreds of voters in that province. No better argument could be used as to there being no necessity whatever for interference with the present provincial law than this very fact. Had the returning officers discharged their duties, as the hon. member for Portage la Prairie says his returning office did, there would have been no ground for complaint. If these polling subdivisions overlap they might have an opportunity there of getting in their funny work, but had the government itself in that instance followed out the law as it is in Manitoba to-day there need be no trouble in that respect.

Mr. ALCORN. Was not this matter of the cutting and carving of the lists in the polling subdivision passed on by the Court of Appeal in Manitoba?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Yes, I will deal with that in a moment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) whether or not any notice was given to the Conservative candidates or organizers when the lists were being mutilated in this way?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). No, absolutely no. And where Liberals were transferred they took mighty good care they sent out information to them in order that they might know where to vote, while the Conservatives were absolutely ignorant of the fact until election day, and even then they were unable to find out where they were transferred to. And while throughout Manitoba there were a large number—no doubt hundreds, but how many it is impossible to say—absolutely disfranchised by reason of being left off their lists and by reason of being taken off their own polling subdivision and not transferred to any other, still there were a greater number who were disfranchised by reason of their being transferred to other lists, 10 or 15 or 20 miles from their own home so that they did not know where to vote.

The Minister of Justice stated he was quite confident that there were not more than 100 disfrachised in the province of Manitoba. It is strange that we who reside in Manitoba have to come to Ottawa to learn that from the Minister of Justice. I certainly would not undertake to vouch for the number of electors that were disfrachised ; I do not think I could come within several hundreds of the number if I made a guess, but the Minister of Justice sitting down in Ottawa knows all about it and he can tell almost to a man the number who were disfranchised. How he can make such a statement as that is past my comprehension. No doubt he got his information from his supporters who know just as little about it as he does. I have

here a facsimile map of the vote held at Beausejour at poll No. 9. This map is marked in sections and the 'X' on the section represents the names left on the list and the 'O' represents the names taken on. Mixed in one with another on the same section you will see six voters, and perhaps four of them will be taken off and two left on, and the four taken off were Conservatives. Does any one suppose that was accident? If they say it was by accident they may tell it to the marines. No intelligent man will believe it. There does not seem to be any particular method in striking off the names except the method of selecting the Tories and taking them off the list. I will pass this around for the inspection and information of hon. gentlemen, so that they may see that on one section of land there would be four residents, two of them Liberals and two of the Conservatives, two transferred, two not transferred—and those that were disfranchised were the two Conservatives. Can the Prime Minister uphold such a thing as that? I am sure his supporters have not told him one-half the nefarious transactions in the holding of that election. Well, these officials were arrested and after the preliminary investigation they were sent up for trial. At the first trial the judge threw out the charge on the technical ground that the words 'wilfully erased' were not inserted in the charge, and he stated that had to be proven, and so a different procedure had to be taken. It came before Judge Perdue and Judge Perdue after hearing counsel withdrew it from the jury again on technical grounds as to what constituted a voters' list. An appeal was taken from Judge Perdue's decision and it came before the full court consisting of Judge Richards and Judge Phippen. I told in my hand the judgment of the full court, and I will read it to the House. This is it:

When the returning officer appointed to hold a Dominion election for an electoral district in Manitoba, selects one of the copies of the lists of voters sent to him by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery pursuant to section 21 of the Dominion Elections Act 1900, as the one which he will certify and forward to the deputy returning officer as required by section 41 for use at one of the polling subdivisions, that copy so selected becomes a voters' list within the meaning of section 503 of the Criminal Code 1902, and it is an offence under that section for the returning officer wilfully to erase names of voters from it, either before or after he certifies it and forwards it to the deputy.

That was the point on which Judge Perdue withdrew the case from the jury.

Such returning officer has no authority under the Dominion Elections Act, 1900, to create a voters' list upon which the election is to be held, or, under sections 22 and 23 of the Elections Act to make a new division of a constituency into polling subdivisions and rearrange the names of the voters for each when there are in fact polling divisions already established and used at the last provincial election for the same territory, whether or not such polling divisions had been erected in strict accordance with the requirements of the provincial statutes. The returning officer who wilfully makes such erasures from the voters' lists cannot escape punishment on the ground that he had to make them in consequence of having made new polling subdivisions which he had no authority to make. The fact that the heading of the list of voters in question used the words 'registration district No. 3,' instead of 'polling division No. 3' did not justify the returning officer in believing, if he did believe, that there were no polling divisions, since the territory of No. 3 was correctly described in the same heading.

The court having held that the trial judge had erred in withdrawing the case from the jury and directing a verdict of not guilty, ordered a new trial.

There is the court of appeal distinctly pointing out that this returning officer had no business whatever to violate the Dominion Elections Act in the manner in which he did. If they had complied with the law there was no possible justification or excuse for adopting the method of dividing the list in order to conform to this new policy of subdivisions. I would read a few words from the argument that followed. Judge Richards stated:

The contention for the defendant is that, under section 22 of the Dominion Elections Act, a returning officer is required or permitted to fix the limits of polling divisions, and necessarily therefore to deal with the lists of voters sent him by the clerk of the crown in chancery by so altering them that they shall suit the limits of the divisions that he so fixed.

I find myself unable to accept that view. Section 22 only requires, I think, that returning officer to get the documents or papers (other than voters' lists) named in that section, for the purpose of ascertaining what the already established polling divisions are.

Further on, Judge Richards said:

It was admitted by defendant's counsel on the argument that the defendant did in fact, by his proclamation under section 16, alter the area of the polling division to which the list which he is charged with altering applied. He took off part of the area and added territory not previously in the division.

It was argued that, even if he had done that wrongly (as it seems to me that he did) it, nevertheless, became necessary as a result of that alteration that he should alter the list so as to make it correspond with the new limits, and that such latter alteration thereby became his duty and that as a result he could not be punishable for making it wilfully, but that his only liability, if any, would be for the alteration of the area of the division.

The contention, if sound, would imply that, because he committed a breach of the law, which he should have known would necessarily cause him to commit a further breach, he is not to be responsible for committing the

second breach. If that were good law, then if statutes forbid changes in the divisions and also forbid changes in the lists, but provided penalties for the latter offence only, a returning officer who wished to alter the lists to favour a candidate could do so with impunity by first deliberately altering the divisions and then justifying under such last named alterations when charged with having changed the lists.

Where a man commits a breach of law knowing that it will necessarily involve his committing another breach, and he does also commit that other breach, it seems to me that to the extent to which the law provides penalties for such breaches he is liable to punishment for either, or for both of them.

In this he was supported by Judge Phippen in the following words :

It is now argued that the returning officer may disregard these conditions and of his own judgment, under section 23 of the Dominion Elections Act, declare 'that under the laws of the province there are no polling divisions for the purpose of provincial elections,' and then proceed to create divisions and prepare new lists.

I do not think the statute will bear any such construction. To my mind parliament never intended returning officers, appointed and acting in the heat of an election, to be the final court of appeal and to determine such delicate matters in the absence of the parties and with no provision for their being heard. Such questions can be settled only by the courts, then all parties will at least have an opportunity of being present. There were polling divisions in fact for the purpose of provincial elections, and beyond that the returning officer had no authority to inquire. It was not his business to reject that which in fact existed because of supposed illegality in its creation. I am, however, inclined to the opinion that these polling divisions were such in law as well as in fact.

I would therefore answer the questions stated in the case as follows: In my opinion the learned trial judge did not properly withdraw the case from the jury, nor did he properly direct a verdict of 'not guilty' to be entered.

There is the decision of the court of appeal and in the face of that the Minister of Justice declared that somebody had to do this dividing, that it was necessary that it should be done, and why then do we condemn them for the operation of the red line ? The provincial government used the black line. Who used the black line ? The judges of the province of Manitoba are commanded by law to make the division where there is overlapping or a new registration requiring the division of the lists. That work by the provincial law is to-day in the hands of the county court judges, any judge to be named by the Lieutenant Governor in Council and to that judge is assigned the duty of making a division. It is not left to any returning officer. Which is the fairest law, the present provincial law leaving this work to the judges or the proposed law which we are now discussing? In connection with this red line business Mr. E. L. Howell appeared to defend the culprits, R. E. A. Leach and his associates, and he stated that he appeared there on behalf of the Dominion government. Fancy these men, who had been guilty of this act as evidenced by the decision of the court of appeal, who had disfranchised the Conservative electors by the score and by the hundred, being defended by Mr. F. L. Howell, of Winnipeg, who stated that he was there at the instance of the Justice Department of this government. How different were their actions in 1896 when they caused the arrest of a number of innocent deputy returning officers in Macdonald, where there were supposed to be unwarrantable trafficking with the polls and disfranchisement of Liberal electors. Did the provincial government there, although a Liberal government, spend any of their money ? Not at all, they called on their friends here and this government spent nearly $10,000 without securing a verdict against any one of them, in hunting down the supposed criminals. But in this case they sent their legal representative in Winnipeg to defend the culprits who had been guilty of disfranchising their Conservative opponents.

I quoted a while ago the statement that under the provincial law the judges have to do the dividing of the territory and of the lists. Here is the statute for that :

In the event of territory comprised within or partly comprised within an electoral division being changed and included in another electoral division, or other electoral divisions, whether newly created or not, a judge of one of the county court divisions of the province, to be nominated and appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, shall subdivide the names appearing on the list of electors as so finally revised, according to the altered boundaries or limits, and make a complete list of electors for the electoral divisions affected, as aforesaid, and appropriately divide the names of electors and allot the territory between suitable polling subdivisions as shall in the opinion of such judge be just and equitable.

Is that not a fair provision to have the work done by the provincial judge of Manitoba, taking it out of the hands of the returning officers ? By this it is possible to judge which law is the more fair.

Some returning officers were arrested. One of them was named Duggan—and by the way I cannot congratulate the government on the superiority of the gentlemen whom they selected in some instances at any rate, to act as returning officers. This gentleman's training, however reputable he may be, has not been such as to win the confidence of the electors of that constituency. Mr. Duggan, some time before he was selected, was a clerk in a hotel kept by his brother in Selkirk.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. That is not correct.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). That is in the evidence, anyway.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. It is not.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I think it will be found that I am right. The hon. gentleman once before contradicted me. I referred to Mr. Duggan as a bartender at one time. He had been bartender, but some time prior to his appointment he was clerk in the hotel, and the hon. gentleman admitted that in a speech a few sessions ago.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. That statement is not correct.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). We will look up the evidence and see whose memory is the best. What was Mr. Duggan?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Go ahead and tell it.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). In what capacity was he acting prior to being appointed?

An hon. MEMBER. Was he a bartender?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. No, he was not.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Duggan gave some evidence. I have not got the evidence, but have a portion of it. He was the returning officer for Selkirk. It was he who took the proclamation to Mr. Leach; it was he who took the voters' lists to Mr. Leach to have them fixed in accordance with the new alterations, and he was brought before the court and gave a certain amount of evidence. We shall see the character of this evidence, as I propose to read some of it:

Q. Did you supply any one with a copy of the lists as altered?—A. No.

Q. Did you show anybody a copy of the lists as altered?—A. No.

Q. Did you know where the Liberal committee got their copies from?—A. I do not.

Q. Are you prepared to swear they did not get them from you?—A. They did not.

Q. You have told us that you did not look over those lists you received nor check them over in any way—

That is the lists he received from Mr. Leach.

Q. So you cannot swear whether a number of electors were not left off altogether?—A. I could not.

Q. There might have been for all you know?—A. There might have been.

Q. There might have been 100 struck off or 500 and not put on any other list and you would not know anything about it? Is not that the fact?—A. Yes, I did not check them up.

Here is a returning officer who certified to this list as being correct. In the face of the declaration of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth), who states that there were not over 100 electors disfranchised in the whole province of Manitoba, here is a returning officer who swears that there might have been 500 names struck off that list and not put on any other and he did not know anything about it.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Why did the Attorney General of Manitoba enter a nolle prosequi in this particular case?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I am coming to that.

Q. And that is the conclusion to draw from the fact that you did not check them over. You cannot tell whether 500 were disfranchised or not owing to the alterations?—A. I could not swear.

Q. And yet you as returning officer certified to the correctness of the list you issued?—A. Yes.

That is the kind of returning officers this government appointed. Whether there were 100 or 500 disfranchised, they certified to the list without knowing about it, but the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) knows to a man almost how many were disfranchised in the whole province.

Mr. Leach was also sworn. He said at the investigation that he was the chief organizer of the Liberal party.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Give me the names of any men outside of the few who were disfranchised.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Give me the various voters' lists, some of which are here in the office of the clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and give me the lists that were destroyed by your deputies and I will show you.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. That is no answer to my question.

Mr. STAPLES. I can give the hon. gentleman twenty-eight of them.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I went to the clerk of the Crown in Chancery and asked to be allowed to peruse some of those lists, and he admitted that many had not been returned at all. Where are they? They were destroyed no doubt by the various deputies lest they might be incriminated, and now, four years afterwards, the hon. gentleman challenges us to give the names of the men who were disfranchised.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I am just following your leader's example. He is a great man for challenging to give names. I will give some to-morrow.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. During 1904 Mr. Leach was chief organizer for the Liberal party. In the summer of that year he had been doing organization work in connection with the voters' lists for the Manitoba constituency. He had been doing the work of preparing the lists for the committees, copying in the books the reports, preparing a different division of the polling districts

from those mentioned in the registration papers. Some time before the election and before the writs were issued, he was making arrangements for having the lists in the elections different from those used in the Dominion elections. He was asked:

Q. What were the methods of arriving at the lists which were used?—A. After planning out what we thought would be suitable polling subdivisions, we prepared lists to conform with these divisions.

Q. Who were present while you were doing that work? I presume you were not personally doing the work yourself? Did you supervise the work?—A. I directed it.

Q. Who were the persons actually doing the work?—A. Mr. Neighorn was chiefly charged with the responsibility.

He goes on to say that he did not touch either the Brandon, Dauphin or Portage lists. That is the reason these gentlemen had no complaints coming in. Mr. Leach did not have the opportunity of disfranchising in connection with these lists. But with these exceptions, all the lists in the other constituencies were prepared under his supervision. On being asked regarding the secrecy of the operations, he gave evidence as follows :

Q. You carried out the work in the same way as the rest of the work in this office—in such a way that information as to what was being done did not go outside, as far as you know?—A. It did not get outside.

Q. Except to the Liberal organization and the persons you thought entitled to the information?—A. We did not take any pains to notify our opponents.

Q. But you took good care to keep your work from your opponents. You were doing your work as effectively as possible?—A. It turned out to be effective.

This is the Leach who flaunts the operation of the thin red line as having done its work very effectively in disfranchising the citizens of that province. The Liberal organs of Manitoba have been writing up articles to supply these gentlemen down here with material for this discussion. The authority is a very poor one, but let me give you the very best that the 'Free Press' can say—not that I agree with its conclusions, because I entirely disagree with them, but to show the very best face that can be put upon these proceedings :

Free Press, February 14, 1908.

On the whole the work was done in 1904, in view of the limitations of time, with creditable accuracy. In practically only three constituencies were there any real grounds of complaint. There were clean lists in Winnipeg, Souris, Dauphin, Marquette, Brandon and Lisgar.

I beg to differ. There were not clean lists in Marquette or one or two other of those constituencies, but where there were clean lists is where Mr. Leach did not have the opportunity of using the red line.

In the constituencies of Macdonald, Selkirk and Provencher there were, in some four or five polling divisions, undoubtedly irregularities.

What a mild term !

Whether these were wilfully done or not has never been established. The points at which names had either been carelessly transferred or unintentionally dropped——

As, for instance, where there were 41 names scored off the list 23 of which did not appear on any other list, of which 18 were the names of Conservatives—that was merely 'careless transferring.' Of course, it was quite unintentional—but it was significant just the same.

—were Beausejour, St. Boniface and Miami. There also appears to have been some trouble at Poplar Point, although no attempt has ever been made to state the facts as to these cases.

The article goes on :

It can, however, be said that at the outside not more than forty or fifty parties lost their votes——

This was stated by the hon. member for Lisgar and will be stated by other hon. members on that side. This is their authority for that statement.

—and that with the possible exception of Provencher, the results of the Dominion elections were in no wise affected by these mistakes.

Here is an acknowledgment that a gentleman sits on the Liberal side of this House representing a constituency—Provencher—that was stolen from the Liberal Conservative candidate. Here is the admission of the Liberal party organ that that constituency at least was stolen from the Conservatives. Their candidate had a majority of only 10, and in St. Boniface alone there were 25 Conservatives who were disfranchised, more than double enough to wipe out the Liberal majority. And this is the kind of argument that these hon. gentlemen put up to bolster up their case.

I am just reminded, in connection with the duplicate list, that Mr. Leach swore he was provided with only one copy of these lists by those whom he had in his employ. But he is distinctly contradicted by Neighorn who did the altering of the lists. Leach swore that he left it with Neighorn, and Neighorn swore that he made a duplicate list and handed both to Leach. And, no doubt, the duplicate was sent to his political friends to notify them where they were to go to poll their votes.

Now, I am asked by the hon. member for Pictou, 'Why were these cases dropped ?' What have we read in the Liberal press ever since this question arose in 1904 ? Persecution ! Persecution on the part of the provincial government of Manitoba against these poor officials who had done nothing wrong. So it has been stated, but I do not

think they will state it again. We were told that these officials were being persecuted. They were taken from court to court until they were brought to the court of appeal. And there it was decided that they were wrong, that they had no right to make these new polling subdivisions, and no right to treat the lists as they did. What was the use of going on when there was a decision of that kind, in the face of which such actions cannot be repeated. Had we gone on, the charge of 'persecution' would have been hurled still more viciously against the Conservatives. But another reason why these cases were dropped was that the Dominion government had turned this into a political question by sending Mr. E. L. Howard to represent the party in these cases. Would it be possible to get a jury that would not be a political jury with the Dominion government defending the accused? I think this is a sufficient answer to the hon. member for Pictou. Had the cases gone on we should have heard much more from the Liberal representatives and the Liberal press the accusation that we were persecuting these returning officers. In fact the Minister of Justice admitted as much by stating that if the present law were left in force, it would be impossible to get men to act as returning officers in future. But, as the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) rightly stated, that any returning officer who discharged his duty faithfully and well in accordance with his sworn declaration need not fear the law,—if he does his duty he has nothing to fear. Now, why were the lists in the constituency of Selkirk handed to Leach? Mr. Duggan had been a resident of the constituency for fifteen years, and must have been much better acquainted with the constituency than Leach, in fact, Leach had no local knowledge of the constituency. Mr. Duggan, if he had an education and was a proper man to act in that capacity, having been a resident for so long, should have been able to do the work himself.

Now, what became of these gentlemen? In the first place, we have Leach appointed to a position by the Minister of the Interior—not the present Minister of Interior. Leach carried on this work for the election in December, 1904. He was in charge of the province of Manitoba as organizer. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) was Minister of the Interior at that time. Mr. Leach was a confidential friend of that hon. gentleman, and, after perpetrating these gross frauds he was rewarded by being appointed to a position under the Crown the salary of which was $3,000, if I mistake not. To-day he is on the pay-roll of this government, acting in the capacity of inspector of land offices. Mr. Neighorn, the chief man in charge, has also been rewarded by being made, I believe, private secretary to the chairman of the Transcontinental Commission. Mr. Ayotte, the returning officer for Provencher, has been rewarded with a place as immigration agent in the United States where he draws a salary the amount of which I have forgotten. He is pensioned upon the people of this country for his services to the Liberal party on that occasion, and McLeod was similarly rewarded with a government position. Each and every one of these men is to-day on the pay-roll of this country; instead of being punished for their nefarious transactions, they have been rewarded by this government in accordance with its well-established practice.

Now, this action of the government in trying to force this Election Act upon us is an evidence, a confession of the pitiable weakness of their position with the western people. As I have already said, the government fear a free and untrammelled verdict of the people. They have placed imposition after imposition upon the little province of Manitoba ever since they came into power. For reasons best known to themselves, they have been punishing that little province until now we have the crowning iniquity of endeavouring to throttle the franchise of that province. I can tell the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that he is not going to improve his reputation with right-thinking people, Liberals as well as Conservatives, by this measure, for it is resented by the people of the west, but especially of Manitoba, irrespective of party. This measure is an acknowledgment that the government cannot hope to carry Manitoba without resorting to loaded lists. Sir, the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) when prime minister of the province, ran elections in 1892, 1896, 1899, and he never once ran an election without loaded lists. And to-day, because the lists in that province are absolutely as fair to one party as to the other, that hon. gentleman and his colleagues in this House—every one of whom has sat in the legislature behind him as premier—demand that the same handicap should be placed upon their opponents in Dominion elections.

Talk about the list being unfair. I picked up to-day the 'Winnipeg Telegram' and what do I find? You would not find this in any Liberal organ in any province of the Dominion of Canada, unless they were perfectly sure of their ground. This paper offers a bonus of $25 for every case that can be found of a man who has been improperly left off the list during this coming revision. The 'Telegram' offers a bonus of $25 to any man who can substantiate before an impartial judge that he has appeared before a registration clerk in the coming revision this month, or next month, who is qualified to get his name on the list, and who has been refused. And who do they select for the judge? The Hon. Charles Mickle, leader of the Liberal party in the local legislature of Manitoba. Here is the article in that paper:

There is not another province in Canada that can show such a record in the administration of its election law. There is no partiality in the administration of Manitoba's election law, for the simple reason that the system makes the elector independent of officials and renders partiality obsolutely impossible. The 'Telegram' is confident that the fairness and impartiality which have characterized previous registrations in the province of Manitoba will characterize the registration which is about to be held. It is so confident that the electors of the province, irrespective of party sympathies, will be dealt with fairly that it makes the following proposition:

The 'Telegram' will pay the sum of $25 to any elector in the province of Manitoba who is not already on the voters' lists who is refused registration if he applies in the regular manner and is legally qualified to vote under our law. Should any claim or claims be made under this offer each case to be referred to Hon. C. J. Mickle, leader of His Majesty's loyal opposition in the Manitoba legislature, from whose decision there shall be no appeal. Should any award be made, one half the amount is to be paid to the elector who has been refused registration and the other half to the Winnipeg General Hospital.

I ask the Prime Minister, is it reasonable to suppose that any person holding a responsible position would make an offer of that kind if he did not feel absolutely sure of his position, absolutely confident that no such case can be found? Under the existing law both parties will be at the court of revision, each party will have an equal chance with the other, and I say it is absurd to suppose that these charges of unfairness can be substantiated. But that is not all. Information came to me to-day that this offer is going to be followed up by another to the effect that if it can be shown that any elector was unjustifiably kept off the list at the last revision, having complied with the law in every respect, or if he was improperly left off the list, or if anybody was improperly struck off the list —and I desire to emphasize this, because no registration clerk in the province of Manitoba has power to strike a single man off the list the judge may do so, the revising barrister—I believe that to-morrow's 'Telegram' will say that if it can be shown that any one was disfranchised improperly last year, they will pay $25 for every such case, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier himself shall be the judge. Now I think our Liberal friends, instead of indulging in declamations and reckless assertions, should come down to hard facts, and give us specific cases if they are able to do so.

Now it has been stated that in 1904 Mr. Sifton endeavoured to pass an Act similar to this. So he did. The Prime Minister knows that. He knows that an Act was hatched, was printed in fact, but it never saw the light of day so far as this parliament is concerned, strangled almost before it was born, by reason of the fairness of the predecessor of the present Minister of Justice. The present Minister of Justice, though, will strike an opponent below the belt, he will stoop to do things of this kind that his predecessor in office would not resort to. He came into parliament with a great reputation as a legal authority; as a politician he has proved a huge failure, but as a partisan he has proved a splendid success. He is making for himself a reputation that certainly is not enviable west of the great lakes. In 1904, as I say, Mr. Sifton hatched an Act and told his friends never to mind a revision; I am going to introduce an Act, he told them, that will take the lists entirely away from the officials of the local legislature, and we will have our own officials prepare the lists. It was because of that that the Liberals in Manitoba did not become active in connection with the revision of 1904, and hence they had to resort to the thin red line, they had to make it up in some way, and they endeavoured to do it by that method. Now what does this Bill provide. There is a very significant clause here, subsection 2, which reads:

In the preparation of such lists the provisions of the laws of the province regulating the preparation and manner of revising and bringing into force the provincial voters' lists in the like cases shall as far as possible——

Very significant words in the light of past experience.

—be observed and followed and no person whose name is not included in the voters' lists so prepared and revised shall be entitled to vote.

What do I mean by saying, 'In the light of past experience?' We had a by-election in the constituency of Lisgar in 1901. The then representative, Mr. Richardson, was unseated, and a by-election was held in consequence. The provincial voters' lists were upwards of one year old. The Dominion law provides that when the lists are upwards of twelve months old, the Dominion officials shall make up lists of their own, a law with the identical words in it, following as far as possible the provisions of the provincial law. What did they do? At that time the judges constituted the board of registration as they do now, the five judges of the province of Manitoba. These five judges had the power to say where the registration booths should be placed, they had the naming of the registration clerks, they had the naming of the revising barristers, the government had not a single word to say in either of these respects, either in placing the registration booths in the different districts, or in appointing the registration clerks, or in naming the revising barristers. The government had not the slightest thing to do with all that. Did this government follow out

the provision of that law? They could have done so, but they ignored it. What did the late Minister of the Interior do? He appointed a gentleman named, I think, Alexander McLeod, a strong Liberal partisan, and they constituted him a board of registration instead of the judges under the provincial law. Was that fair towards their opponents? They ignored the provincial law entirely. Now it was not impossible to have taken these judges as the provincial law required. But they appointed this Liberal lawyer and gave him all the power that the provincial law centred in the judges. He designated where the registration booths should be, and placed them in the most inconvenient places for the Conservatives in that constituency. He appointed the registration clerks every man of whom was a partisan Liberal, and he appointed the revising barristers, not one of whom was a Conservative. These gentlemen claim that under the present Act all the registration clerks are Conservatives. Does this Aylesworth Bill provide that there shall be a Tory appointed to revise the new lists? Do you suppose that it worked a hardship? Is it wrong to have a Tory appointed as a registration clerk and is it right to have a Liberal? Alex. McLeod appointed partisans as his officials. The Liberals appointed revising barristers of their own political faith, and they appointed registration clerks, partisans of their own. They ignored absolutely the provisions of the law. Hence, I say these words, 'as far as possible,' are utterly meaningless, and that with the provision of the present Act we would just see a repetition of what we did see in connection with the Lisgar election of 1901.

I wish to anticipate one or two things that no doubt will be said and to refer to one or two things which have been said by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford). He made a speech prior to the Christmas holidays in connection with the voters' lists and he made several accusations in connection with the revision of the lists that are absolutely foundationless, as I have already proved, in connection with the Balsam Bay revision where seven names were left off. At page 348 of 'Hansard' the hon. member for Portage la Prairie referred to the official voters' list of the district of Rockwood and he complained of the fact that 90 names had been struck from the voters' lists of polling subdivision No. 1 of that district and some 45 names left on. He made the bold statement that if the act had been done by a Grit he would have been put in the penitentiary, but as it was done under Tory instructors every man got scot-free. As a matter of fact the striking of those names off that polling subdivision was done by Judge Meyers, a gentleman who represented the Liberal cause in the constituency in which I have the honour to reside for many years and who was an ardent Liberal politician. He was the judge appointed. He did nothing illegal. Why? Because the district was divided by the redistribution and he had to divide the lists. Under the provincial law it was referred to a judge. Judge Meyers divided it and yet this hon. gentleman states it was done by a Tory and that if it had been done by a Grit he would have been placed in the penitentiary. Surely the hon. member for Portage la Prairie does not want to put Judge Meyers in the penitentiary for carrying out the provisions of the law. There was no more ardent admirer of his than the hon. member for Portage la Prairie in days gone by. He was appointed by this government. He did so under the powers given him by Act of parliament coupled with an order in council. The order in council is right here under my hand appointing Judge Meyers. I have a certified copy of that order in council in my possession. The Act which gave the judge authority to strike these names off the list is chapter 23 of the statutes of Manitoba, 1906, section 7 and subsection 4 coupled with an order in council, No. 11465. The changes in the voters' list for the electoral division above mentioned were occasioned by the fact that the boundaries of these electoral divisions were changed by chapter 11 of the statutes of Manitoba, 1907. And by a perusal of subsection 4, section 7, chapter 23, statutes of Manitoba, 1906, it will be seen that provision is made for changes in the revised voters' lists by a judge in the county court of the province to be nominated and appointed by an order in council whenever the territory comprised in an electoral division has been changed; so that, in making changes in these electorial divisions, Judge Meyers and Judge Ryan, in another district, were each acting within their jurisdiction and in accordance with the law.

At page 349 of 'Hansard' it will be seen that the hon. member for Portage la Prairie said, in reply to a question of the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), as to whether these names had been struck off in open court 'no court, they simply did it on the side and it was all right.' I tell you that it was done in open court and that it was done by Judge Meyers acting within his jurisdiction according to chapter 23 of the statutes of Manitoba for 1906, to which I have already referred. Then, again, at page 349 of 'Hansard,' it will be seen that the hon. member for Portage la Prairie made this statement:

> They take from one electoral division and add to another, but they fail to make the necessary provision for the correction of the voters' lists.

This is as unfortunate as the statement that he made previously that these names were 'not struck off in open court but simply on the side and it was all right,' be-

cause provision had, as I have already pointed out, been made by subsection 4 of section 7, chapter 23, statutes of Manitoba, 1906, for dealing with the rearranging of the voters' lists in case territories are taken out of one electoral division and placed in another. I will read the subsection which is the authority under which Judge Meyers acted :

> In the event of territory comprised within or partly comprised within an electoral division being changed and included in another electoral division, or other electoral divisions, whether newly created or not, a judge of one of the county court divisions of the province to be nominated and appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, shall subdivide the names appearing on the list of electors, as so finally revised, according to the altered boundaries or limits, and make a complete list of electors for the electoral divisions affected, as aforesaid, and appropriately divide the names of electors and allot the territory between suitable polling subdivisions as shall, in the opinion of such judge, be just and equitable.

There was the justification for Judge Meyers' action.

In reference to the changes made in the boundaries of the electoral divisions of Kildonan and St. Andrew's, St. Boniface and Winnipeg North under the statutes, chapter 11, of 1907, Judge Meyers was appointed under order in council No. 11493, to arrange the lists under powers conferred by subsection 4 of section 7, chapter 23, of the statutes of 1906, and in striking off names from the voters' list of Kildonan and St. Andrew's and St. Boniface, all the names were struck off by Judge Meyers, and while they were not added to any other voters' lists, all these parties who were then qualified electors and whose names were struck from these voters' lists had an opportunity to become electors in the electoral division of Winnipeg North when the voters' lists of that electoral division were compiled and revised just prior to the general election of the province in March last, because they were then within Winnipeg North and no possible injustice was done to any bona fide voter by having his name struck off either of these lists as by the provision of chapter 11 of the statutes of 1907 they ceased to be electors of either Kildonan and St. Andrew's or St. Boniface and, by the operation of that Act, became entitled to be registered as electors of the electoral division of Winnipeg North.

There is another charge made by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie, as reported on page 349 of 'Hansard,' in reference to an Act passed by the legislature of the province of Manitoba and known as chapter 13 of the statutes of 1907, whereby the names of seven persons were added to the voters' lists of that electoral division. That is the Balsam Bay division which I have already dealt with. At page 2128 of 'Hansard' the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) made the remark that the revisions that are taking place are only little things, that they do not amount to much. I have here the result of the last revision that took place and here is a book containing the revised list almost as large as the original list and yet the hon. member calls it a little revision. Hundreds of names have been added to the list. The hon. member made this statement :

> The little things that have occurred since then have been merely revisions, and notice is now given in this proclamation that it is not necessary for those on the list to appear at the court of registration. It is simply necessary to revise the list.

It was he and his own political friends in Manitoba who objected to the hardship of compelling the old residents of the province to come forward and register after they had once registered. They claimed that all that was necessary was that in case of death or removal their names should be struck off. These little revisions that he speaks of are the same kind of revisions which this Act is supposed to perpetuate. What are they going to do ?—take this very same list and in the province of Manitoba and revise it by their own Dominion officials. They are going to make a complete list, they are going to adopt the provincial lists, with what little revision they can do after the issue of the writ. But these are the very same methods that they condemn as being unwarranted. I tell the Prime Minister that there would not have been the slightest objection to the manner in which the last elections in Manitoba were conducted had the law been observed. I tell the Prime Minister candidly that if he wants to prevent a recurrence of the carelessness of transferring names, and if he wants to prevent the disfranchisement of electors by means of transferring where there is overlapping, the only thing he has to do is to adopt the provision of the provincial Act and employ a county court judge to do that dividing. That will get over every complaint that has been made and it will obviate the necessity of the thin red line. Let the county court judge do the transferring where there is overlapping, let him appoint each one of these separated places as a separate polling division in each Dominion constituency, let the judge name a separate polling division as the provincial Act enacts, let him do the dividing of the lists and there will not be a single complaint from Grit or Tory in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. BERGERON. And they are all Liberal judges.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The government need have no fear of the judges because they are all appointees of the Do-

minion government. If the Prime Minister acts on my suggestion which is a fair one, it will do away with the necessity of introducing such a Bill as this which perpetrates a rank injustice on the people of the west.

Mr. ALCORN. And the voters could be notified of where they are to vote.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Yes, and at the same time the people could be notified and know at what poll they should vote. The Minister of Justice told us the other day :

> We are not only adopting the provincial lists in their entirety as the basis upon which revision and appeal takes place but in addition we follow completely the provincial method of preparing and revising the lists.

But this method has been condemned by the hon. gentlemen opposite and yet the Minister of Justice says they are going to follow completely the provisions of the provincial law and to adopt the provincial lists in their entirety.

> And the lists are made in accordance with whatever laws the provinces choose to enact for their own purpose, as was the intention when the statute of 1908 was passed. That is an outline of the first clause of this Bill.

And yet hon. gentlemen opposite get up and denounce the present method of compiling the present lists in Manitoba, and their own minister says he will adopt these lists in their entirety in order to have a revision. But the whole object and the whole motive behind the Bill is to have the preparation of the lists pass into the hands of partisan officials of this government. That is the whole secret of the Bill and from our experience of the past we know just exactly how much fairness we can expect from those gentlemen in the preparation and revision of the lists.

I shall not discuss the provisions of the Bill as it affects other provinces, but as was justly pointed out so far as it relates to the unorganized districts of Ontario and Quebec it would work out in practice that all the navvies working on the Grand Trunk Pacific, who are under the influence of the contractors who are in turn under the influence of the government, would be placed upon the list and would be polled holus bolus in favour of the Liberal candidates. At any rate that is the object and intention of the Bill. The hon. member of Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) stated that there was an educational test in Manitoba which necessitated the voter being able to read the Manitoba Act in one of several languages, and he told us that was designed to disfranchise certain foreigners. But, at the same time he told us there was a clause in the Dominion Act by which they were going to vote the Galicians and, he said : I am going to poll the Gallician vote. He spoke about them as if he was herding a lot of cattle ; he told us that he was going to poll the Galician vote. Yes, that is the way they did it in my own constituency. They had their homestead inspector, they had their interpreters, they had a Mounted Policeman all the way from Regina standing at the door with his side arms, and we know what influence that had on Galicians who were practically serfs in their native country. We had them standing there threatening them that they would have to serve in the army if they voted Conservative and that they would have their homesteads taken from them. The Galician interpreter was arrested with $600 in $2 bills in his pockets starting out to influence the voters on Sunday morning and he and the $600 were tied up during election week. The member for Winnipeg told us that he was going to poll the Galicians, they are not going to have much to say in it themselves, but he is going to vote them just like so many cattle. Now, this provision for voting the employees on the Transcontinental railroad is quite apparent, and although it is only a blind to put it in this Bill I am glad in one way it is associated with this outrage on the province of Manitoba. We have had an overture made to drop the unorganized territories in Ontario and Quebec and to drop British Columbia from the Bill, but the object is to get at Manitoba. They simply associate the other provinces with us in the Bill so as not to make it appear so transparent, but the overture made shows exactly the animus by which they are influenced.

I throw out a warning to the Prime Minister. I tell him that he has no idea of the feeling that has been raised in the west by the introduction of this Bill. I was surprised on a recent visit to my province to find no Liberals justifying the Bill, while every Conservative condemned it. The fair minded Liberals will not stand for it, and I tell the Prime Minister he is being misled. if he believes what his supporters have told him that there is any outcry in Manitoba against the method of preparing the provincial lists under the present provincial law, he will find many honest Liberals in that province to tell him otherwise. Why was it that the Liberal candidates throughout the last provincial campaign had scarcely a word said as to the method of preparing the voters' lists ? I never heard the thing discussed in the four constituencies I had the privilege of speaking in. The Prime Minister has no idea of the bitter feeling that has been engendered in Manitoba by this Bill, and it will not redound to his reputation for fairness as a statesman to force upon an unwilling province an Act of this most objectionable character. At the worst it will invite retaliation. I am not going to say that the provincial government will retaliate, but I do know that when the provincial government came into power and

when Hugh John Macdonald wiped out that Greenway Election Act which was described by Mr. James Fisher, an independent Liberal, as a monstrosity of monstrosities, there were a great many in the province of Manitoba who thought it was a mistake to repeal the Greenway law for they claimed it should be retained so as to give the Liberals a dose of their own medicine and let them know what it was to run an election under such an Act. If this Bill is forced upon an unwilling opposition in this House there may be a temptation to retaliate, and if so the last state of the Liberals in that province will be worse than the first, for to-day they are disunited, disintegrated, unable, to secure a seat for their outside leader, and with their inside leader endorsing the voters' lists as at present prepared in the province of Manitoba.

Without any investigation this Act has been introduced. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has made a challenge. I would like to see that challenge accepted. If they are going to force on Manitoba the making of voters' lists by Dominion officials, why should that not be done in other provinces if it can be established that other provinces have voters' lists and Franchise Acts far more unfair to political opponents than those in Manitoba? We have never had any investigation into this question, and the leader of the opposition has stated that if an opportunity is afforded he will bring forward two voters disfranchised in Nova Scotia by means of the operation of the Franchise Act there to one in Manitoba. This being the case, why should we be forced to accept such a Bill as this without any investigation? It is unjust and unfair and as a Manitoban I protest. I go still further. I do not wish to use words that may be interpreted as a threat, I do not desire them to be interpreted in that way, but I say, as has been said by other hon. members, that the opposition would be justified in refusing a dollar of supplies to carry on this government until that obnoxious measure is withdrawn. The First Minister knows the constitutional privileges which an opposition may utilize to fight for what they consider their rights. He has occupied that position in days gone by. He objected to the Franchise Act of 1885 with all the resources on which he could call, and I say it is impossible for an opposition here to calmly submit. There is a limit to the forbearance and we would be justified in refusing supplies until that Bill is modified to the extent of having the obnoxious provision relating to Manitoba and British Columbia withdrawn. There has been no complaint by any members from British Columbia as to the voters' lists there. The clauses which relate to the unorganized districts of Ontario and Quebec fall within the same category. I, therefore, feel in duty bound to move the following amendment:

Mr. W. J. ROCHE.

That all the words after the word 'that' in the proposed motion be omitted, and the following substituted instead thereof:

This House affirms that the Dominion Elections Act should be effectively amended during the present session in order to prevent corrupt practices and ensure honest elections, but that the discrimination against the provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia created by the first section of the proposed Bill is not founded upon any inquiry, evidence, report or sufficient information, is a radical departure from the principle of acceptance of provincial voters' lists and is invidious and unjustifiable.

Mr. JOHN CRAWFORD (Portage la Prairie). Mr. Speaker, the closing remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat are almost sufficient, without any other reason, to make every honest Liberal and possibly every honest citizen of this country seriously consider the situation. The closing remarks of the hon. gentleman's speech were practically a hold-up for this House and a challenge for the Liberals of this country. In fact, his entire speech was along the line of trying to prove that the Conservatives were more honest than the Liberals; that idea underlay his whole argument. I shall not follow his remarks in detail, but I would say to the Prime Minister that he need not be the least alarmed as to the feeling in Manitoba towards this legislation. I can assure the Prime Minister that this legislation has the warmest kind of support from the majority of the people of Manitoba.

I shall refer to some of the opening remarks of my hon. friend and leave it to the House to judge whether we may accept any part of them as being in keeping with the facts. He referred to certain work that was being done in connection with registration in Manitoba at the present time; he tried to make out that fair and liberal treatment was meted out to the people there with the exception of one or two cases. But in reading the order in council in regard to the situation and the time given for work in connection with the revision of the list, he did not keep in touch with the facts. In speaking of Beautiful Plains he tried to read from this order in council that there were four clear days between the closing of the registration and the revision, while there were only three. In the Gladstone division he claimed there were twelve clear days, while there were only eight. If the rest of his statements are no nearer the truth than that, the House will not put very much credence in what he says.

Mr. STAPLES. Will you be satisfied that your grievance is remedied if the time is extended in the particular places you have in mind?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I shall be better satisfied than I am to-day but not completely satisfied, because I am convinced that if

this agitation were not on here to-day, if this legislation were not before the House, I would not be getting a promise of that kind.

Mr. STAPLES. Will the hon. gentleman allow me? Who fixes the dates for the courts of revision?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Lieutenant Governor in Council—the political machine of the province of Manitoba. It is not the judges, as our Tory friends throughout the country would lead the people to believe. The judges have no control over the courts of revision as to fixing dates.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. The hon. member for Marquette said it was the judges.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There were only eight clear days in Gladstone and three in Beautiful Plains.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The last date for the court of registration in Gladstone is May 28, and the court of revision 9th June. Can you make eight days out of that?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I will read it and show the hon. gentleman he is not correct.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I am quoting from the 'Gazette.'

Mr. CRAWFORD. June 1, for the court of revision in the electoral division of Gladstone; in the town hall of Gladstone on June 9. In all eight clear days. The hon. gentleman said to-night there were twelve days.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). In justice to myself let me point out that the latest court of registration is usually that at the foot of the list. The last notice of the registration clerk at the foot of the list is usually the last court of revision, and in this case it was set at the 28th May. But I notice that above there was a court of revision advertised for June 1, which I overlooked. I took the notice at the foot of the list as being the last court.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. You will have to revise the rest of your speech.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In connection with the proposed legislation I do not think there is any better evidence this House can have for the securing of something along this line than the fact that throughout the country, for the last four years, there have been hurled at the Liberal party statements of the most extravagant kind imaginable as to what they did in the elections of 1904. The discussion here up to the present has gone to prove that we have an undesirable condition of affairs in connection with the conduct of the elections in Manitoba and that there is need for some remedy. I have spoken on this question every session since the election of 1904 and have taken the position that the conditions surrounding the running of elections in the province of Manitoba are such that we ought not to tolerate. A great part of the long speech we have just heard was spent on a comparison between the Greenway legislation and that of the Roblin government, trying to prove that the latter was better than the former. But so far as we on this side are concerned, that is not an issue because in this Bill we adopt the legislation of Manitoba. And while I do not approve of the Manitoba law in its entirety and propose to show where I take exception to it, the greatest trouble we have in that province lies in the administration of the law. The provincial government have taken full control of the administration of the law. No official or judge has anything to say as to how that law shall be administered. The full control is taken by the executive council.

Mr. LANCASTER. Do not the judges revise the lists?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Only on the direction of the executive council and only during the hours fixed by the executive council. Let me give you an idea how that works out. In the Beautiful Plains division where I live, the necessary time is not provided to make a proper revision of the list. The time allowed by the executive council of Manitoba to revise the list is five hours in a day from 1 to 6 o'clock p.m. Only during those hours can the judge act in connection with the revision of the lists. Is that fair? The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) complained bitterly of the conditions under the Greenway Act and he referred to Beautiful Plains, where he said the list was stuffed to the extent of 107 names. But what was the condition last year? There were almost 600 names to be adjusted in connection with that list in that same division last year. We succeeded in striking off 319 names and adding 184. How does that compare as against a list stuffed with 107 names? And how did we get this adjustment? Was it by law? Not at all. We had to meet our Tory opposition independent of the courts, and only at the will of our opposition friends did we succeed in getting any of those names off. If we had gone into the courts and argued, we would not have got 10 off. And after getting those few adjusted in that amicable way, there were 75 or 100 more that should have gone off but on which we could not agree. That is the kind of administration we are getting in Manitoba. The condition is not endurable and does not compare in any way with the conditions under the Greenway legislation of some years ago which is so condemned by our Tory friends.

In connection with this whole matter, I am satisfied that the people are tired of the situation. I am satisfied that the people, particularly in the province of Manitoba,

are tired of hearing about those 9,000 names which were disfranchised by the red line. They are tired of hearing about what was done, or supposed to be done, in the way of irregularities in 1904. I know that the Liberals of Manitoba are convinced that the law for running Dominion elections is bad and they want to have better arrangements. I am satisfied that our Tory friends came to the conclusion that the situation is not right, as proven by the fact that, for three or four years, they have had charges standing against Dominion officials and they have spent thousands and thousands of dollars of our money trying to secure convictions and finally quit the job without succeeding. They must have come to the conclusion that the situation is bad and that there should be some remedy for it. I think that is the conviction of the honest-minded people of this country generally. Now, if the law is in such a shape that wrongs of that kind can be committed, I think it is up to this government to provide such legislation as will prevent such wrongs in the future. On the other hand, there should be some law that would provide for the protection of these officers. If these acts were legal acts, acts that it was proper for these officials to do, I think this country should give them protection ; something should be done for these people who have been persecuted and hounded for the last four or five years. I take the position that no wrongs were done, but that, in adjusting the lists, of 1904 as they did, the returning officers did what they had a right to do. And what I take exception to here as mentioned by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) that when some of our Tory friends did the same things of which complaint is made against Liberals, they were not prosecuted by the authorities of the province ; they were allowed to go scot free while the Liberals were hounded. I think we want to get something that will get us away from this whole trouble and agitation.

Mr. LANCASTER. Before the hon. gentleman leaves that point, will he allow me to ask him a question ? He belongs to Manitoba, and I want to understand the situation as a citizen of the Dominion. I think he said there was a hardship in these judges not having time to revise the lists. Will he tell me of any case in which a judge refused to adjourn a court to another day when he was not through with this work ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I can tell him that Mr. Heap——

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not want to know about him.

Mr. CRAWFORD. He was sitting as a judge and had the powers of a judge so far as his work was concerned——

Mr. CRAWFORD.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not care about Leach. There are judges in Manitoba, and the hon. gentleman knows what a judge is. And these judges are reputable men.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am speaking of Mr. Heap.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would like the hon. gentleman, if he will, to answer my question. I am talking about the judges of the province of Manitoba. He said that there is not time for them to do their work. I ask him, can he give an occasion where any of these judges who did the revising refused to adjourn a court when he was not through with the work of revising ? If he cannot tell me that, I would like him to say so.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The order in council is imperative, and where a judge adjourns his court for the purpose of placing men on the list who were not on, the attorney general of the province took the position that it was an illegal act and he took those names off the list—at least approved of the taking the names off.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will the hon. gentleman kindly tell me what was the name of the judge when it did happen ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Heap was the revising officer. Now, in connection with the working out of the situation in Manitoba in the last election, I take the position that the returning officers did their work and did it as they had a right to do. But, at the same time, I must say that they were put in a position which they should not be asked to occupy. Section 24 of the Dominion Elections Act provides :

> The polling divisions shall, except as herein otherwise provided, be those established by or under the laws of the province for the purpose of provincial elections within the territory comprised in the electoral district for which the election is held.

Now, in the situation as it existed in 1904, in Manitoba, there were no polling divisions established by law.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The judge in the court of appeals said there were.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I challenge any hon. gentlemen opposite to show and define any polling division established in the province of Manitoba by law.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would accept the challenge and say I defeat the hon. gentleman by quoting the fact that the court of appeal of the province of Manitoba said that there were—and that is pretty good authority.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Chief Justice Howell, of the court of appeal of Manitoba, before the special committee two years ago, made the statement made by the hon. member of Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford).

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). And he was overruled by his colleagues.

Mr. LANCASTER. His judgment was appealed from and overruled, and he——

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. He was not overruled at all.

Mr. LANCASTER. He was overruled by the full court, and my hon. and learned friend (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) ought to know that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I make that statement and I have yet to find out that any poll was so established. I have read the evidence taken before the committee, and even if you take the statement made by the hon. member for Marquette, you will see that they do not say there was a poll established.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Certainly they do.

Mr. CRAWFORD. No, they say that if it did exist the officer had a right to do so and so.

Mr. LANCASTER. They said it did not exist.

Mr. CRAWFORD. No, they did not. The position in which the returning officers were placed when they were called on to carry out the election in the province of Manitoba was this: I have here before me the lists of Manitoba, nearly all of them, and you can go over these lists from one end to the other and there is not a polling division mentioned throughout the lot—they are all registration divisions, and there is no evidence anywhere that the returning officer could show in any shape or form that there existed a polling division anywhere in the province of Manitoba. That being the case, I take the position that the returning officer did perfectly right in creating his own polls as he saw fit. And that was done. Some of these lists were less suitable for polling divisions than others. Let me cite a case from my own division in which there was no formal allegation that there was any disfranchising by the 'Thin Red Line' notwithstanding Hon. Robert Rogers, who has been quoted here to-night, said that there were 1,395. I will cite one instance in my own experience. I have possibly one of the most favourable divisions for establishing polling places in the province of Manitoba. Here are two townships and a half in the provincial constituency. At one end there is a town largely Grit, at the other end there is a town that is largely Tory. These are all put into one poll, and the Grits are forced to go from their town twelve miles to the other town to vote. I think the returning officer under those conditions would have the right to divide that poll and make it convenient for the voters. I think the poll is numbered 44. Under such conditions I think the returning officer was justified in doing everything he did do, and he should not have been subjected to prosecution. The hon. member for Marquette said to-night that no one had been prosecuted for making a division where there was an overlapping of polls. Now, I have here a map showing a case where there is an overlapping of one polling division into the counties of Lisgar, Macdonald and Souris. I have here the federal electoral list. The division is called the provincial electoral district of Mountain, registration district No. 5; 41 names apply to Souris, 6 to Lisgar and the balance to Macdonald. Yesterday with the clerk of the Crown in Chancery I checked over this list with the lists that were used at the election by the deputy returning officers in those three polls, and I find that every name was on these lists that were used in that election. But what happened? The returning officer was arrested and prosecuted for dividing that list to suit the circumstances of the case. Mr. Leach, the organizer, was also arrested in connection with the same matter. I am satisfied that so far as the polling divisions are concerned the returning officers were justified in what they did. I have here the lists that are supplied to the returning officers for the electoral division of Portage la Prairie. On those lists there are about 13,000 names, and of those 13,000 names, 4,244 do not belong to the division of Portage la Prairie, and these of course can be put to one side. Then we have in round figures 7,000 names that belong wholly within the territory of the division. Then we have of those that lie partly within the division and partly outside the division names to the number of 1,494, of which 556 are within the bounds of the federal division of Portage la Prairie and 938 outside. Now, here is where the trouble comes in. There are 11 polls that overlap, as shown on a map that I will lay on the table of the House. In poll No. 8 in Beautiful Plains there are 49 names that belong to Dauphin and 145 that belong to Portage la Prairie. In the Gladstone district there are two polls overlapping, in one of which 21 belong to Dauphin and 21 to Portage la Prairie; in the other poll, 15 belong to Dauphin and 38 to Portage la Prairie. In Lakeside there are 90 votes in Macdonald, in poll No. 4, and only 1 in Portage la Prairie. To get a man on list No. 4 for that district you would have either to strike off 90 names and leave the one on, or attach it to some other poll. In poll 3 there are 112 names in Portage la Prairie and 123 in Macdonald. In the original division of Portage la Prairie that overlaps, there are 93 votes in Portage la Prairie and 63 in Macdonald. In Cypress there is a poll overlapping which has 46 names in Portage la Prairie and 164 outside. In South Brandon there are two polls that overlap. In one poll there are 63 in Brandon and 3 in Portage la Prairie; in the other there

are 34 in Brandon and 56 in Portage la Prairie. In Norfolk there are two polls that overlap. In one there are 86 in Brandon and 17 in Portage la Prairie; in the other poll there are 111 in Brandon and 24 in Portage la Prairie. Out of 556 names there are 123 on these lists in polls that overlap of persons who have not fixed residence, and you cannot tell whether they belong to Portage la Prairie or to Dauphin by looking at the lists.

There is no judge or returning officer who can in any way locate and distribute these names unless he goes to the place and takes evidence. I am surprised that in so far as this particular division is concerned we got off with as little trouble as we had in that election and the reason that things worked out as smoothly in regard to the matter as they did was that all those who were on these lists that had not the proper qualification were left in Portage la Prairie whether they belonged there or not. In regard to the situation and how it works out you will find that in the division of Portage la Prairie there are parts of seven local provincial constituencies and not one whole one. If you want to see a gerrymander, or see a division made to suit political purposes, just look at the constituencies which form part of my division. They run in all kinds of shapes. In every one of them there is more or less trouble in adjusting matters. I took the trouble to go into the situation in so far as the polling subdivisions were concerned, and the working out of things by the returning officer in the Portage la Prairie federal division in the last election. I found that in some of the polling subdivisions for provincial purposes there was only an average of 100·5, but, as arranged for federal purposes there were 114 people to each poll, and it was a much more convenient arrangement. Everybody was conveniently provided for and nobody had more than six or eight miles to travel to cast his ballot. In connection with the working out of the election law in the province of Manitoba, let me say that our political opponents take the position that at no time has there been any particular exception taken to the preparation and revision of the voters' lists. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) is pleased to quote as frequently as possible the position which the Hon. Mr. Meikle took with regard to this election law that we have in Manitoba. The way that the hon. gentleman makes the statement misrepresents the facts and misleads the House from the fact that the law that Mr. Meikle referred to has no more semblance to the law that is in existence to-day than a black cat has to a white one. The law that Mr. Meikle referred to was the first law passed by the present government when it came into office in 1900 or 1901. That law Mr. Meikle, I think, approved of, and I am prepared to-night to say that the provisions of that law met my views more completely than any other law that I know of with reference to the preparation of the voters' lists. It was practically independent of any political or partisan manipulation; it was free from it altogether. But, that did not suit our Tory friends. They only had one registration under it, that registration was practically fair to all parties, but they could not stand for it and at the very next sitting of the legislature they wiped the whole thing off the statute-book. From section 21 to section 99 of the Act was repealed, entirely doing away with the situation which then existed and placing the preparation of the voters' lists completely in the hands of the executive council of the province, making it purely political and purely under the manipulation of the political machine in power, which was a much worse condition than existed under the legislation of the Greenway government which they declared to be so iniquitous. What is the difference between the two laws? We find that in regard to the preparation of the lists, as provided for by the Greenway legislation, in so far as the appointing of registration clerks is concerned, the two laws were practically the same. The executive had authority to name the registration clerks and provide for the working out of the registration. There was ample time given, fixed by statute, far more than was given by the present order in council, for the registering of the votes by the registration clerk. Then after the registration clerk did his work the statute fixed a time for the court of revision, not a time for the sitting of the court of revision, but a time in which the court of revision could not sit. The Act provided that when the work of the registration clerk was finished the court of revision could not take place within six weeks. Six weeks had to elapse from the compilation of the list by the registration clerk before the court of revision could be held. Then, what followed? As soon as the registration clerk had finished his work he had to get a complete list of the electors printed as prepared by him. Then, before the court of revision could be held these lists had to be posted up in many places throughout the country, in the school-houses and post offices and they also had to be sent to many officials. Section 22 of the Election Act of 1891 provided that a copy of the list had to be posted up in the following places in the electoral division:

(a) Every county court office;
(b) Every post office;
(c) Every public school house;
(d) Every municipal hall or office;

And shall mail to the following persons each fifteen copies thereof:

(a) The member for the legislative assembly for the electoral division last elected;

(b) The defeated candidate for the electoral division at the last election;

And one copy to each mayor, reeve, councillor and alderman in the electoral division.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. That was before the revision.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That was before the revision. In connection with that law the people had ample time to examine the lists to see whether their names were on, or what names were left off and then there was a reasonable time allowed to appeal, a sufficient time granted to give the people every opportunity to have a complete and fair list. But, what are the conditions of this legislation that hon. gentlemen say is all right and should not be interfered with at the present time? There is no time fixed by statute as to how long a time shall intervene between the registration and the sitting of the court of revision. This whole power is vested in the executive council and they can manipulate it according to their own sweet will. Here to-day in my own district, at my own home, where I live, in Beautiful Plains, the full time allowed for compiling and revising the whole list, where there are hundreds of names changed, is only sixteen days. In Gladstone, which is 100 miles long, the time allowed is only seventeen days. There is no comparison at all as to how the system is worked out under the Acts of Greenway and Roblin and his associates. We have in this proposed legislation practically decided to accept the situation so far as the law of the province is concerned and we can give sufficient and reasonable time for that work. I would say, however, that it would please me much if we could adopt the Act of 1902 of the Roblin government which places in the hands of the judges complete control of making the voters' lists, including the appointment of registration clerks. That is the kind of legislation I would like to see so far as the preparation of the voters' lists is concerned

Mr. LANCASTER. That is not the legislation before the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. Are you voting for or against the legislation before the House?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The legislation of 1902, to which I have referred, would please me much better than any other proposed. We have got to have something of this kind and the present Bill will meet the requirements if we cannot get anything better.

I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier the House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, May 8, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Report of the Board of Civil Service Examiners for year ending 31st December, 1907.—Hon. Mr. Fisher.

List of shareholders of chartered banks of the Dominion of Canada as of December 31, 1907.—Hon. Mr. Fisher.

SCHOOL LANDS.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 163) to authorize the exchange of certain school lands for other Dominion lands.

Mr. FOSTER. What does this Bill propose to do?

Mr. OLIVER. In one case it proposes to exchange a section of school lands to complete the area which was agreed upon in connection with an irrigation proposition, the irrigation works having been completed and it being desirable that they should go into operation.

In the other case the Bill provides to satisfy the claim of a settler who has been on the land for about eighteen years.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SS. 'MONTCALM' IN COLLISION.

Mr. J. D. REID. Before the orders of the day are called, I direct the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the following item which appears in the Montreal 'Gazette':—

> Rammed the 'Montcalm'—Steamship Milwaukee' punched a hole in the side of the ice-breaker.

Quebec, May 7.—(Special).—A collision occurred in the harbour to-night, shortly before 10 o'clock, between the Canadian Pacific Railway steamer 'Milwaukee' and the government steamer 'Montcalm,' and, as a result, the latter is badly damaged on the starboard side in line with the foremast. The 'Milwaukee' is apparently undamaged and proceeded to Montreal. The rent in the 'Montcalm's' side is about eight feet wide at the top and the vessel is making water.

Both steamers came into port together, and while the 'Milwaukee' slowed up to change pilots, the 'Montcalm' passed up and turned about a mile up the river, so as to go into Allan's wharf, as the 'Aranmore' was at the King's wharf. As she was reaching that wharf the 'Milwaukee' came along, and the skipper of the 'Montcalm' gave three signals for full speed astern, which was responded to by the 'Milwaukee,' but the latter struck the 'Montcalm' almost immediately.

The 'Montcalm' was on her first trip after spending the winter in dry dock, where she

was required, and will have to be docked again. She is now moored in Customs House pond.

I have since heard that the 'Montcalm' has sunk. In what position is the matter?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I have not seen the statement which my hon. friend has read and I am unable to say whether everything contained in it is accurate. A report reached the department this morning that there was a collision between the 'Milwaukee' and the 'Montcalm,' and so far it has not been ascertained which was in fault. When the report reached the department I gave instructions that a preliminary inquiry should be held to-night or to-morrow morning by the wreck commissioner, and if he deemed it necesary to hold a formal investigation that it should be held immediately.

Mr. J. D. REID. Have you heard that the 'Montcalm' has sunk?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not received that information.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister did not say whether the damage was serious or not.

Mr. BRODEUR. The damage seems to be rather serious because the statement read by my hon. friend says that the rent in the 'Montcalm's' side is eight feet, and that apparently is corroborated by the statement which has reached the department.

STANSTEAD ELECTION PAPERS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). Has the government any information as to the destruction of the papers connected with the Stanstead by-election of January, 1908. I have a telegram informing me that when the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery was summoned to produce the election papers in order to prove the holding of the election and the status of the petitioners, he declared on oath that the papers in the box labelled 'By-election of Stanstead, January 19, 1908,' were the papers of the general election of 1904, and that apparently the papers of the by-election had been destroyed. Has the government information on the subject?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes. This matter was called to my attention a week ago last Friday by Mr. Foley, the present Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. Mr. Lamothe, the former Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, died at the end of March and Mr. Foley, the assistant clerk, was appointed to the vacancy about the 20th of April. About a week afterwards he came to my office and informed me that he had been summoned as a witness to appear in the Stanstead election case at Sherbrooke and that he could not find the papers connected with the election. He was accompanied by Mr. Chadwick, a clerk in the Privy Council, who had been transferred and had been acting as assistant to Mr. Lamonthe in his office. I may say that the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is in this building and Mr. Foley was nominally assistant clerk of the Crown in Chancery, but he had his office in the Privy Council Department and acted only when the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery was absent. We appointed Mr. Foley to the office in accordance with the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission, which I think will commend itself to the judgment of the House and which certainly commended itself to our judgment. We transferred the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery from the Privy Council to the staff of the House of Commons. When Mr. Foley informed me he could not find the papers I told him the only thing to do was to make further search and if he could not find them to attend the court and state the particulars. I advised him at the same time to report to Mr. Speaker the fact that he could not find these papers. I may say, in justice to Mr. Lamothe, that all those who knew him in his lifetime will bear testimony that he was a most honourable, conscientious and painstaking officer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I entirely concur in what the Prime Minister has said about Mr. Lamothe.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to repeat the question which I asked yesterday respecting the resignation or the supposed resignation of the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR. The best way to answer the question which my hon. friend put yesterday is to read a letter from Colonel Gourdeau, which is as follows:

Department of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa, Canada, March 31, 1908.

Dear Mr. Brodeur,—I have worried every moment since the publication of the Civil Service Commissioners' Report containing accusations against the officials of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, which I feel are both unjust and untrue. I am convinced that a full and complete investigation will establish this and will clear the public mind of all the insinuations and reflections that have been made against them. As my presence in the department as deputy head might in some quarters be considered as prejudicial to the fullest inquiry, I beg to renew for the third time, my application for six months' leave of absence preparatory to superannuation and which you have so loyally hitherto refused to entertain under similar circumstances. I court the most rigid examination of all the department's transactions so far as I am concerned and by placing myself in your hands I hope to assist you in that regard. Again thanking you for the many kindnesses

which you have shown me as Minister of Marine and Fisheries,

Believe me, yours very faithfully,
(Sgd.) F. GOURDEAU.

Hon. L. P. Brodeur,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

The letter explains itself.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—HON. W. S. FIELDING.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING. My attention has been called to a news report in the 'Citizen' of this morning under this heading: 'Want Route Changed for Financial Reasons'—'Toronto World' says Hon. W. S. Fielding called to New York to Discuss Obstacles in Selling of Bonds.' I do not know whether the House will regard the matter as of sufficient gravity to require formal notice to be taken of it. However, to prevent misunderstanding, let me say that the report has not a shadow of foundation. I went to New York on purely personal business, and had no negotiations with reference to the bonds of the Transcontinental Railway or any other financial matter whatever. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has called my attention to another point. Partly associated with this is a question regarding a change of route.

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose this is with the leave of the House.

Mr. FIELDING. With the leave of the House. I may say that there have been no negotiations with the government respecting any change of route, and no negotiations of any kind as to the matters referred to in this report.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT—AMENDMENT.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Aylesworth for the second reading of Bill (No. 115) to amend the Dominion Elections Act and the proposed amendment of Mr. Roche (Marquette) thereto.

Mr. JOHN CRAWFORD (Portage la Prairie). Mr. Speaker, when I moved the adjournment of the debate last night, I was referring to the election law which was formerly in operation in the province of Manitoba. I stated that it was nearer to my idea of what an election law should be than possibly any other law that had ever before been on the statute-books of this country. I made that statement because the law at that time was entirely free from partisan control or manipulation. That is the law that was in operation when the lists were revised in 1903, and that was the law that our friends opposite, particularly those from the province of Manitoba, paraded before this House and this country as being a good and proper law. Under that law certain Liberal officials were appointed in connection with the preparation of the voters' lists. The law to-day is entirely different. Our Conservative friends who are in control of affairs in the province of Manitoba were not prepared to stand by that fair and honest and non-partisan preparation of the voters' lists. They only stood for it in one revision; that was for the list referred to by the Hon. Mr. Mickle as the cleanest list ever made in the province of Manitoba. The preparation of that list was entirely under the judges. and was free from any manipulationn by political partisans. I will read from the official 'Gazette' of the province of Manitoba a notice to show that the board of judges had entire control of the situation:

> Public notice is hereby given that the board of registration constituted to make and revise a new list of electors for the several electoral divisions of the province, has selected D. M. Walker, county court judge as chairman, and for the purposes of registration of electors, divided the several electoral divisions into registration districts, naming a registration clerk for each district. Following are the boundaries and limits of the several registration districts, with the name and post office address of the registration clerk.

That is followed by a proclamation in which practically the same words are used:

> Notice is hereby given that the board of registration constituted to make and revise a uew list of electors for the several electoral divisions of the province have made the following additions, alterations and corrections in the boundaries and limits of certain of the registration districts and in the list of registration clerks.

Further on, there is this notice with regard to the appointment of revising barristers to revise the list:

> Whereas, it has been determined to make and revise a new list of electors in and for the several electoral divisions of the province pursuant to the provisions of 'The Manitoba Elections Act.'
>
> And, whereas, pursuant to the provisions of sections 70 and 71 of the said Act, the chairman of the board of registration has intimated to the provincial secretary the appointment of revising officers for the several electoral divisions.

That is the law about which our hon. friends are pleased to talk and say it is so fair and just. They have tried to mislead the people by these statements, have tried to make them believe that that law is under operation to-day and that the judges still have full control over the preparation and revision of the lists.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. No one ever tried to do any such thing as that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I beg your pardon, I have seen it in print and I have heard it repeated, not by my hon. friend it is true, but he is not the only man in this country and has not control of everything. What

was done in regard to the preparation of voters' lists, what treatment was meted out to the people of Manitoba at that time by the judges who had control of the situation? I shall refer only to a couple of constituencies with which I am personally acquainted. I find that the judges then gave ample time for registration and revision. In the local division from which I come they established sixteen registration places appointing a registration clerk for each of these sixteen registration places. These registration clerks had to receive applications there for one whole week, from Monday morning May 25, until Saturday night May 30, and the hours were from 9 a.m. to 10 p.m., giving ample time for the people to register. They were not confined to a couple of hours, as has been the case in the last few years, or to half a day, but they were allowed six days and sixteen registration places in my constituency. Contrast this with the one day afforded by the political partisans who now control the lists in Manitoba.

In Gladstone under the management of the judges there were fifteen registration places which were kept open for one full week from 9 a.m. till 10 p.m., daily. Only one day was appointed for the sitting of the court of revision, but there was no limit on the duration of the sittings by the order in council. It is true the judges did not confine themselves to any particular hour or hours, the time for registration was not limited by them and they could sit from day to day notwithstanding the fact that the attorney general took the position that they had no right to adjourn the court from day to day. The matter later came up in Winnipeg before the late Judge Killam, who decided that the judges had the right to adjourn their courts from time to time until they had finished their work. But the attorney general of the province took the position that they had not and disfranchised a number of people on that account, tearing from the votters' lists a certain number of electors who had registered that year.

I wish to make a comparison between the time allowed under the present law and under the previous law. Whereas in Gladstone in 1893, under the old arrangement we had sixteen registration places and six days for registration in 1893, in 1905, under political manipulation, we had only one day, one place and one registration clerk—and that clerk was only occupied in connection with the registration of voters for the whole territory from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m., from 2.30 p.m. to 6 p.m., and from 7.30 p.m. to 9.30 p.m. Then the court of revision that was held following that registration allowed only five hours, from 11 a.m. to 6 p.m., for revision. For the registration and the revision, the entire time allowed in connection with the compilation of the lists in that year was only twenty-two days. Under the law put in force by the Greenway government, which has been referred to in this House as an iniquitous law, it was provided that not less than seventy days should be allowed in connection with the registration and revision of the lists. Contrast that with the present system by which only twenty-two days are allowed. This year there was even a shorter time than that. In the division from which I come, the whole time allowed for registration and revision is sixteen days. The law now in force in Manitoba is entirely under the control of the executive council of that province, the judges have nothing to say in connection with the preparation of the lists, they have nothing to do except to take evidence as to whether or not a man is entitled to be on the list. This is entirely different from the idea of the election law which hon. gentlemen opposite seek to convey.

I might put this concisely in the form of question and answer. Who limits the time for registration? The executive council of Manitoba. Who decides that there should be, but one registration clerk and one booth in each constituency? The executive council of Manitoba. Who fixes the places for registration booths and the hours during which they are to be open? The executive council of Manitoba, the political machine. Who appoints the registration clerks who have very considerable discretionary powers The executive council of Manitoba. Who fixes the courts of revision allowing but for a single day or a part of a day or a number of days? Who fixes the time for the sittings of the court of revision and the duration of those sittings, who limits the hours during which the courts of revision can sit? The government of the province of Manitoba have full control over the courts of revision and everything else, in so far as registration and the revision of the voters' lists in the province of Manitoba are concerned. In fact the executive council of that province, the political machine, practically does everything in this matter and I do not hesitate to say that they manipulate and direct things to their own advantage. I have no hesitation in saying that because of the agitation that has been raised, because of the statements that are made in the press, because of the threatened hold-up of this government in this House the whole thing is done for one purpose and one only; they wish to continue every possible manipulation in connection with the preparation of the voters' lists in Manitoba. The government of Manitoba is not prepared to give to the people of that province the protection they are entitled to. We have not been getting that protection, and we are not getting it now. If they had wished to live up to the pledges they made before coming into power, they would have left on the statute book the law of 1903 when the clean voters' list was prepared. In this connec-

tion, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) was pleased to refer last night to the Hon. Charles Mickle and to a statement attributed to that gentleman that these were clean voters' lists. I wired to Mr. Mickle asking him what he had to say about the election law and the administering of the same, and this is his answer :

The Act better in 1903. New amendments have largely destroyed best features. Grievous complaints of unfair administration by government in many parts.

(Sgd.) C. J. MICKLE.

This is an entirely different showing of Hon. Mr. Mickle's opinion from that given by the hon. member for Marquette, last night. That hon. gentleman tried to lead the House and the country to believe that Mr. Mickle had a high opinion of the present law and its administration. The very contrary is the fact. What Mr. Mickle was talking about, when he said the list was a clean list and the best list ever prepared in Manitoba, was the list proposed in 1903 when everything was under the control and management of the judges and entirely free from party manipulation.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Mr. Mickle has been in the legislature since 1903. Has he ever made any complaint in that House of the present law ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have given Mr. Mickle's reply, and I think that is sufficient for the present. For the last few years we have had an agitation over the franchise and the compiling of the voters' lists in the province of Manitoba because the law and the administration of the law have not been what it ought to be. If there is one thing more than another that we should sacredly guard it is the citizens' right to vote. I am sure that my hon. friends opposite are honest enough to admit, in their quiet moments that it is up to us all to stand strongly against any manipulation of the people's franchise. But, owing to the fact that party lines are strictly drawn, party prejudices strong and the desire for party advantage great, many are prepared to do what they themselves cannot justify. We should take a broader view and try to make a law that will be just and fair to all.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Does this Bill do that ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. We have not in Manitoba to-day the conditions which, as I have just said, we ought to have, but we expect, if this Bill is passed, to have the privilege of creating these conditions. We have heard a great deal about the large number of people disfranchised in Manitoba in the last Dominion election. We had an exhibition here last night by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) that that hon. gentleman should be ashamed of—or, if not ashamed of his statements of last night, he should be ashamed of his position on the third of August, 1906. On that day, the hon. gentleman attended a banquet in his own district at which Hon. Robert Rogers made the statement that the Liberals had disfranchised 1,395 of the honest electors of Portage la Prairie. The hon. gentleman (Mr. W. J. Roche) sat there and allowed these statements to go unchallenged, to be published broadcast in the press, and last night we had his own statement that, so far as he knew everything was done right in Portage la Prairie. And it was. I defy him or any other man to show that even one man was disfranchised in Portage la Prairie.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Did Leach manipulate your lists as he did those of Provencher ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not saying anything about Leach ; I am talking about yourself. I cannot understand an hon. member of this House who takes the position now taken by the hon. gentleman for Marquette, sitting at a banquet in his own division and allowing such statements as I have quoted to go uncontradicted.

No, the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) referred to statements made by the Montreal 'Gazette,' and there are one or two statements that I wish to quote from that newspaper myself. I must say I am disappointed in the 'Gazette.' I had looked upon it as being the most honest Conservative newspaper in Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is not saying very much.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, be that as it may, I can only say I am surprised that any newspaper of such standing would allow itself to be led into making statements that are not supported by any credible evidence. I have always felt that I could believe most of the statements in the columns of the Montreal 'Gazette,' but I find reiterated in those columns the same kind of statements as are published in far less reputable journals. I think the time has arrived when the minds of the people of Canada should be disabused of opinions which some people have sought to cultivate in them concerning the thin red line. I am satisfied that the people of this country have no idea of what the thin red line really meant. They do not know that instead of 9,399 of the honest electors of Manitoba being disfranchised, as stated by Hon. Robert Rogers, and repeated again and again in this country, there were not even 99—to say nothing about the odd 9,300. I cannot understand hon. gentlemen, members of any party, allowing their co-workers in that party to continue reiterating such

statements, knowing all the time that they are false in every particular. The Montreal 'Gazette' repeats what many others repeated, and as it refers to my own division, I certainly think that the representative of the Montreal 'Gazette' here to-day should ask that paper to take back statements made in their editorial of a short time ago on that subject. I think it is only justice to themselves and justice to the people that they should do so. I find the 'Mail and Empire' practically in the same position, and I think they should do likewise. They pretend to be fair and honest, and to give honest expressions of opinion, they pretend to do it.

Mr. TALBOT. But they don't

Mr CRAWFORD. Well, if they don't, then I take it all back, and there is no use suggesting to them to act fairly. However, I hope there are some Tories in this country that are fair and reasonable people, but possibly we don't meet them, particularly amongst those who are engaged in active politics. Now to disabuse the minds of the people of a false impression, it might be well to repeat some facts in connection with the election of 1904, and I hope those papers that I have a little respect for will publish the figures that I am going to quote. The Hon. Robert Rogers, who is the mouthpiece of the Tory party in the province of Manitoba, said that the provincial constituency of Hamiota, in the Dominion constituency of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) said there were 777 Conservatives disfranchised by the red line. Now how does this figure out? In 1903 the judges controlled the lists, an election was run on that list, and 740 votes were polled for the Conservative party in that election. In 1907 the total vote polled for the Conservative candidate was 737, and he won. But the Hon. Robert Rogers makes a statement that in 1904 there were 777 Conservatives disfranchised by the red line in Hamiota, and the highest number they can count for themselves, either in the election of 1903 or in that of 1907, was 740. So we must have found by the red line a few more votes than they did. I think these figures should disabuse the minds of those who are inclined to be fair, of the impression sought to be conveyed by the Hon. Robert Rogers, the Minister of Public Works in the province of Manitoba. I think such exaggerated statements as he makes here should discredit him in the minds of the people of the whole country. Now take the provincial electoral division of Minnedosa, which is also in the constituency of Marquette. In the provincial election of 1903 the total Tory vote polled was 504; in the Dominion election there was polled for my hon. friend 521 votes, in the same territory. In the provincial election of 1907 there were polled 502. Still the Hon. Robert Rogers says that in 1904 we disfranchised 200 Conservative votes. But even with these 200 disfranchised, there were 521 polled, or 17 more than were ever polled before. I think this proves conclusively that the statements of the Hon. Robert Rogers are not in keeping with the facts. Now take the town of Hamiota. In 1903 there were 317 Conservative votes cast, and in 1904 there were 314 cast, only 3 less than in 1903. Now in 1907, you would think that on account of the Tory candidate having won, and on account of the increase in population, there would be many more votes polled, and we find the Conservative candidate winning in 1907. Everything was then under the control of the powers that be in Manitoba, and the hon. gentleman who so severely criticised the red line, only polled 317 votes. just 3 more than were polled by the Conservatives in 1904. Still the Hon. Robert Rogers makes the statement that in the town of Hamiota there were 147 Conservatives disfranchised. Now take the Crandall poll. In 1903, 199 votes were polled; in 1904, 203, 4 more Conservative votes polled at the Crandall poll when this red line was used, than there were in the previous year when no red line was used. Still the Hon. Robert Rogers makes the statement that there were 172 Conservative voters disfranchised at that time Take the district of Marquette. In 1903 there were 4,526 Conservative votes polled, and in the next year there were polled for the hon. member for Marquette 5,115, or 489 more Tory votes polled in 1904 than in 1903; notwithstanding the statement of the Hon. Robert Rogers that in that territory there were, 1,919 Conservative voters disfranchised. I think these figures prove conclusively that the statements of the Hon. Robert Rogers, Minister of Public Works for the province of Manitoba, cannot be relied upon in any shape or form. I think the people of Canada who have been more or less disturbed in connection with this red line, feeling that wrong has been done, will hereafter discredit the statements of the Hon. Robert Rogers and will come to the conclusion that the Liberals are at least as honset, and perhaps a little more so, than our Conservative friends.

Now what do we find further? I have here a document prepared by our Conservative friends opposite in which they make use of the same startling statements. In this document they talk about the red line as one of the scandals that will be referred to in the coming Dominion elections. The heading is

Between 9,000 and 10,000. Additional light is thrown upon this steal by the statement of the Hon. Robert Rogers, Minister of Public Works, who has made an examination of the red line list, and declared that 9,399 electors were disfranchised by this process

He declares that 9,399 electors were disfranchised by this process. Well, the follow-

ing is the record by constituencies. Marquette, 1,919. I think I have proved by the votes cast in Marquette at that time that statement is entirely false and untrue. Provencher, 568; Portage la Prairie, 1,395. There is positive evidence, admitted by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche), that there was no truth in any shape, so far as Portage la Prairie is concerned, in that statement; and that being the case, every statement with regard to the red line by the politicians of Manitoba, backed up by Messrs. Roblin, Rogers and Campbell, fall to the ground entirely.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Will the hon. gentleman read that article all through? We would like to hear it all.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think it would not be any harm. I will read a portion anyway. It is just a sample of the campaign stuff which our Conservative friends are distributing throughout the country, and I would like to warn the people of Canada of the nature of the statements being put out at this time to discredit the Liberals of this country—statements entirely false and untrue.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Would the hon. gentleman kindly read that portion of my speech, as contained in 'Hansard,' in which I sad that in Portage la Prairie there was no fraud in connection with the lists?

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the hon. gentleman likes he may read it himself.

Mr. W. J ROCHE I did not say that at all and I challenge the hon. gentleman to point that out in my speech.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In connection with this red line business and the possibility of the people continuing under the present situation, I may say that we have to get away from anything which will keep us in that condition of strife and discussion and of unfair dealings in connection with the preparation of the lists.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Show where it is unfair.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Where what is unfair?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The way we make up our voters' lists.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have shown that, under the present administration in Manitoba things are manipulated purely for political advantage, and that is what we want to get away from.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. You make that assertion.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. But you have not proved it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have proved it to the satisfaction of myself and I think of many more in this country. To show that even at present we cannot afford to go on in the present situation, I have the voters' lists prepared last year and revised, and what is the situation with regard to one poll? Poll No. 13 in the local constituency of South Brandon, part of which is in the constituency of Brandon and part in the federal division of Brandon—in that poll there is a list of electors, and we have in the 1904 election 63 votes in the lists supplied the returning officer on the Brandon side and 3 on the Portage la Prairie side. In the lists prepared in 1907, we find in that poll 58 names only, one of which belonged to the division of Portage la Prairie and 57 to the division of Brandon.

The next matter I shall deal with in connection with the red line will be with regard to the committee which was appointed by this House and the statements made before that committee by Mr. Knott, who acted on behalf of the province of Manitoba in connection with the prosecutions. Mr. Knott gave evidence before that committee, and you will find, on examining his evidence, that the conclusions he came to were these. Mr. Knott stated positively that, in so far as the adjusting of constituencies and the polling divisions in the province of Manitoba by the returning officers was concerned, they did the only thing they could do. It was the only reasonable way of doing it. That is Mr. Knott's statement under oath before the committee at that time. You will find on page 51 of the evidence that he was asked the question:

> Can you tell me any way how he can get a list except in the way in which it has been suggested, as you say, he did here by a red line throughout, as the Manitoba Act says he should do with names that are to be struck off.

I might repeat what was said the other day by the Minister of Justice, namely, that the Manitoba Act provides that when names are being erased or struck off in any way, the means used shall be either a red or a black line. In this case the returning officer used a red line.

> Q. He did here by a red line throughout, as the Manitoba Act says he should do, with names that are to be struck off?—A. Under what circumstances?
>
> Q. In the case of overlapping?—A. I have stated my opinion very fairly, I think, what in that case his duty should be.
>
> Q. His duty would be to do what he did here?—A. There is no doubt about that; of course he might do something else, but I think that would be a reasonable thing to do.

That is Mr. Knott's statement before the committee in connection with this red line situation. And, as I have said before, Mr. Knott was the prosecuting attorney in those cases in Manitoba and appeared before the

committee on behalf of the red line situation and the local government, and he made the positive statement that the right thing to do was to do just what was done, and that was draw a red line through the names. Further on Mr. Knott repeats this. The question was asked:

How is he to get, except in the way he did—I am simply speaking about the matter of striking out the names, of using the red lines—how else was he to get a proper list for the polling division of the federal constituency out of the local registration lists. Can you tell me how else he can do that?—A. I said at first, I think the reasonable thing would be to do what was done. I think I stated that two or three times before.

Those are the words of Mr. Knott.

He goes on to say, referring to the overlapping, that if he had the legal right to do it there was no other way of doing it than the way he did it.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Did he say he had the legal right?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes, in connection with the overlapping.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Did he say that Mr. Leach had the legal right to draw the red line?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not talking about Mr. Leach now. Further on he says that he could see no objection to doing it. Mr. Knott repeats practically the same statement and arrives at the same conclusion throughout his whole evidence. Mr. Howell, who is now chief justice of the Appeal Court in Manitoba, took the same position and therefore, so far as the red line situation is concerned, there can be no question, and there should be no question, in the minds of the people of this country that the only thing that could be done under the circumstances was done. I do not like to repeat what I have already said, but it is very important that the people of Canada should understand the red line situation, and, therefore, I shall have to refer to what I said last night. I have here the list of polling division No. 5 in the electoral division of Mountain, the returning officer of which was arrested and put in jail for using the red line in connection with the list. I checked the lists over in the office of the clerk of the Crown in Chancery the day before yesterday, and I can say that on the lists that were used by the deputy returning officers at the polls on that occasion there was not a man disfranchised in the 1904 election, notwithstanding that the returning officer was arrested and put in jail for doing the very thing Mr. Knott said he had a right to do and that it was the only thing he could do. I would point out that it is hardly fair that our officials should be prosecuted and hounded and persecuted for doing just the same thing that Tory friends allow their officials to go scot-free for doing. I think I will be able to prove that the law in the province of Manitoba under the present management is not fairly administered. I have here a letter which was published in the 'Free Press' on the 19th of February, 1908, re the changing of polling divisions in the 1903 provincial election, and it is signed by Mr. James Hooper, who, I think, is the King's Printer in the province of Manitoba. There was a criticism in the 'Free Press' in regard to the changing of these polling divisions and Mr. Hooper admits in his letter that some twelve returning officers in the provincial election of 1903 changed the polling constituencies. This is the letter:

Election irregularities in 1903.

To the Editor of the 'Free Press'—

Sir,—In your editorial on Friday, under the caption of 'last words on an old subject,' you give currency to a statement which reflects on the honour and integrity of officials of the government of Manitoba. You say:

Then it recites the statement in the 'Free Press,' but I need not read that.

Mr. STAPLES. You had better read it all:

Mr. CRAWFORD. All right:

The Dominion returning officers, the attorney general claims, were not, however, justified in subdividing provincial polling divisions which were entirely within the limits of Dominion constituencies. It is to be borne in mind that at the provincial elections in 1903, there were subdivisions of polling divisions in undoubted contravention of the law, in no less than 17 of the local constituencies. It is an open secret that these subdivisions were made, not by the returning officers but by officials of the government in the legislative buildings on Kennedy street working under the direction of the government.

Then Mr. Hooper says:

Evidently your assertion is made on the same authority as similar statements were given to a committee of the House of Commons in 1906, &c.

Your editorial, if allowed to pass unanswered, would emphasize the impression then attempted to be left on the public mind—that the civil servants of Manitoba are lacking in spirit of honesty and integrity—therefore, I hope you will give space to the following letters received from the returning officers in the provincial elections of 1903.

Now, this is what I want to call particular attention to. This is Mr. Hooper's statement in regard to different returning officers in different electoral districts in the province of Manitoba dividing the polling divisions:

As far as I know these are the only returning officers who created new polling divisions that year.

Then he gives the names of these officers as follows: H. Archibald, Melita; W. G. Hetherington, Souris; S. T. Parr, Neepawa;

N. O. Carey, Saint Piere; Thomas Coulter, Dominion City ; John Sigvaldason, Icelandic River; Thomas Partington, Selkirk; W. J. Helliwell, Oak Lake; James Fargey, Manitou; T. J. Long, Stonewall; C. Marion, St. Boniface ; O. B. Harvey, Plympton. He gives these men as the only ones in connection with the dividing of the polling divisions contrary to the law in Manitoba, and he says that so far as the officials of the parliament buildings in Winnipeg are concerned they are not to blame, and he throws the onus on these returning officers. Well, if it was wrong to do anything of that kind in the federal elections—and I claim it was not wrong; it was what was done by our returning officers—it was worse still to do it in the provincial elections where the elections were held directly under the control of the province. But our officers were put in jail and the provincial officers were allowed to go scot-free for doing the same thing. I have here another document to which I have made reference on two or three previous occasions, but which I think is worth referring to again; it has reference to the disfranchising of certain electors in the province of Manitoba. I hope that the challenge or bluff that was put up by the 'Telegram,' and that was read to this House last night, will be extended back for a few years at least. The hon. leader of the opposition has said that if we can show that the people anywhere in the province of Manitoba have not had fair treatment in the matter of the franchise, he will assist in passing legislation that will improve the conditions. The hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn), I think, made the same statement.

Now, it is not denied that, with the approval of the Attorney General of Manitoba and of the hon. member for Marquette, 38 electors were disfranchised in the federal district of Selkirk in 1903. If our hon. friends are so anxious to see every elector entitled to vote in the province of Manitoba granted the franchise, why did they not allow those 38 men to remain on the list of voters ? They were properly put on the list, and they were certified to by Judge Walker in these words :

I, David Marr Walker, chairman of the board of registration, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the names, residence and occupation of the persons appearing on registration register of registration district No. 2 of the electoral division of Springfield, added at the adjourned meeting of the court of revision, held at Lac du Bonnet on the 24th day of June, 1903.

Some exception has been taken to that form of certificate; but there was no evidence, in any shape or form, that those 38 names were not just as much entitled to be on the list as any other 38 names in the province of Manitoba; yet the Attorney General of Manitoba approved of tearing out of the list the sheet containing those names, and depriving those 38 people of their franchise in that year. Yet the certified list sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in Ottawa contained practically all those names—a patched-up list which I am sure the members of the opposition would be astonished at. Those 38 names that were torn off the list with the approval of the Attorney General of Manitoba were sent to Ottawa and were certified to by the clerk of the province of Manitoba as being qualified electors, and they used their franchise in the election of 1904.

I have documents in my possession, which I have had for a considerable length of time, showing that in the year 1905, when election matters were wholly under the control of the executive of Manitoba, numbers of people were prevented from having the use of their franchise by manipulation in connection with the registration and revision of the lists, some 8,000 in all, and I will give you some information along that line. I will read only short sketches from different constituencies at Emerson :

Sixty of the Liberals came on an average of twenty-five miles and others drove from fifteen to twenty miles, that only being one way. A number of Galicians walked in twenty miles and one over thirty miles.

Mr. LANCASTER. Would the hon. gentleman mind telling us what document he is reading from ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Manitoba 'Free Press' of June 3, 1905.

Mr. LANCASTER. Are the names of the parties who were disfranchised given there?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I will give you some names later on.

Mr. LANCASTER. Are they given in the document ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Not in this particular item that I am reading ; but the hon. gentleman might just take a look at these 38 names for a while. Here is what took place at Alexander :

About 150 qualified voters are yet unregistered owing to the busy season and the distance they have to travel. The Liberals were refused a copy of the names registered and also of the protests filed, no doubt on account of the inability of the clerk to comply with the Act, as he had no idea, when ten o'clock came, how many names were registered, and refused to open up the list of applications.

At Virden :

Several went away without registering because they had to get home and could not get their names on the list.

At Neepawa :

There were no developments of unusual character at the registration of electors yesterday, nor was the clerk kept very busy. In all, 125 names were registered, but there

were probably as many more qualified who could not present themselves.

It is not possible for every person to get to the registration district in one day, under the regulations provided by the order in council issued by the Manitoba government. Here is what took place at Brandon:

At 10 o'clock the doors were closed and all those inside at that time qualified to register were allowed to do so, fully sixty being registered after 10 o'clock.

I think there was a wrong impression created last night when the hon. member for Marquette stattetd that all present were allowed to register at the hour fixed for the closing. In connection with that statement I want to disabuse the minds of the members of this House by saying that that practically meant nothing, for the Act provides that during the sittings of the registration clerk, there can only be twelve in the room at a time.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Twelve beyond all the officers.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This is the condition surrounding the registration:

48. The following persons shall be entitled to be present at sittings of the registration clerks for the purposes of this Act:
(a) The candidate or candidates at the last election for the electoral division;
(b) Any person who considers himself to be a prospective or probable candidate as a member to represent the electoral division in the legislative assembly at the then next ensuing election therefor to be held in such electoral division;
(c) Any two qualified persons entitled to be registered electors within the electoral division and representing any political organization, duly authenticated to the satisfaction of the registration clerk;
(d) Any person desirous of being present as a spectator: provided that no more than twelve persons, other than the persons before mentioned and officers in attendance, shall be entitled to be present at the same time.
(e) The registration clerk shall strive as far as possible to allow the representation of all political parties in the place or places of registration to be fair and equal.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That might be 20 people.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There cannot possibly be any larger number of people present when that registration booth closes. That is quite different from the impression left on the House by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) last evening. He practically gave the members to understand that all who might be within almost any distance of the polls so long as they were in touch with it, would be allowed to register. But that is not the fact. For instance in Brandon the registration clerk locked the door and only those who were inside at the time were allowed to register, even if there had been a thousand or twenty outside they would not be allowed the privilege of getting on the list.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will the hon. member give examples of men who were left off.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes, hundreds of them.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is no answer.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am going to give them; just wait:

In Brandon at 10 o'clock the doors were closed and all who were inside at the time who were qualified to register were allowed to do so, fully 60 being registered after 10 o'clock. The total number placed on the list in this division was 603, which made a heavy day's work. Great interest was taken in the registration by the citizens and the large number placed on the list shows the growth of the city in the past year.

Mr. LANCASTER. There were none outside waiting?

Mr. CRAWFORD (reading):

Many left off.

Russell, Manitoba, June 1.—At the sitting of the registration clerk held here to-day for the electoral division of Russell 115 names were added to the list, a majority of them probably Conservative It is safe to say that there are 150 more entitled to be on, largely Liberal. One man from Roblin told me there were ninety in his vicinity who could qualify if they had an opportunity. The feature of the day was the comparatively large number of absentees and sick men put on.

In connection with the sick men I know of some cases where many were put on as being sick and I have my doubts as to their being very sick.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. They took the declaration, did they not?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No, it was the other man who took it, the political operator. I now propose to read the opinion of an hon. gentleman to whom hon. friends opposite will not take exception. The Hon. James Johnson.

Mr. SCHAFFENR. A fine man.

Mr. CRAWFORD (reading):

Hon. James Johnson, who was in attendance all day, stated this afternoon that there should have been at least four places in the constituency for registration for the convenience of everybody.

I have here a report from Portage la Prairie:

206 new names were added to the list, about 45 more than were added in the 6 days of registration last year. In addition 300 applications were received to strike off voters' names from the lists. Both parties had done quite a lot of committee work regarding the lists and so as much as possible was done in adding and striking off names, but quite a

lot more voters would have been added had the time been longer. The matter of registering would have been greatly facilitated if there had been more than one clerk. Some went to register several times and after losing a good deal of time from their work went away without registering. In Lakeside, voters had to go all the way from Clandeboye, Poplar Point, High Bluff and other places to Macdonald to register, so that the clerk was not rushed, only 57 registering out of about 200.

The paper says that the Roblin government should feel very proud of themselves over the successful result of their plot to disfranchise hundreds and even thousands of Manitoba voters.

I might give many further illustrations. I have, for instance, the names in my district. There were 170 in the district of Beautiful Plains who did not register.

In Gladstone, only 45 registered. The paper says :

Mr. Jamieson instances the case of a man who had to assist his neighbour on that day and therefore on account of the one day registration could not register.

S. B. Olsen, who keeps the post office at Marshland, says of his locality a number of names were left off: also up the Narrows, among the quarries, there are not a few. He places the matter thus: 'It is beyond all reason to expect men working for $1.50 a day to stop work, sail down to Westbourne, the nearest point (if weather was favourable this trip would take three days), thence by train to Gladstone and with this return trip a whole week would elapse, and the expense incurred and loss of time would run up to $25 or more.'

Barney Mathews was in town to-day from up the lake and reports the same grievance at Siglunes post office as other places. Had there been a registration booth near, four brothers, John, Joe., George and William Bowen, would have been registered, but on account of the great expense are deprived of their votes. At the same place Alex. Monkman and M. J. Mathews did not register for similar reasons.

If these cases occur in one or two remote places, sparsely populated, what must be the ratio in more thickly settled districts?

In this constituency it has been looked upon as a big joke and even the man who first brought the member, Mr. Wilson, before the public eye says that although written to by his party leaders to look after matters, the trouble of getting them on, six or seven legal voters he knows of in the north part of the constituency are going to be allowed to go unregistered because of the difficulty of rounding them up. So the reports come in from all points.

I have here a letter from a friend of mine in regard to the same matter :

I might say that so far as the Glenboro strike off some 189 electors that were wrongfully on the list at the last election. I have not got the full information at hand, but I think that the total number of applications to strike off was 250. The registration is a complete farce, but of course we cannot give a full statement until after the court of revision.

From the Glenboro district there were only some five or six that applied to have their names added to the list and they had to travel about 35 miles to add their names at a great expense to themselves.

I might say that so far as the Glenboro district is concerned that we have a very large number of names to add and it all depends on what facilities are given us at the court as to whether we will get the names added or not.

Here is another report from Roblin and the complaint is made that owing to the large distance they have to travel and the expense, it is impossible for them to register.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. In what year was that ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That was on June 8, 1905. Here is the summing up of the whole situation :

It is probably well within the mark to say that as the result of the Roblin government's one day, one place, one clerk registration scheme, at least 8,000 electors of Manitoba, eligible to be enrolled, were deprived on June 1 of an opportunity of registering.

This looks like a stupendous total; but when the figures come to be looked into it is seen to be a very moderate estimate.

Pretty close calculations have been made in some of the country constituencies, and these give a basis for an estimate embracing the whole province. Thus in Norfolk there are 160 names not registered, in Beautiful Plains, 300; in Gilbert Plains, 300; in Emerson, 250; in Dufferin, 150; in Rockwood, 200; in Gladstone, 200; in Dauphin, 150; in Deloraine, 70; in Virden, 150. This is an average of nearly 200 disfranchised electors for each constituency; and the same proportion is likely to apply throughout the province.

This all goes to show that under political manipulation and under the management of the government of Manitoba the electors are not safe to-day. Our people expect to get and have not been getting fair treatment in regard to the registration of electors in that province. There is not sufficient time given for that purpose. To prove this we need not do more than take the proclamation issued a few days ago in that regard. The very idea of compiling a list for a constituency 150 miles long, without railway communication, in 16 days ! It is an outrage on the people of the district, it is something that cannot properly be done.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the whole electorate is to be registered?

Mr. CRAWFORD. One man is as much entitled to his franchise as a hundred are to theirs. And a man is entitled to his franchise whether he lives a hundred miles away or fifty miles away.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Quite right; but only the additional ones who have become qualified since last year are registered.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is just one of the abuses that, I am satisfied, hon. gentlemen opposite want to continue in the province of Manitoba. The fact is, we have a stuffed list, a list not compiled according to the law of the province; and yet, without the consent of the opposite party, we cannot get any names off that list. It is because it is a stuffed list that they have continued it for five years. In my own division we have a list on which are six or seven hundred names of Conservatives that should not be there, but, without some arrangement made between the political parties, we can no more get those names off than we can fly to the moon. We have a list stuffed in favour of the Conservatives, and that is why they are fighting this Bill so hard to-day. In summing up my own division I have no hesitation in saying that there are from ten to fifteen Conservatives to be struck off that list for every Liberal, while the proportion to be put on is the other way. I have here a map of the district of Gladstone. This riding covers a great deal of territory; it is about a hundred miles long, and there is no railway communication except through one corner of it. And yet all the time that was allowed to make up and revise the list for that district was seventeen days. For the district of Beautiful Plains, the time was provided by order in council. and under it the preparation of the lists was to take just sixteen days. It was simply impossible for the people in these districts to go to the place of registration and the court of revision within the time allowed. Then, see what we are up against as compared with what used to be in the old days. Nobody knows who is on the list. We tried in the city of Winnipeg to buy from the government some voters' lists to check up the names. But we could not get a list; the provincial authorities have not got them or won't supply them. That is the situation we are up against in Manitoba to-day; and we want to get away from that, and we have got to get away from it. In the division of Gladstone, between the registration and the sittings of the court of revision there were only eight days. And there was no list, but the people who wished to examine the list had to go to the door of the registration booth and read what the registration clerk had posted up there.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crawford) is wrong. The registration clerk is compelled, by law, to furnish lists on application.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If you go to him and he has time to give them.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crawford) think that the clerk should be compelled to come to him?

Mr. CRAWFORD. You may have to chase him all over the country. For, if you read that order in council, you will see that he is not required to stay at one place, but is to spend an evening at one place, an afternoon at another, and so on, and so it is pretty hard to tell where to find him. He has no fixed residence.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. There are just three days of registration when the clerk does not sit the full number of hours.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, here is the proclamation, and you can read it for yourself. For a man to get on the list in Gladstone he will have to travel two hundred miles coming and going. To be registered in Russell, he will have to travel 156 miles; in Emerson, 216 miles; in Selkirk, 200 miles; in La Verandrye, 240 miles.

Some reference has been made to a few names put on the voters' list by special Act of parliament last year. I think I made reference to that myself in speaking on a previous occasion. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) also mentioned it in his speech a day or two ago. As to that situation, I have here an article published in Winnipeg a few days ago which I think it would be well to read:

What about the seven put on the Balsam Bay lists by special Act the following season for which Mr. Roblin claimed so much credit? Were they the remaining men?

Now, the hon. member for Marquette would have had this House believe that in this case those whose names had not been put on the list by the registration clerk or at the court of revision were put on by special Act of parliament. This article says that that is not the case——

Not at all, that matter has been misrepresented.

The Liberals went up and chased over the country to find the men, and the men applied but the registration clerk refused. The Liberals heard about it, and they had to go out into the country to look up these matters. It cost them quite a sum of money to get the particulars of the case.

The fact is, that a number of people were actually disfranchised who applied. We could not get them all in time and the government never did anything to remedy the injustice.

This is the point that I wish to get this House to understand—that the government of Manitoba did not do anything more than pass this special Act; they did not try to hunt up these people.

The case of the seven you refer to is quite a different matter. These were men who had had their applications accepted by the registration clerk and had signed the interrogatories, but the clerk through ignorance or neglect had never filled in the questions.

But the only thing that the government did was to pass an Act of the legislature to place these men on the list.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crawford) to say that these men applied to get on the list?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes, they applied.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. And their application was not received?

Mr. CRAWFORD. It was received, but the interrogatories were not filled in.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The hon. gentleman is wrong. That is true of the twenty-one, but for the seven, no applications were received.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, I read the statement I have here. It was our friends who chased this thing up and finished it. These are the men who had their applications accepted by the registration clerk, and signed the interrogatories of the clerk through ignorance, and the clerk had never filled in the question. So it was not a proper application.

There was no evidence that they had ever answered the interrogatories or had been sworn, and the judge could do nothing, but presumably, as the clerk had accepted them they were all Conservatives. To save their franchise the government had to pass a special Act, and the opposition naturally made no objection to this passing.

Q. Of course in this case the registration clerk was prosecuted by the government?—A. No, the attorney general was too busy inventing thin red line charges which he never intended to press seriously.

Q. What do you think about the Manitoba Election Act?—A. As first passed it was very fair, but it has been mangled out of all resemblance to the Act which Liberals in the legislature declared some years ago to be fair.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Can you state how many applied to the registration clerk whom the registration clerk refused to accept on the day of registration ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have heard the statement made that there were somewhere about 35.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I think 21 is the right number.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand that the registration clerk made use of these words, he said they were all Grits and he would be darned if he would let them on. So they did not get on the list.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The seven Grits that the special Act was made for.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. My information is that every man was a Tory.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The point is as to how the preparation of the voters' list was done in the province of Manitoba. Now here is the list as prepared and sent out by the Manitoba government, just as it appears in the statute, placing those men on the list. Those men have no post office address given, no occupation, no residence, just the name, and everything else blank.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Who are those ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the voters' list prepared by the Manitoba government, printed by the King's Printer, and distributed throughout the province. The list in no way complies with the conditions surrounding the registration of voters. That is just one more sample of what we are up against in connection with the lists in Manitoba to-day. In my division at the present time there are nearly 3,000 electors, out of 8,000, that have no post office address given. Unless we can notify those electors and prove to the court that we have notified them in some reasonable manner, we cannot get them off the list. I am sure that we have in my own division a stuffed list to the extent of 600 Conservative votes, and I can see no way how we can get these off the list unless we get the consent of our Conservative friends in that division.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). What is the court of revision for ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Why, we could spend all the time we are allowed over one elector, with only fifteen hours for a court of revision. The hon. member can take up that much time himself on one case. The idea of striking off, as we did last year, some 300 votes in Beautiful Plains, and adding 184. And we could not have done that much except by the mutual consent and arrangement between both parties. Here is another glaring case :

In the case of forty names struck off at Alexder, continued Mr. Walton, the protests were handed in to Kemnay and not to Griswold, as the 'Free Press' stated, and the number of names affected was forty, not forty-four. The registration clerk did not sit at Alexander but at Kemnay and Griswold. Mr. Hastings tries to make it clear that there was something irregular in the application.

I understand Mr. Hastings is an employee of the government of Manitoba drawing pay from that government, while he is the political organizer of the Conservative party in Manitoba. This man is drawing from the people about $3,000 a year, and still he is the recognized organizer for the Conservative party in the province of Manitoba, and has been for some time.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to ask him how it is that the Conservatives managed to get Liberals who were not qualified off the list ? Do they get them off ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. A lot of them never got on.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The hon. gentleman was referring a while ago to the names improperly on the list. If he would explain how the Liberals were struck off, he might have a little force in his argument.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, a lot of them did not have to come off. In the last election when the provincial government manipulated everything, the Liberals polled a little over 49 per cent of the total vote of the province. So I think there are a few left yet, even though the Conservatives had full control. Now I am going to read a letter that was addressed to the Conservative party in Manitoba by their organizer, Mr. Hastings, and this organizer is a paid official of the government of Manitoba. The letter is as follows :—

Dear Sir,—You will no doubt have noticed from the public press and particularly from the address delivered by the Hon. Robert Rogers on the evening of the 21st instant, before the French Conservative club of this city, that the Minister of Justice has introduced a Bill in the Dominion parliament to amend the Dominion Elections Act and make provisions for the making up of entirely new lists for Manitoba and British Columbia for Dominion elections. It is unnecessary for me to go into details regarding the proposed amendment further than to say that if that Act becomes law the Liberals will be able to fix the lists in such a shape as will make it impossible for the Conservatives to carry a single seat in this province in the next Dominion election.

Now they must have a fine idea of the working of the voters' lists. I fancy their great trouble is that they know how to do it, and they are afraid they are going to lose it. We know how they have done it.

Our friends at Ottawa will make a determined stand on this Bill, and will if necessary keep the House of Commons in session until it is withdrawn or so amended as to give the electors of this province something like fair-play in the way of an honest voters' list.

Evidently we have not got honest voters' lists now.

In the meantime the work of revising the provincial lists will be proceeded with by the local government the same as has been done in previous years and I write you on behalf of the party——

On behalf of the party—paid out of the funds of the province of Manitoba; drawing money out of the treasury of our country and still working for the party. If we were to do that down at Ottawa, if the government at Ottawa were to act in that manner, we would not hear the end of it for months.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Does the hon. gentleman not know that his party have homesteaders and bush rangers and others doing that kind of work all the time?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The writer of this letter goes on to say :

—and I ask you to urge on our friends all through your electoral division the great necessity of revising the provincial lists this year——

The government are going to look after the revision of the lists. They will do the Conservative end of the campaign. That is what Mr. Hastings says, and he ought to know, because he is employed by the Manitoba government and is working for the party.

I ask you to urge on our friends all through your electoral division the great necessity of looking after the revision of the local lists this year in anticipation of the general Dominion election being held on the local lists as they are revised this year. The dates and places of sittings of the registration clerk and the revising officer for your district will be made public in the very near future and we should all work upon the revision of the list with just as much ardour as we would do if no amendment had been introduced in the Dominion House. The Liberals of your district will probably endeavour to convey the impression to the people generally that the lists will be useful when they are revised and for that reason no attention will be paid to the revision, but don't let any such report or statement cause our friends to relax in the slightest degree in getting a fair, full, complete and honest voters' list in your district, a list that will give every man, Conservative and Liberal alike, the right to vote if he possesses the necessary qualifications.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Hear, hear. I commend that paragraph to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. (reading).

A list so revised and corrected as will be a credit to the province and will meet with the approval of all honest men irrespective of party. With such a list prepared and revised, and ready for use by the Dominion authorities, we as a party in this province will feel and know no matter what legislation they may eventually pass at Ottawa——

They are going to have things so fixed that they need not fear any legislation we may pass. Things will be all right anyway.

We have done our duty and succeeded in preparing honest lists in Manitoba and that the Liberal government endeavoured to pass legislation allowing them to make up special lists because they were afraid of the honest verdict of the newly qualified electors of this province.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. A very good letter.

Mr. CRAWFORD (reading) :

I am writing this letter to you with the sanction and approval of the leaders of our party and I trust you will personally see or write to every worker of the party in your district, asking them under the circumstances to pay more than usual attention to the coming revision of the provincial lists, and that you will see that the lists, so far as your district is concerned, is properly and correctly revised. I will be pleased to furnish you with all necessary forms and to give you all information regarding the law governing the revision of the lists if you drop me a line telling me what you require.

Mr. PATERSON. Is that the same letter that you have got, Doctor?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I may have got that. It is a good letter. I would not be ashamed of it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On April 2 our Conservative paper in the town from which I come——

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Would the hon. gentleman kindly inform the House what appointment Mr. Hastings holds under the provincial government and whether he is paid by salary or in what way?

Mr. CRAWFORD. In discussing the Bill now before the House, this is the conclusion arrived at by this Conservative paper which is, I am quite satisfied, under the control of the Minister of Railways and Canals for Manitoba :

That the Dominion government should revise the lists up to date within reasonable time before the federal election is quite just in view of the fact that provincial revision is done only once a year, no objection would be made if the revision were in the hands of the judges for final completion.

That is all we are asking, and there is at least one Conservative paper in the province of Manitoba which agrees that that it is right and proper to have a revision of the lists for federal purposes in the province of Manitoba.

In connection with those voters in the particular case I was going to refer to in Lansdowne last year, here is where an abuse crept in to the extent of 40 voters, owing to the fact that the registration clerk failed to do his duty. Applications were made to strike 40 names off the lists, but when the case came before the judge, owing to the fact that the registration clerk had failed to notify the electors whose names were protested, the judge would not deal with it at all, and those men were allowed to remain on the lists. That is one sample of how things are done in Manitoba. There is just about one more item which I will take up of wrong-doing. It has been referred to before by some of the previous speakers and that is with regard to three names added in the electoral division of Morris last year, and it shows how an important Act improperly carried out affects the election of a candidate. The attorney general of Manitoba only secured a seat in the legislature by the consent and good will of the returning officer. There were three votes allowed to go on the list of men who did not appear and personally register, nor did anybody appear on their behalf and make the necessary sworn declaration. If the law of the province had been followed out to the letter, they would not have been on the lists, and the attorney general of Manitoba would not be holding his seat in the government of Manitoba as he is doing to-day.

That is just a sample of how these things are worked out. As this question no doubt will be discussed in committee, I shall not detain the House further. But there is just one matter I am not satisfied with in regard to the adoption of the provincial franchises. The hon. member for Lisgar talked about it the other day. I refer to residence qualification. A Canadian citizen who has lived in this country and helped to build it up simply because he steps over the boundary line from one province to another should not be deprived of his vote for 12 months. I think three months is long enough, if not too long.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Please tell me who passed the law making twelve months residence necessary for qualification.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It was passed by parliament.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Under the Conservative regime the residence qualification was six months, but the Liberal parliament of which I think my friend was a member made it twelve months.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I don't care who made the law I want the grievance redressed. Now, Mr. Speaker, this Bill which we are now considering will enable us to get away from the defects which at present exist in our election law, and it will give us in Manitoba a fair and honest preparation of the voters' lists. It will ensure that instead of a court of revision sitting for five hours it will sit the same as any other court as long as there is any work to do.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. At what hours of the day does the court of revision sit?

Mr. CRAWFORD. In Beautiful Plains it sits from one o'clock to six o'clock.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. There are just six places out of forty-one where that is the rule.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not care how many places there are, it is a grievance and we want a reasonable time to properly register the electors and we want it done without too much expense which this Bill will give us. Under the Greenway Act which is said to be iniquitous by the Tories the registration clerk cannot close his list within twenty-eight days from the time he receives his instructions, he must keep his registration book open for thirty days after the list is closed and forty-two days must elapse before the court of revision can be held, and the lists are printed during that time and distributed to the leading officials and to the school-houses and post offices all over the country. That is a proper condition and I hope we will get back to it. That is what we are striving for and what I hope we will get. We have heard a good deal about the marked ballot and it seems that there is an attempt to send out the impression that the marked ballot applies to all electors; but the marked ballot only

applies to any person who for some reason or other has his name left off the list and who wishes to cast his vote.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What clause is that?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Clause 13, and it reads :

150a. Where any separate voters' list has been prepared by the returning officer under section 25 of this Act and any person applies to vote whose name appears on the general list from which such separate list has been prepared but whose name has been omitted from the separate list, the deputy returning officer, in addition to placing his initials on the back of the ballot paper as provided by this Act, shall also place on the back thereof a number corresponding to a number placed opposite such person's name in the poll book, and such person, having taken the oath in the form X 1 and, if required, the oaths prescribed by this Act, shall thereupon be entitled to receive such numbered ballot paper and to vote.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Will the hon. gentleman read clause 17 which provides no writing or figuring can be made on the ballot.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is a different point; you might please wait until I finish the point I am dealing with. Now, I want the true information with regard to this to go out to the country and I hope the press will do the fair thing by us in that regard. It has been represented in the Winnipeg 'Telegram' and other papers that there is going to be a marked ballot and that we are going to know how every man votes. That is not the case. It simply applies to any person whose name has been left off the list and who gets a ballot from the returning officer and the returning officer marks it so that it may be discovered afterwards if there is any fraud. This is important for we might have a case like that of the Attorney General of Manitoba who was elected by the vote of the returning officer. If the vote of that man can be traced back it will be known whether he was properly qualified to vote or not, and that is a reasonable and proper precaution to ensure fair-play at the election. I know of elections that have been voided in the west, because of the neglect, wilful or otherwise, of the returning officers in putting illegal marks on the ballot, or not initialing, and I think that the will of the people should be given expression to without the restriction of any technicalities. Now, Mr. Speaker, I approve of this legislation along the lines of the present Bill and I will do all I can to see that it is passed. No matter how our friends opposite may threaten it will make no difference in my stand, and I am afraid that the style of operating which they have adopted will only tend to keep us further apart and to prevent us getting together and deciding on what should be the proper form of this legislation.

Mr. CRAWFORD.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, I have followed with a great deal of interest the discussion which has taken place upon the second reading of this Bill. Indeed, I think that no subject-matter which has come before the House during the present session has been as interesting as the one now under discussion. For my own part, I say frankly and sincerely that the Bill seemed harmless when I first read it; but after having listened to this discussion, I look upon it as one of the most pernicious, most mischievous and most wicked pieces of legislation that has come under my notice since I have had the honour of a seat in this House. It is so qualified by me unreservedly because its object is to depart in a clandestine manner from the principle which this House adopted in 1898, so far as may be necessary to control the results of the election which is about to take place. This is something new to me at any rate. We have had election frauds of a very grave and serious character—far more serious within the last few years than formerly. Under the old forms of influence the elector at least had knowledge of the manner in which his vote was disposed of through direct means of corruption. But we have had another stage which consisted in influencing an election by spoiling, stealing and switching ballots. I say this because there has been abundant proof of it, irrespective entirely of what side has been guilty. There has been that form of undue influence over the free expression of the will of the people; and we have here a third form, which is perhaps more serious than any of the others, inasmuch as it cannot be guarded against. Without any regard to the will of those who are really the electors of a constituency, it will permit a government which is waning, which is moribund, which is failing, to influence the free expression of the will of a constituency. That is the way in which I understand this legislation, and I am quite open to conviction if my judgment in that regard is too severe. But taking that view of it, the House will understand that I look on it as an extremely serious measure which deserves our careful attention.

We in this country are continually comparing our institutions to those of England, saying that we live under the same regime and that the principles that obtain in England obtain here. That statement is only partially true. If you compare the manner in which subjects of this kind are treated in the mother of parliaments with the manner in which they are treated here, you will find that there are profound differences, which are to our dishonour and disfavour to such an extent that travellers from the old country who visit Canada constantly remark upon them to our detriment. Take the subject of the preparation of the electoral lists. We all know that in England that subject is always amicably discussed

and arranged between the parties before the law relating to it is enacted. The parties confer and something which is fair, reasonable and just is determined upon, and that becomes the matter of legislation. You will not find in England, during the past century or very nearly so, such a discussion as the one we are having here to-day. The distribution of seats is another matter which is arranged amicably between the parties, the discussion between them leading to something which incorporates British fair-play, and that becomes a matter of statute. Let me go a little further in order to speak of a matter which is uppermost in my mind, and which has been so for several weeks past. Take the question of the audit of the public accounts. Could there be anything more absolutely different in the two countries? Could there be anything more grotesque, more absurd, more unjust, than our way of proceeding with that audit, as compared with what obtains in England?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. I hear somebody say 'hear, hear,' on the other side of the House, and that is just the hon. gentleman who has contributed perhaps more than anybody else to accentuate those differences which are altogether to our discredit.

Mr. JOHNSTON. My hon. friend did not contribute very much one way or the other.

Mr. MONK. Well, my hon. friend has evoked from me an admission which is this. When I have been at the Public Accounts Committee, and have seen there my colleagues, to whom I cannot give too much praise, busying themselves with what in England is uncontradicted, untrammelled, unobstructed, and have seen the hon. gentleman and some of his colleagues doing what they were doing, courage has failed me, and I have preferred to give up the job. We all know that in England the public accounts are audited by a small committee of ten or twelve members, to which some others may perhaps be added.

Mr. JOHNSTON. It would be interesting to ascertain from our hon. friend how often he has attended the Public Accounts Committee before he gives any instructions with regard to it.

Mr. MONK. Let me ask my hon. friend what business he had there at all, because a man who has no subject-matter to be investigated in the Public Accounts Committee in England never thinks of setting his foot there to obstruct those who have. I am speaking of constitutional usage and I say, without fear of contradiction that a member of parliament in England who would go to a committee having any such matter as this before it, in order to object to the questions of others would arouse such public indignation that within 24 hours he would be compelled to resign.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Has my hon. friend tendered his resignation? Because I have seen him often asking questions in matters in which he had no special interest or which he did not bring before the committee himself.

Mr. MONK. I may have done so in trying to help the investigator, but I think that any sensible man will admit that is a very different thing from sitting there as a counsel, as a lawyer, fed, engaged, paid, one would say—I do not say that was the case, but I say bore the appearance of a court and we were there in the presence of people who were obstructing the investigation.

I do not wish to prolong discussion with my hon. friend upon that subject, but I say it is another example of the difference which we find between British parliamentary institutions and our interpretation of them here. There the chairman of such a committee is always a member of the opposition, the investigation we know covers the administration, so to speak, of the British empire, compared with which our own investigation must necessarily appear extremely small and puny. Where do you find the difficulty in England? These 10 or 15 men go through the accounts, every opportunity is given for the fullest investigation, there is no question of proof or the nature of evidence, there are no men there occupying the singular and contradictory position of, being members themselves, having found nothing whatever to investigate and being there for the sole purpose of blocking the investigations of others. Could one imagine anything more abusive than our usage in this respect of what we call the British constitution and British practice? But let us go a step further. When in England, Sir, as happens at least every ten years—and I think it should happen every ten years here, because I am a great admirer of the political institutions of the mother country—a government feels itself falling, as the present imperial government feels itself falling to a certain extent even at this moment, the cabinet, in a quiet and dignified manner, accepts the situation and awaits patiently and calmly the verdict of the people. But in Canada, almost invariably—and here is a flagrant instance of it—there is an endeavour made, by some crooked wicked mischievous legislation, to prevent the result, to thwart the will of the people, to prevent that free expression of popular will by some hook or crook, as we will see it is intended by this section, and thus to delay the fatal hour. That is the conclusion at which I have arrived in respect of the purpose of this legislation. But I have not by any means lost confidence in my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). He did not prepare this legislation, it is not he who drafted this Act. I have noticed with what care he has attended to and taken notes of the dis-

cussion which has taken place. I do not think the Minister of Justice himself, personally, of his own hand, has drafted that disposition. It comes from that part of the country which it is especially designed to affect and although it may have gone through the hands of the Minister of Justice, I say that he was not the inspirer of it; I know the hon. gentleman and that is my belief. I have confidence in my right hon. friend, I have known him for a long time. We were trained under the same legal master.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. And my right hon. friend will admit that I am right when I say that no man had a keener sense of what is just and what is right, no man was more generous, than that master under whom we both served.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. There is one thing which I found absolutely astonishing, because I do not know, as well as others, the circumstances in Manitoba. I am perfectly within the truth when I say that every one was deeply surprised in this House at the spectacle of last night. Here was my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) who, in a very able speech, giving chapter and verse, and fact and circumstance, denounced and brought to the knowledge of this House what I cannot help calling, because I am one of those good men who live in the east one of the most abominable frauds that could possibly be perpetrated in regard to an election. He did that fully, giving facts, and most of the gentlemen who come from that province were at that time in the House, but there was no sign whatever of indignation on their part. I think some differences arose as to whether Douglas was a bartender or a hotel clerk, it was not decided, I believe, but the balance of testimony was that he was a bartender. Then there was some question with regard to a man with an unpronounceable Polish name, whose defence was assumed, I think by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie, but evidence was immediately produced that he had been sent to gaol or had left the country. Barring those two signs of contradiction and indignation, the whole sad, melancholy story told by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) seemed to go without any protest, without any of those visible signs of indignation which I can say to my hon. friend would have been shown by every member from Quebec had he said such things in regard to that province.

The hon. member for Portage la Prairie certainly spoke at length, there is no doubt as to that, but, Sir, I fail to find, I am bound to say frankly and with all due respect, although I do not know all the circumstances of the many facts he gave to this House, I fail to find in his speech two things, an indignant categorical and determined denial of the story told us by the hon. member for Marquette, in respect to the thin red line, the frauds which had been committed and the secret manner in which those names had been taken from the list by the Liberal organizer or under his direction. Of the results of this I know something because one of my old time friends, Mr. La Rivière, who sat for Provencher, was undoubtedly deprived of his seat by means of those practices. There was no denial of those facts, there was not that categorical statement traversing the statement of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) which I tell you frankly I would have been glad to hear, because I think it is a disgraceful thing that such occurrences as those should happen in this country.

I listened attentively to my hon. friend in the hope of finding some explanation of another point, and that was in regard to the electoral law respecting the lists as it exists in Manitoba. I do not find anything in the long statement made here by my hon. friend to show me that, under that law, there was any colour of injustice or that things happened under that law that do not happen anywhere else. For you may make an election law as perfect as you like, but there will always be some abuse, there will always be somebody who will ill-use that law. In fact, my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) began by saying that he did not complain so much of that law in general, nor of the judges who sat under that law, but he complained that the administration of the law was left to the executive and that there was abuse in that respect. It seems to me that the answer to that was given by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) when he stated here in the House—and this, like all his other serious statements, has gone uncontradicted—that no complaint in the local House in the province itself has been made in regard to the law. I say frankly that all I gathered from the speech of my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie was that there was a certain Mr. Rogers there of whom he spoke very often and whom he represented as a very bad man, and there were other bad men in the west. But there was nothing to traverse the statements in regard to the scandal attending the 'thin red line,' and nothing whatever to show to us in what respect the law was defective. Now, allow me to call your attention—for I do not wish to wander from the subject—to the amendment which has been proposed by my hon. friend from Marquette. I will not read that amendment, but, summed up, it says this: There has been discrimination against Manitoba and British Columbia, and the object of this Bill is a departure from the principle of the acceptance of pro-

vincial voters' lists and the measure is invidious and unjustifiable.

My hon. friend from Marquette stated to us last evening that the province of Quebec was mentioned in that law for the sole purpose of a blind, and I think the province of Ontario too, but I am not quite sure of that. If the province of Quebec is brought in as a blind, that will make this measure particularly detestable. It is an insidious enactment. Now, let us look at the Bill so far as it relates to the province of Quebec, and let us see if there is the same truth in that statement of my hon. friend from Marquette as there is, I am sure, in everything else that he told us last evening. The Bill provides:

9a. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein contained, voters' lists for the portions of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec which consist of territory not municipally organized and where there is no regular assessment or valuation roll——

—shall be prepared, as further stated, by officers specially named by the Governor in Council. Now, is there in the province of Quebec any territory not organized municipally? For, if there is not, then the statement contained in that enactment is not true, and a great semblance of reason, it seems to me, is given to the statement made here by my hon. friend from Marquette. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has practised law for a long time in a part of the country where municipal cases were frequent. He knows perfectly well that there is not one inch of the province of Quebec that is not organized municipally—not one inch. He shakes his head; he has doubts on that point. I will, therefore, endeavour to convince him. You know that we have in the province of Quebec cities and towns and villages especially organized—that is, covered by special statutes of the local legislature. Will my right hon. friend say that these particular places are not municipally organized?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. MONK. Very well, I have his assent to the proposition that these are municipally organized. Now the rest of the province, the whole of the rest of the province, is covered by our municipal code, article 1 of which says:

The Municipal Code applies to all the territory of the province of Quebec except the cities and towns incorporated by special statute.

So we start from this principle that, except the cities and towns incorporated by special statutes, the province of Quebec is covered entirely by the municipal code. That territory, as my right hon. friend knows, is divided into local municipalities. My right hon. friend will not deny that where there are local municipalities the territory is organized municipally. Where there are no local municipalities—and there are such places in large numbers—article 28 applies, which says:

Every territory not erected into a local municipality or every territory of which the council is not organized, is, until it be annexed to an adjoining local municipality or until the council thereof be organized, administered and regulated by the county council and its officers, under their usual names and with the same privileges, rights and obligations, as if such council and officers were the local council and officers of such territory.

So that upon that point there is no doubt whatever—the whole of the province of Quebec is municipally organized. Cities and towns especially incorporated are, of course, so organized. The municipal code applies to all the rest of the province under article 1, and where there is no local municipality—that is, with councillors, &c.—you have article 28 applying which says that the county council and its secretary-treasurer are the officers administering that municipality.

So that there is not, in the province of Quebec, a single inch of unorganized territory. But my right hon. friend may say that there are parts of the province not included in any county—for, as regards territory included within any county it seems to me my argument cannot be controverted. But there are no such places. If we look at our last revised statutes of the province of Quebec giving the division of the counties, we find that the division of the counties covers the whole province without excepting even a single inch. It goes to the limits of the province, to the American line in the south and to the utmost bounds of the province in the north. So if you take an extreme point, for instance, away back of the city of Three Rivers, some point where there is not an inhabitant within a hundred miles, that spot is within the limits of a county and that county with its councillors and secretary-treasurer is the administration of that particular place and of anybody residing there. So it is quite a mistake to say that there is any part of the province of Quebec that is not municipally organized.

To such an extent—because I am making this argument in order to come to a further point—that if you wished to prepare an electoral list and a man was a resident far back of any habitation whatever—take the county of Labelle, take the county of Montcalm, any of those counties running back from the St. Lawrence river north to the extreme limits of the province—and that man wanted to know if his name was on the electoral list, and I wanted to know if he had a right to be on it, I could go to the secretary treasurer of the municipality and say, 'have you accomplished your duty, have you made an electoral list and placed upon it this man who resides beyond the

limits of any local municipality? There is no doubt whatever as to that. So that part of the allegation is not true, and there is no ground for any enactment in regard to Quebec so far as its unorganized territory is concerned, because there is no unorganized municipal territory in the province of Quebec. Now let me as briefly as possible point out what obtains in our province as regards the electoral lists. I am quoting from the Quebec Elections Act of 1885, and pointing out how our lists are prepared. From the 1st to the 15th of every month of September, under article 19 of that Act, the secretary treasurer prepares his electoral lists, and gives notice of its publication. If the secretary treasurer fails to prepare the electoral lists within that delay he may be ordered to do so by a judge, or a judge may order another person to do so in his place. After the lists is prepared there are 15 days given for complaints to be made. The secretary treasurer has made his list, he has posted it up and given public notice, and 15 days are given for complaints in writing. Then the complaints are taken up with the electoral lists at a special meeting of the council. The council hears these complaints, revises the list and finally decrees that the list is in force. Then you still have thirty days in which to appeal from the decision of council to a judge of the Superior Court. That is briefly the routine followed in our province. Since I have been in this House I have heard a great deal about electoral lists, the manner of making them, and the procedure, and I doubt if there is a simpler or better way of preparing lists than that. Nobody knows better than a municipal councillor the qualifications of a man to be an elector. As a rule, the councillors are not of the same political colour. Their decisions are sometimes unfair, and appeals are taken; but there is always the appeal from a judge to a judge, and that appeal is generally satisfactory. If there is no organized municipality in any territory, it would be undoubtedly the duty of the secretary treasurer of the county council, which has jurisdiction in that case, to prepare a list and to go through exactly the same formality. He would have to post it up, it would come up for review before the county council this time, not before the local council, and there would be an appeal to a judge. I think that confirms what my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) stated, that the province of Quebec was brought in here as a pretext, because there is no need of this provision in Quebec.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not by way of controverting what my hon. friend has said, because I think that on the whole he has been measurably correct, but by way of getting information from him—he says that in the county of Montcalm for instance, or Labelle, or any territory which is not organized, the warden of the county and the secretary of the county have municipal jurisdiction over that territory. So far so good. But does he believe that there is machinery provided to make electoral lists? Under our system the assessment roll is the basis of our electoral lists.

Mr. MONK. I would not have expected that from my right hon. friend, but I think he has been inspired by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot), and badly inspired. The assessment roll is not alone the guide of the secretary treasurer, that has often been decided in our courts. Let me read the article :

> The secretary treasurer of each municipality shall between the first and fifteenth day of the month of March, in each year, make in duplicate subdivided for each polling subdivision, a list in alphabetical order, of all persons, who according to the valuation roll then in force in the municipality for municipal purposes, appear to be electors by reason of the real estate possessed or occupied by them in any manner within the municipality, or by reason of being otherwise qualified as set forth in article 9.

The valuation roll is the principal guide which is used in the local municipalities, but in the case mentioned by my right hon. friend, the latter part of that article applies 'or by reason of being otherwise qualified as set forth in article 9.' It has been decided by our courts that the valuation roll is to a certain extent the guide as to the qualification of the voter, but it is not the only one. A man may be put on the electoral lists who is not on the valuation roll at all. For instance, a man who earns $300 a year in our province is not on the valuation roll, yet he has the right to be on the voters' list, because in our province any man who earns $300 a year, is a British subject, and of the proper age, has the right to be on the voters' list. Now, there is no doubt whatever that we have no unorganized municipal territory within our province. My hon. friend from Bellechasse would perhaps be surprised if I told him that, although I have written to a number of people asking for information in regard to this Bill, people residing very far from each other within the limits of my province, and people conversant with the electoral law, they all answer in exactly the same way, and I will place these letters at any time at the disposal of my right hon. friend. The object of this Bill is unfairly to obtain the right of franchise for men engaged on government works; that is the answer which I received from every one of these people.

The object is to use that part of the Act in order to have special officers named and have them make special electoral lists which will enable people, working within the limits of a province, upon the Transcontinental or other public work, to obtain the franchise for the purposes of the next general election. There is no doubt that

is the object, and I consider that the opposition are right in refusing to allow the passage of such a measure. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) is quite justified in saying that the province of Quebec is brought into this enactment under a false pretense. There is no unorganized territory there.

Mr. D. ROSS. Does my hon. friend know as a matter of fact that the county treasurer does prepare the lists for those unorganized territories even if they are within his county ?

Mr. MONK. I do not. My hon. friend will understand that there are very few people residing out of the purview of a local municipality.

Mr. D. ROSS. If he does not do it, does my hon. friend argue that these people are not entitled to their franchise?

Mr. MONK. They are undoubtedly, but there are very few, if any, who exist. If there are any, they have their recourse. The treasurer should perform his duty as regards those electors. If he does not, the machinery is there and can be brought into requisition in five minutes. The secretary-treasurer may be required to make an electoral list for those voters. That list will be subject to revision before a county council and there may be an appeal to a judge, but that is a very different thing from coming in on the eve of an election with a returning officer, who may not be very scrupulous—and while there are very honest returning officers there may be some who are not—and going through those outside localities and placing 300 or 400 men on the list, without giving any chance of revision, without notice, without any recourse of appeal to the county council or the judge. That is the opinion entertained in the province of Quebec by everybody, Liberal as well as Conservative, who takes the trouble of looking over that enactment and has any knowledge of the working of our electoral law.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC BRANCH LINES.

House in committee on Bill (No. 151) respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—Mr. Crawford.

Mr. LENNOX. I have an amendment to offer and I would like it to be distinctly understood that it does not touch in any way the construction of the western division. I realize the importance of not hampering the railway company in any way as regards the western portion of that line and I realize also that inasmuch as the railway company is to a large extent building that portion of the line with their own money, the necessity for my motion does not arise in connection with the western division. I am thoroughly in sympathy with the western members and with the western people who desire to facilitate in every way not only the construction of the western division but the construction of the branches and feeders of that division. On the other hand I feel that inasmuch as the country is furnishing the money for the construction of the eastern division, and as it is quite a possibility that at the end of the fifty years period we may resume the operation of that road, it is of importance that the country should now take a position which will enable it at the end of the fifty year period to have not only control of the main line of the eastern division of the Grand Trunk Pacific, but control also of the feeders of that eastern division which are absolutely essential to it. When in 1904 we were considering the supplemental agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company we incorporated a provision in the agreement enabling us under certain terms to get control of certain of the branch lines, but I intend to show that the provision which we were then able to get from the government was not such a provision as we should have in the interests of the people of Canada. While I have endeavoured as far as possible to work along the lines of least resistance, yet I felt I would not be doing my duty unless I endeavoured to frame a provision which is more in harmony than that is, with the interests of the people who are building the eastern division. We are building this road and letting it to the Grand Trunk Pacific upon easy terms for a period of fifty years, and I contend that should we resume possession we should be in a position to take over upon equitable terms all the branch lines which have been constructed. The enormous importance and extent of these branch lines will be appreciated when we note that the capitalization of this company is $50,000,000 and that it was remarked in 1906 that the aggregate of these branch lines exceeded either of the total length of the Transcontinental Railway or the total length of the eastern or western division ; which it was, I cannot positively say. I propose for the protection of the people of Canada to add the following section to the Bill now before the House :

2. In case the government as defined in the schedule to the National Transcontinental Railway Act, 1903, in pursuance of the terms of the said schedule shall at any time determine to undertake the operation of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway, the government shall thereupon and thereafter have the right to take over all or any of such of the lines of railway authorized by chapter 99 of the Acts of this parliament of 1906 as are connected with or

running from a point or points in the said eastern division, at such value as may be agreed upon between the government and the company; and in case they cannot agree the amount to be paid by the government to the company the amount shall be determined by the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, from whose decision either party shall have the right, without leave, to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada. If any such line of railway, so to be taken over, shall have received any grant or grants under the provisions of any Act of the parliament of Canada, the amount of such grant or grants, without interest, shall be deducted from such value, and the difference only shall be payable by the government upon the taking over of the line. Provided, however, that nothing in this Act contained shall authorize the government to take over the said lines of railway or any of them without the consent of parliament, previously obtained, to the exercise of such right of taking over as aforesaid.

This amendment differs in some degree from the provision in the Act of 1904 contained in the agreement form in the schedule to the Act, chapter 24, statutes of Canada, 1904, section 11. That section provides that we shall only take over such lines as the railway company elects not to retain. My amendment provides practically in the same wording as section 11 of 1904 for the taking over of all these lines. There is this difference, and in this I think I shall have the concurrence of the Minister of Finance, namely, that I have added on the words :

Provided, however, that nothing in this Act contained shall authorize the government to take over the said lines of railway or any of them without the consent of parliament, previously obtained, to the exercise of such right of taking over as aforesaid.

That proviso is contained in the statute respecting the Quebec Bridge and, we adopted it in another statute passed this session. I am not satisfied altogether with this amendment because I would like to have it go so far as to provide that in the event of our taking over these railways and there having been a grant by parliament to them, the amount of that grant together with the interest should be deducted, whereas my amendment provides only that the amount of such grant without interest shall be deducted. However, I am trying to work along the lines of least resistance. To show that if this amendment has a fault, it is that of not going far enough, I would refer to a clause set out in a contract between the Post office Department in Great Britain and the city of Glasgow, which is quoted in a very concise and valuable little work by a gentleman whom we used to have in the gallery of the House of Commons, Mr. William Richmond Smith, at page 41. I may say that substantially it is a clause which is known generally as embodying the tramway terms, and its provisions are such that there is no possibility of the government having to pay any fancy price. I would much prefer such a provision to the amendment I propose ; but we shall probably have to work up gradually to that. I will venture, however, to read it, so that we shall have it available in 'Hansard,' and I hope it will not be many years before, in those matters which so intimately affect the public, as railways, the granting of rights in navigable rivers, and so on, we can have easy terms on which to take over the properties in the interest of the public. Hon. gentlemen, I hope, will bear in mind, in considering this question, that it is an entirely different proposition from the ordinary proposition of taking over a railway. It is a case in which we are building a railway, the essential feeders to which are under consideration, and the railway company constructing them is coming here for an extension of time ; and this company, although coming under a different name, is to all intents and purposes the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. Let me point out the necessity for this provision. We have, in section 11 of the agreement which forms the schedule to the statute of 1904, a provision enabling us to take over such branches of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company as they may determine not to retain ; but we have no provision which will cover the case of a company which has a distinct organization, although identical in interest, that is, the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company ; and therefore it is important that wet should have in this Act, now that we are granting to this company a blanket charter over a vast territory which is essential as a feeding ground for our own public highway, the eastern division of the Transcontinental Railway, a provision which will enable us to deal with it in case it should come into the government's hands at the end of the fifty-year period.

Mr. KNOWLES. In what way can we be sure that the interests of these two companies will be the same ? Might not a capitalist invest a large sum of money in the Transcontinental Railway, and nothing in this, or vice versa ?

Mr. LENNOX. I am not at all sure that tinue to be the same ; but I am clear that the interests of Canada will continue to be the same to the end of the fifty-year period. We are incorporating this company and giving it large powers of extending railways through a territory which must be the feeding ground of the railway we are constructing ; and whether this railway will be separate in interest from the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, which is very unlikely, or not, it is essential to us that we should now see to it that we annex such conditions that, whether it does or does not pass into other hands, we shall have con-

trol of the situation. I will read the provision in regard to the taking over of the Glasgow telephone system by the Post Office Department in England :

On, or as soon as may be after the 31st of December, 1913, the Postmaster General shall buy and the local authority shall sell and convey all such plant as is, at the date aforesaid in use by the local authority for the purpose of supplying the means of telephonic communication under these presents, and as is suitable for the actual requirements, at the date aforesaid, of the telephone service of the post office within the licensed area. No plant shall in any case, be considered suitable for the requirements of the telephonic service of the post office, which has been brought into use without the sanction in writing of the Postmaster General, but as aforesaid, if any question arises as to the suitability of any of the plant of the local authority for the requirements of the telephonic service of the post office within the licensed area, such subject shall, in case of difference, be decided by arbitration. The value of all plant purchased by the Postmaster General under the foregoing articles shall be deemed to be its fair market value at the time of purchase, due regard being had to the nature, and the then condition of such plant and to the state of repair thereof and to the circumstance that it is in such a position as to be ready for immediate working and to its suitability for the purposes of a telephonic service and no addition shall be made to such value in respect of compulsory purchase, or of good will, or of any profits which might have been or be made by the local authority from the use of such plant. In the case of difference, such value as aforesaid shall be determined by arbitration. All matters which in pursuance of the conditions herein contained, are to be determined by arbitration, shall be referred to an arbiter to be mutually agreed upon by the Postmaster General and the local authority and failing such agreement, to be appointed on application of either of them, by the board of trade.

Here is a specific provision, that there shall be no fancy price paid, but only the actual value, without anything for good will or franchise or anything of that kind—only for such things as are absolutetly suitable; and no plant which shall not have the sanction of the Post Office Department before it is used shall be taken into consideration when the purchase is made—a provision which seems eminently reasonable under the circumstances, and would be conspicuously reasonable in regard to a proposition such as we are now dealing with. However, I have not asked to have so far-reaching a provision incorporated in the amendment I propose. I ask only a provision along the lines we adopted in 1904, but differing essentially from the provisions of the Act of 1904 in this respect, that it provides for what I think Canada should certainly have the right to—not the refuse of the lines which the Grand Trunk Pacific Company or the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company may desire not to retain, but the absolute right when we assume possession and control of this public undertaking, to take with it all those portions of railway which are essential parts of it, namely, the feeders constructed by this subsidiary company connected with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It occurs to me that this amendment is not in order. Under the British North America Act it is provided that:

It shall not be lawful for the House of Commons to adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address or Bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue or of any tax or impost to any purpose that is not recommended to that House by message of the Governor General in the session in which such vote, resolution, address or Bill is passed.

I take it that the real meaning and construction of these words is that no charge shall be imposed on the public revenue without a Bill or resolution for the purpose being first recommended by His Excellency the Governor General. By this Bill it is declared, in the first place, that the Governor General in Council shall have the power to take over all the branch lines of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. I think there can be no question that if the resolution stopped there it would be clearly out of order, because that would enable the Governor in Council to take over these roads, no matter what they might cost, and, of course, appropriate the moneys of the country for that purpose. It is very clear that a Bill of that kind could not be proposed to parliament except upon the recommendation of the Governor General in Council. Then it is also provided by the first part of the resolution that the government shall have power to proceed to a valuation of the company's property, take all necessary steps for that purpose, and, therefore necessarily incur any expense which might be necessary for the purpose of having an arbitration. That clearly would be also a charge upon the revenue. The amount, therefore, which, if this amendment passed the country would have to pay for these branch lines, would be fixed and determined by arbitration in the manner which this amendment suggests. There you have by the first part of the amendment authority given to the Governor General in Council to take over all these branches and also provision to take the necessary steps for arbitration and necessarily incident to that power, to incur whatever expenses would be necessary in order to take those proceedings. You have also a provision as to the mode in which the valuation shall be arrived at, that is to say from the valuation shall be deducted any subsidies which may have been paid. The only question to my mind is whether the proviso at the close prevents the prin-

ciple which I am invoking from applying. The proviso is :

That nothing in this Act contained shall authorize the government to take over the said lines of railway or any of them without the consent of parliament, previously obtained, to the exercise of the said right of taking over as aforesaid.

It might be said that perhaps when the time arrived when the government would be in a position to exercise the powers conferred by this Act the government would still have to go to parliament and get its authority, but it seems to me that does not remove the objection because, by the previous provisions of the Act, the government would be powerless, it would have to take over the lines upon the valuation fixed under the provisions of the previous part of the section or not take them at all. Therefore, this seems to me to be an amendment which would be clearly within the prohibition of section 54 of the British North America Act, and which could only be brought before parliament by a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister has become very astute as to the manner in which we can vote supplies ; no doubt he has reason for that. But let me remind him that we have a very distinguished precedent for this, not yet four weeks old, in the case of the Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Company. In that case two amendments were moved, one by myself and another by a gentleman opposite. The Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Finance were present on that occasion and the House then incorporated in that Act this provision that we should not take the company's works over without the consent of parliament being first obtained. That was done not on the ground that it was necessary that the matter should be submitted to the Governor in Council for his sanction as being an appropriation of money, but on the ground that it would not be proper that we should impliedly authorize the Governor in Council or the government to take over a large undertaking without first submitting it to parliament. No such question as has been suggested arises. There is here no such thing as an appropriation of money. I realize as fully as the hon. gentleman the difficulty that any gentleman on this side of the House would have in bringing forward a measure of this kind.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How would you pay for the railroads unless you pay for them?

Mr. LENNOX. We will not pay for them until we take them, and we will not take them until parliament votes that we shall do so ; parliament will not so vote until the proposition is submitted to parliament, and it will not be submitted until the proper steps are taken by the government in power and the matter has been submitted to His Excellency. If my hon. friend looks at the supplementary agreement of the National Transcontinental Railway, 1904, he will probably not find that any sanction was obtained from His Excellency the Governor General on that occasion. The principle is the same, we get the option to take over the works, but whether we shall exercise that option or not is for us to determine when the 50 year period has expired. We are not committing ourselves by securing this option in the interest of the people to the extent of one cent. I am not asking the appropriation of one cent in this matter. I am asking parliament and the government, who should be the guardians of the people, to avail themselves of the opportunity they now have of securing the necessary condition to the granting of this extension of time, a condition which costs this parliament and the people of Canada not one cent, which appropriates not one cent out of the revenues, but which secures for the people something they ought to have. the possibility of not only obtaining these branch lines but of obtaining them on something like reasonable terms when the time arrives. I would like to ask the members of the government: when that provision was inserted in the Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Bill, a provision similar to the one we have here—not worded in the same way, but providing that parliament may take over that work—did we get the sanction of His Excellency the Governor General on that occasion ? No ; we did not think of such a thing. And that emanated from the government themselves, it was a provision introduced by the Minister of Railways and Canals, as I assume. It is perfectly idle, I submit, to raise this objection. I am surprised that my distinguished and learned friend the Minister of Public Works, astute lawyer and able counsel as he is, should suggest for a moment that this is a question of the appropriation of money. You have only to read the statute on one hand and the provision of this amendment on the other to see instantly that this is not a question of appropriating money. But, granted that he is right in saying that before we can complete this option we should obtain the sanction of His Excellency the Governor General, still, as a first step, it would be submittetd to parliament, and it would be so submittted only after His Excellency had given his approval for the taking over of the lines. I submit that this is only an option at the most ; there is no pretense of appropriating one dollar of the revenues of Canada by reason of the condition which, I submit, should be annexed to the granting of this extension of time to this railway company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If no other gentleman wishes to speak, I desire to say just a

word. Before dealing with the question itself, I may perhaps not improperly remark that I think it is a pity that my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox), called upon as he was simply to discuss a constitutional question, should have thought it worth while to go far out of his way to suggest that there was some impropriety in the fact of my taking this objection. I exercised my right as a member of the committee to raise what seemed to me a good and substantial point of order.

Now, with regard to the original agreement between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific, the hon. gentleman suggests that he doubts whether that agreement was submitted to parliament with the approval of His Excellency. I cannot imagine that he is correct in that. I take it for granted that the agreement had received the consent of His Excellency and was so submitted to parliament. I have no doubt whatever that that was the case and I think anybody would say that it was necessary before parliament could properly consider it.

Now, I do not know that the case of the Shuswap Boom Company could be any precedent for action by you on this occasion because the provision in that Bill was altogether different from the provision here. This Bill proposes that the government shall take certain steps before coming to parliament, that it shall proceed to value all these properties, that it shall incur the obligation of having an arbitration and with power to appeal, and that all that shall be done——

Mr. FOSTER. Not necessarily.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, before coming to parliament. And then, if the consent of parliament was given, it would go through. But all these things have to be done before coming to parliament; and I submit that this imposes a money obligation on the country which can only be imposed by parliament upon the initiation of the government and the consent of the Governor General.

Mr. BARKER. I wish only to say a few words——

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry—if I had known the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) was going to speak, I would not have closed——

Mr. LENNOX. We are in committee and can speak as often as we like.

Mr. BARKER. In 1904, parliament, in its wisdom, thought of protecting the future interests of the people of Canada by reserving certain rights in branch lines which might be built by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. After full consideration, that protection was passed by this parliament under the guidance of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and his ministers. We have now a palpable attempt to evade the protection that was then given to the people of this country and to enable the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to get rid of the right then reserved to the people by putting up a mere fiction company belonging to themselves—virtually the same company —which will build the branches and set the people of Canada at defiance. And this is being done with the knowledge of the right hon. gentleman and his cabinet. There is no concealing the fact; the truth is apparent on the face of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I rise to a point of order. It seems to me that it is very irregular for an hon. gentleman, in discussing a point of order, to travel outside and to attribute motives.

Mr. BARKER. We are discussing the amendment.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, a point of order has been raised.

Mr. BARKER. Unless the clause is passed, I will discuss the point itself.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The point of order has not been ruled upon.

Mr. FOSTER I can hardly yet think that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) can be serious in raising this as a point of order——

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is, very serious.

Mr. FOSTER. It certainly was surprising to me to hear the hon. gentleman. I have had quite a long experience in this House, and it surprises me to hear it argued that we cannot give advice and embody that advice, in a resolution or even in an Act, with reference to precautions that should be taken to safeguard the public interest. This is what is authorized: 'The Governor shall thereupon and thereafter have the right to take over——.' That is all that this amendment proposes to ask. Then, at the last, we have the words:

> Provided that nothing in this Act contained shall authorize the government to take over the said lines of railway or any of them without the consent of parliament, previously obtained.

Consent obtained for what? To the exercise of such rights. But before doing that we should get the authority of parliament to exercise that right. So I take it they will have no authority at all, even on that point. You go to work and make valuations, spend money, do anything at all until you have asked parliament and until parliament has exercised that right.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then what is the object?

Mr. FOSTER. The object is to preserve the right of the people to do that if they

please, and so to preserve the public interest.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Parliament can do that at any time.

Mr. FOSTER. But parliament, sitting now and giving this extension to this peculiar company, thinks it is better, and having a perfect right to think so, to put that proviso in and so safeguard what they consider to be in the public interest.

Mr. LENNOX. I think it is my duty to endeavour to get the leader of the government to take some definite attitude with reference to this matter. I would like to see the government realize what their duty is, and I would like to see the right hon. gentleman realize his duty, because he is more than anybody else responsible for what we should now do. He is an old parliamentarian; he realizes the gravity of a proposition of this kind. Because a private member of this House wants to submit something that he believes is in the public interest, something which will never cost the country a dollar unless parliament sees fit to exercise the rights and privileges there secured, to say that a private member in the discharge of his duty cannot bring in a constitutional amendment to safeguard the rights of the people, because if that right is exercised by the government, it will cost money; to say that no private member has a right to submit an amendment which will give the country the right to acquire the property if parliament says so at the end of fifty years—I say that is a startling proposition. I appeal with confidence to the right hon. gentleman on account of his great experience. I always feel that I can with a good deal more confidence appeal to him than I can to some other members of the cabinet. I am sorry that the Minister of Public Works thinks I said something that was not complimentary.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think you were not discussing the constitutional point.

Mr. LENNOX. I will admit that. But I doubt whether my hon. friend relied much on the objection he takes. Astute lawyer as he is, always actuated by honest motives as lawyers are, I feel that he put it forward for what it was worth, and realized at the time that it wasn't worth very much. Now, in order to impress this matter upon the leader of the government, I wish to refer to the Act from which I take this clause.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Let us dispose of the point of order. I intend to refer the matter to the Speaker in consequence of its importance. If there was no proviso I would declare the point of order well taken.

Progress reported.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have had the opportunity of listening to the discussion and am inclined to rule that the point is not well taken. The amendment proceeds in the first place to state :

> In case the government, as defined in the schedule to the National Transcontinental Railway Act, 1903, in pursuance of the terms of the said schedule, shall at any time determine to undertake the operation of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway, the government shall thereupon and thereafter have the right to take over——

And so on. The amendment down to the word 'provided' is unquestionably within the rule, and the point would be well taken. But the words following the word 'provided' :

> That nothing in this Act contained shall authorize the government to take over the said lines of railway or any of them without the consent of parliament, previously obtained.

Modify the earlier portion and would preclude, as I view it, the possibility of the expenditure of any money for the purpose without the consent of parliament being first obtained, and then would be the time to procure the consent of the Governor General and submit the matter by resolution to the House.

Mr. BARKER. I regret that I was interrupted in the few remarks I was about to make by the astute Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley). Having heard so much about his astuteness, I would be almost inclined to think he had directed that astuteness to-night to raising a point of order in order that it might prevent the completion of the discussion before nine o'clock. I suppose that the Bill, under the order of the House, will now have to stand over; but being so very astute, it may be difficult to know in what particular direction he was displaying that astuteness. I was saying that in the Act of 1904, this government, at the instance of hon. members on this side, had made provision to protect the interests of the people in years to come. When the provinces were so progressing that no man could at that time foresee what might be the general public interest in the future, we thought it absolutely essential, looking forward to that future to provide that, should the leased property be surrendered, we should have the right to take over branches that might be absolutely essential to the main property. In all fairness, honesty and statesmanlike prevision, we consider that we were entitled to provide proper protection. Therefore we did provide that, in certain eventuality, we should have the right to take over certain branches, if parliament saw fit. Now, what is being done, palpably done, to evade that provision and done—if the right hon. gentleman and his cabinet did not see it, they know it now—with the apparent and almost positive intention of evading the

condition parliament imposed in 1904? We have the right by act of parliament to take over certain branch lines, should it be in the interests of the country to take them over. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles) asked how do we know that the people then interested in these branch lines companies will be the same as the Grand Trunk Pacific to-day? What a wonderfully shrewd motion that is. We know who are interested in that company to-day. We know that the effect of the Acts they are trying to get through this House will be to evade a condition imposed upon the Grand Trunk Pacific in the public interest. And if they bring in a Bill here, under their own auspices, a Bill in which, beyond all doubt or question, nobody else to-day is interested —if they bring in a Bill to enable them to take out of that contract what may be most valuable property, why should we not put on record in the Acts of parliament that the company they form are bound by the original contract, so that those who become associated with them may know the terms upon which they come in and will be bound as the Grand Trunk Pacific would be and as they ought to be.

Mr. GRAHAM. Do I understand my hon. friend to say that the clause proposed is identical with the one in the original Act referring to the Grand Trunk Pacific itself? I think it is far different.

Mr. BARKER. Will my hon. friend bring in the original clause?

Mr. GRAHAM. That would not be an answer to my question.

Mr. BARKER. It is a very common and ancient custom to answer one question by asking another. But are we to go on year after year and never get more enlightened? The hon. gentleman himself has had an opportunity of knowing what was thought right in 1904. But he is going backward. Are we not therefore to go forward? If we find a weakness, if there be a weakness in what was then proposed, why should we not correct it? Or shall we do as the Minister of Railways and Canals proposes, cut away our protection altogether? Surely there can be no question as to what we should do. What possible excuse has this company to come here and say that the branch lines which, in the original contract, were to be built by the company, subject to certain rights on the part of the people of Canada, shall, by our own acts and concurrence, be allowed to be built by somebody else who will not be bound by those conditions. Why, talk to any business man on such a subject and he will say that the proposition is one of pure idiocy. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that if, as an individual, he were making a bargain and were a shareholder or proprietor or interested in the contract, he would be taken in by such a palpable evasion. I give him credit for too much common sense to believe it. But of course he is only dealing for the people of Canada, and we know what, the late Mr. Vanderbilt is supposed to have said about the public.

Mr. JOHNSTON. What did he say?

Progress reported.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT—AMENDMENT.

The hour for private Bills having expired, the House resumed consideration of the second reading of Bill (No. 115) to amend the Dominion Elections Act and the proposed amendment of Mr. W. J. Roche thereto.

Mr. MONK. As I said, Mr. Speaker, before you rose at six o'clock, what impressed me most, during this discussion regarding what took place in Manitoba, is the failure by hon. gentlemen opposite to deny that what is called 'the thin red line' was perpetrated either by Leach himself or under his direction. Surely if any alterations had to be made in the electoral lists, they came naturally under the purview of the returning officer in each constituency. Although there may not be any provision especially in the Act, under the circumstances in which those alterations were made, the returning officer was called upon, in common fairness and justice, to notify the candidates before making any changes. Did he notify those with regard to whom he intended altering the lists? No, the alterations were made by a person or persons having an authority; and once made, whatever might have been their effect—whether they cancelled entirely the names of the voters or transferred them to distant polls is a matter of no importance although one as to which there has been a great deal of quibbling—those alterations should have been brought to the knowledge of those who were affected. But we have no excuse whatever offered in that regard. The whole discussion has impressed me with the absolute certainty that what was perpetrated that time was the result of a preconceived scheme which successfully worked the disastrous results that have been subsequently condemned on all sides.

My hon. friend from Portage la Prairie spoke at great length of defects in the present Manitoba law, but to my mind none of these defects were of a really grave character and none confuted the crowning principle that finally this making of the lists in Manitoba comes under the view of the judge, as it does in the province of Quebec. There are defects in the electoral law of the province of Quebec but that does not mean that our electoral law is not a singularly satisfactory one. Even admitting that defects do exist in Manitoba that is no ground for the sweeping change this Bill contemplates. When in 1898 we decided to adopt the provincial

lists in principle did we not know that defects would be found in the provincial laws exactly as defects were found under our own Dominion Franchise Act? It is the merest flimsy pretext to say that because in some particular respect the electoral law of a province is deficient we will sweep aside the principle we adopted in 1898 and on the eve of an election and after the issue of the writs, that the government will take unto itself the entire preparation of the voters' lists. The amendment of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) after laying down the truism that this Bill discriminates against Manitoba and British Columbia compared with the other provinces, declares:

That this law is a radical departure from the principle of accepting provincial voters' lists and is invidious and unjustifiable.

I stated this afternoon that there is no unorganized territory within the limits of the province of Quebec and that therefore there is no justification for this enactment in reference to Quebec, because the whole province is organized municipally and under the provincial law every man who has the right to vote can be placed upon the list by the proper officer. My right hon. friend may ask: if such be the same, why do I fear the passage of this enactment.

Mr. DEVLIN. There is unorganized territory in Quebec.

Mr. MONK. Where?

Mr. DEVLIN. In the county of Wright which I represent there are 572,397 acres of unorganized territory.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend was not here this afternoon when I placed before the House what I think was an unanswerable argument. Let me repeat for his benefit that every piece of territory in the province of Quebec is under the control of a municipal council and it is therefore organized.

Mr. DEVLIN. It comes under the municipal code in as much as it may be under the control of the county council, but it may not necessarily be organized into a municipality and the residents of a township which has no municipal organization would not have the right to vote unless they have property in an adjoining township.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend is mistaken. Let him look at article 32 of the municipal code, which says: That if there is no local municipality in any given place within the limits of the county—and all parts of the province of Quebec are within the limits of a county—then the county council replaces the local municipality, and so the secretary is obliged to prepare a list of electors for these 500,000 acres my hon. friend refers to, exactly as would the secretary treasurer of a local council. There can be no doubt whatever about that, and I will not discuss the point further. True, there is no local council and there are no local councillors, but, if there are not the very small number of people required by our municipal code to form a municipal council, in that case the administration is by the county council.

Mr. TALBOT. Does the county council make electoral lists?

Mr. MONK. Our electoral law prescribes that the secretary treasurer of the council, whatever council it may be, must make an electoral list, and if he has under his control territory which belongs properly to the county council where there is no local municipal organization, he should make an electoral list for that part of his territory. There is no question about that whatever. My hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Duncan Ross) asked me had I any knowledge of a case where a county secretary treasurer had made such a list and my reply to him is that I have not, and the reason is because there are not many places where there is no local council. But if there were such a place the duty of the officer would be perfectly plain, and if he did not fulfil his duty under the provisions of our election law any party interested could apply to a judge for a remedy, and the judge could order the secretary treasurer to prepare the electoral lists.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. What control has this parliament over such an officer?

Mr. MONK. We have no more control over him than over any other municipal officer, but parliament has adopted the principle that we shall take out lists from these municipal officers. We receive the electoral lists from the registrars who receive them from the secretary treasurer and the registrar is a municipal officer. It is true they grumble about it but nevertheless they forward copies of these lists to Ottawa and so far no difficulty has been experienced. In fact when this franchise question was discussed in this parliament in 1908, I spoke of it in my own county, and knowing that generally speaking our provincial lists are well made, I took the ground that I was not opposed to the change, and I think our experience in the province of Quebec has justified me in that. That being the case, and I know it is a fair subject for discussion, and it is because it is a fair subject for discussion that I have most fear. Here are already two hon. gentlemen from the province of Quebec who mention large areas in that province where there is no possibility of having an electoral list. That is what my hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin) has stated.

Mr. DEVLIN. There will be every possibility under this Bill.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend takes the ground at the present moment that there is no possibility. If that were the case, then I would have to admit that there is a large desolate area in the province of Quebec where there are very few people, where it is very easy to send people, and where people might spring up suddenly like Cadmus' soldiers, and those people would have to be provided with the electoral franchise.

Mr. DEVLIN. In the county of Wright they all vote honestly.

Mr. MONK. I have no doubt about that. There was an old French Canadian in my county who said that he believed everybody was perfectly honest, but that he had misgivings about everybody. What would happen in the province of Quebec would be that this enabling enactment would enable the government on the eve of an election, after the issue of the writ, to send out persons to make electoral lists. I know of ten or twelve or fifteen constituencies in the province of Quebec which would be liable to this kind of invasion. How do I know that in my own constituency, almost an urban constituency, portions of which are densely populated, some gentlemen on the eve of the election would not find some spot unorganized municipality in his opinion, where he would have to make a list? I say this is a most dangerous enactment so far as the province of Quebec is concerned. The Transcontinental Railway is at present under construction through several of those constituencies—through parts where there is no municipal organization. If the idea propounded by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) and the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin), and sustained by the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Ross), be correct, there will be the opportunity to send in an officer to prepare a list, conforming himself, says the Bill, as far as possible to the law. Well, there is only one law, and it is perfectly clear, that is, that you can only make an electoral list between the 1st and the 15th of September. How can a man go in there and make a list at any time, and how can he, between the issue of the writ and the final event, conform even in the slightest degree to those dispositions of our Electoral Act, which require two stages—a revision by a council of men, jurymen, so to speak, with a right of final appeal to a judge thirty days after? And what will be the position of a candidate who does not happen to be a friend of the parties carrying out this scheme? Will he run up into those far northern latitudes in order to find out whether lists are being prepared, and leave the rest of the constituency, where are the legally qualified electors? The truth is that in these cases he will have to trust to chance, and wait patiently until some time after the election, when these parties have returned to the proper seat of the election, and reported as to the results. That is the position, and I say that it places in doubt a considerable proportion of the electoral districts of the province of Quebec. What we are asked to do this evening is to sanction that principle, which is really a return, under a slightly varied form, to the old rotten borough system as it existed in England before the Reform Bill. It is nothing else. We know from past experience that these things are possible. The men who would be suddenly brought into constituencies would be the legitimate successors of what used to be called the pot-wallopers—people brought into a constituency at the last minute in order to change the free expression of the will of the people. Our hon. friends may argue that this is to suppose that the government would abuse its powers. Governments do abuse their powers as much now as they did before the Reform Bill, and to ask us to allow that latitude is to expose us to the danger of the intolerable oppression that existed before the passage of that same Reform Bill. Under these circumstances what is our duty? It seems to me that our duty is very clear—it is to resist the granting of such power, to resist the possibility of a renewal of those abuses. I speak only for myself. We have in our hands a remedy, which is the old remedy which enabled the people of England to secure the redress of the great grievances from which they suffered during centuries, that is, to refuse supply to the government until they have abandoned this unjust and unfair pretension; and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, and this House, that as far as I am concerned, that being the only remedy in our hands, I will avail myself of it to the fullest extent. This is not the case of an ordinary grievance. It is not the case of applying under ordinary circumstances the old adage that redress goeth before supply. This is not a question of policy; it is not a question of a grievance which at a later date can be cured; it is not a question of a grievance as to which there can be any doubt; it is a question of an imminent danger of oppression. That is the way I view it. We are more or less on the eve of an election, and the government ask this House for power to control the franchise in the constituencies, under circumstances which are but thinly veiled in this enactment—the old abuse by which the Crown prevented the free expression of the will of the people during such a long time in England.

It is for us at the present moment, for those of us at least who do not feel disposed to grant that exorbitant power, to resist it by all the means at our command and the means to my mind are very plain. They are to refuse the grant of supplies. The

government asks us to give them this power that will enable them, under the circumstances detailed in this enactment, to go into the constituencies and prepare their own lists contrary to the existing law, contary to the understanding, contrary to what at present is our best and only guarantee, and at the same time they ask us to vote supply, to give them money. The proposition seems to me to be one absolutely untenable and I would not hesitate, fearless of what would be the consequence. to say that I would never consent to such a thing as that. We must follow the very celebrated example of some of our ancestors of old. The Commons of England mustered in the monastery of Westminster, they knew how to close the doors of the refectory and the cloister, shut themselves up and refused to be moved for supply or scutage or aid to the King unless he would come down and cure their grievances, and this they did at the very peril of their lives. We stand in no such peril. Speaker Seymour, I think it was, was committed to the Temple by the King because, speaking in the name of the Commons, he had complained of the cost of the maintenance of the King's mistresses. This is a far more serious grievance, this is a question of the relinquishment unto the government, the giving to the government in its own discretion, of the preparation of the electoral lists and to my mind nothing having any weight whatever has been laid before us to show that this very sweeping change is necessary. Under these circumstances I for one would be faithful to the old principle and I would refuse supply until this grave grievance has been swept away.

Mr. EMMANUEL B. DEVLIN (Wright). I am sorry I had not the opportunity of being in my seat this afternoon when the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) began his speech. I always admire the hon. member when he speaks in the House for his courtesy and for the soundness, as a rule, of his arguments. But this afternoon, in listening to him, I felt that he made certain statements which cannot be borne out by the law as it exists in Quebec. His statement that there is very little or practically no unorganized territory in the province of Quebec, is certainly not borne out by the facts. I have not had occasion to look up the exact extent of the unorganized territory in that province, but I have already cited that in the county of Wright we have 572,397 acres of land. In the county of Pontiac we have 11,577,618 acres of unorganized territory with a population of 1,339 people. I feel that if this Bill will give to the people living in that portion of the province which is unorganized territory the right to vote, then it certainly overcomes a difficulty which we have felt in that province for a very long time and will be an excellent measure of justice to those people.

Mr. MONK.

Mr. MONK. Has the hon. member read section 17 of the Electoral Act, which provides that the secretary-treasurer of each municipality must prepare the lists of that municipality?

Mr. DEVLIN. Is the hon. member quoting from the statute of 1903?

Mr. MONK. The Act of 1893 as amended up to 1903.

Mr. DEVLIN. Section 9a of this Bill provides:

9a. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein contained, voters' lists for the portions of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec which consist of territory not municipally organized and where there is no regular assessment or valuation roll——

Those are the words that I would like to point out:

—upon which the voters' lists are based——

—&c. The first section which deals with elections in this country and which applies naturally to the province of Quebec is section 6 of the Dominion Elections Act, Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 6, which reads.

For the purposes of any Dominion election held within the limits of a province, the voters' lists shall, except as herein otherwise provided, be those prepared for the several polling divisions established, and which, on the sixtieth day next preceding the day fixed for the nomination of candidates for such Dominion election.

Again section 10 reads.

The qualifications necessary to entitle any person to vote at a Dominion election in any province shall, except as herein otherwise provided, be those established by the laws of that province as necessary to entitle such person to vote in the same part of the province at a provincial election.

Again section 21:

So long as and whenever, for any reason, a certified copy of any list of voters as finally revised has not been transmitted to or received by the clerk of the Crown in Chancery, pursuant to the provisions of this Act, the original and legal list for Dominion elections shall be the same as that for provincial elections.

Referring to the old law of the province of Quebec to be found in the Revised Statutes of Quebec, the law then practically was, as pointed out by the hon. gentleman:

The secretary-treasurer of each municipality shall, between the first and fifteenth days of the month of September, in each year, make in duplicate, subdivided before each polling subdivision, a list, in alphabetical order, of all persons who, according to the valuation roll——

I again point out the word 'valuation.'

—then in force in the municipality for municipal purposes, appear to be electors by rea-

son of the immovable property possessed or occupied by them in any manner within the municipality or by reason of being otherwise qualified as set forth in article 9.

There were subsequent amendments to that law and we find in the statutes of Quebec, 3 Edward VII, chapter 9, this provision :

Section 9. The following persons, and no other, being males, and who, at the time of the deposit of the list under articles 25 and 26 of this Act, are of the full age of twenty-one years, subjects of His Majesty by birth or naturalization and not otherwise legally disqualified, shall be entered upon the list of electors :

1. Owners or occupants, in good faith, of immovable property estimated, according to the valuation roll in force, at a sum of at least three hundred dollars in real value, in any city, municipality entitled to return one or more members to the legislative assembly, or $200 in real value or $20 in annual value in any other municipality.

It goes on to speak of tenants, teachers and so on. Then, we find in this law the meaning of the word 'municipality' as follows :

The word municipality means every municipality of a parish or part of a parish, of a township or part of a township, or united township, of a village, of a town existing under the operation of the Municipal Code, and every town or city municipality incorporated by charter or special Act.

Now, I see what the hon. member (Mr. Monk) had in mind. He quoted, as I understand, section 32 of the Municipal Code. It is perfectly true that that section brings such unorganized territory under the county council for municipal purposes, but it does not bring it under the county council for the purposes of voting at provincial or federal elections:

The county council may, by a resolution, after public notice to that effect has been duly given, previous to the passing thereof, and approved and published in the manner prescribed by article 41, erect into a parish municipality, under the name which belongs to it, according to the rules prescribed, any territory included in one or more townships or part of townships, whether or not erected into municipalities, and which has been constituted into a civil parish, provided that such parish contains a population of three hundred souls and is wholly situated in the county.

Mr. MONK. I did not quote that section. I quoted section 28.

Mr. DEVLIN. Yes, that provides for municipal government for municipal purposes, but it does not bring the unorganized territory under the provisions of the statute governing elections.

Mr. MONK. Why not?

Mr. DEVLIN. Because, to begin with, there is no valuation roll upon which the voters' list may be founded.

Mr. MONK. Does the hon. gentleman pretend that one must be on the valuation roll in order to have his name entered on the electoral list?

Mr. DEVLIN. The lists are prepared from the valuation roll.

Mr. MONK. But the hon. gentleman surely knows that the man who earns $300 a year is not entered on the valuation roll, but his name must be put on the voters' list. It has been held, time and again, in our province that it is not necessary to be on the valuation roll in order to be on the voters' list.

Mr. DEVLIN. I know that. But my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) is speaking of the preparation of voters' lists. Now, in the general preparation, the voters' list is taken from the valuation roll. My hon. friend has surely mistaken the purpose of section 28 of the Municipal Code. I had not previously looked at that in this argument, but, of course, I knew about it.

Mr. MONK. I do not think the hon. gentleman has looked very much into this question.

Mr. DEVLIN. I certainly have had reason to, because I am more affected by it than is the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I have had experience.

Mr. MONK. I have no doubt that this proposed enactment is very useful to my hon. friend (Mr. Devlin).

Mr. DEVLIN. It is very useful because it will bring into existence as voters at the election people who should have the right to vote, but who have no right to vote today. I certainly have not gone to these people to ask them whether they will vote for a Liberal or a Conservative condidate.

Mr. MONK. I am surprised that my hon. friend has not had them put on the list already. They should be there.

Mr. DEVLIN. No, I have never put men on the list who had not the right to vote.

Mr. HENDERSON. You mean, men who would not vote right.

Mr. DEVLIN. But, going on with the legal argument, I would point out that section 32 provides that unorganized territory may be erected into a municipality provided it has a population of 300 souls and is wholly situated within the county. But, what about the parish that does not contain 300 souls? As a lawyer of the province of Quebec, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk knows it cannot be.

Mr. MONK. I did not refer to that article, but I quoted the article I did refer to.

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. gentleman referred to section 32.

Mr. MONK. If I did so, it was by mistake.

Mr. DEVLIN. Article 32 covers the point the hon. gentleman wanted to make—shows how this territory is brought under the authority of the county council. But I will point out that there is no provision in the law of the province of Quebec to-day which gives the people living in this unorganized territory the right to vote. The hon. gentleman says it would be only in very remote parts of the province where such cases might be found. I would point out that in the township of Denholme, I think it is, within a very few miles of the city of Ottawa, the residents there, unless they possess property in adjoining parishes municipally erected, have no right to vote. Above the village of Maniwaki or the village of Montcerf, which is only about 117 miles from Ottawa, there is a very large population of farmers who have not the right to vote.

Mr. MONK. Why not?

Mr. DEVLIN. Simply because the law of the province does not allow it, and we have not those the hon. gentleman suggests we should have to put them on the list.

Mr. MONK. Are they qualified ?

Mr. DEVLIN. They are property holders and otherwise qualified, but they have not the right to vote.

Mr. MONK. They must have.

Mr. DEVLIN. Not under the law.

Mr. MONK. If my hon. friend will allow me, the Electoral Act specifically imposes upon the secretary-treasurer of the municipality which controls these people the duty of making a list and entering their names in it.

Mr. DEVLIN. Where does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) find that?

Mr. MONK. The hon. gentleman quoted from it a few minutes ago—it is section 17, which provides that the secretary-treasurer of each municipality must between the 1st and 15th of September make the list and put upon that list the names of those who, by the assessment roll, have the right to vote, 'or who, by reason of being otherwise qualified, as set forth in article 9' and so on —providing for the case exactly where there is no assessment roll.

Mr. DEVLIN. What particular part of section 9 gives that right?

Mr. MONK. There is a large enumeration in that article. There are, for instance, those who earn a total of $300 a year—say those who work on the Transcontinental Railway.

Mr. DEVLIN. Let me read section 17 :

The secretary-treasurer of each municipality shall, between the first and fifteenth days of the month of September, in each year, make in duplicate, subdivided for each polling subdivision, a list, in alphabetical order, of all persons who, according to the valuation roll then in force in the municipality for municipal purposes, appear to be electors by reason of the immovable property possessed or occupied by them in any manner within the municipality or by reason of being otherwise qualified as set forth in article 9.

Now I will read to the hon. gentleman article 9, subsection 1 :

Owners or occupants in good faith, or immovable property estimated, according to the valuation roll in force, at a sum of at least three hundred dollars in real value, in any city municipality entitled to return one or more members to the legislative assembly, or two hundred dollars in real value or twenty dollars in annual value in any other municipality.

But if they are not organized municipally how are they going to possess the right?

Mr. MONK. Read subsection 11.

Mr. DEVLIN (reading) :

Persons who are domiciled in the electoral district, and who draw, from their salary or wages, in money or in effects, or from some business, employment, trade or profession, or from some investment, a revenue of at least three hundred dollars per annum, or persons who work by the piece in factories and who derive at least three hundred dollars per annum therefrom.

Does that cover the son of a farmer who gets a salary from his father on the farm?

Mr. MONK. What about the $300 a year men?

Mr. DEVLIN. I am now speaking of farmers in the province of Quebec. We are not providing for transients, people that may pass through a town and that no honest man will attempt to put upon the list. I think the hon. gentleman ought to be satisfied by this time that there is a large portion of the population in the province of Quebec who have, under the existing law, no right to vote at a Dominion election. But by section 9a of this Bill these people will have a right to vote and therefore justice will be done to them. I have no hesitation in saying that this Bill will meet with the universal approval of the people of the province of Quebec, and that it will cover a long felt want. The only reason I have heard hon. gentlemen adduce against this Bill is the fear that they may have dishonest officials to operate it. That is a very foolish argument. If every time we wished to pass a law in this House we were deterred by the fear that it would not be efficiently enforced, or that some dishonest officials might put it into operation, why, we would pass no law whatever in this House. When I first glanced at this Bill I immediately thought of the poor people residing in the county which I represent, people who have said to me time and again: It is a shame that your parliament does

not pass a law which will give us the right to vote. Merchants have come to me, farmers have come to me and have asked why their names should not be put upon the voters' list.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman ever appealed to the legislature of Quebec to remedy that defect he complains of?

Mr. DEVLIN. I leave to the legislature of Quebec to deal with matters coming within the sphere of their jurisdiction. At the present time I am considering what laws this House is called upon to pass.

Mr. FOSTER. Does this Bill propose to fix a basis of representation ?

Mr. DEVLIN. No, but this Bill will bring into force in unorganized territories the provisions of the law as they exist in organized territories.

Mr. FOSTER. If this Bill becomes law will it empower you to place on the revised list any man anywhere who has not, under the province in which he lives already, the property qualification for a voter?

Mr. DEVLIN. Speaking for the province of Quebec, provided he has under the provincial law the necessary qualifications of an elector, and those qualifications are laid down in section 9.

Mr. FOSTER. If he has those necessary qualifications now?

Mr. DEVLIN. But he has not.

Mr. FOSTER. This Bill does not propose to amend the qualification.

Mr. DEVLIN. Not at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Then how will he have the right to vote under this Bill?

Mr. DEVLIN. Because this Bill will bring him under the operation of section 9a I have just read.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein contained, voters' lists for the portions of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec which consist of territory not municipally organized and where there is no regular assessment or valuation roll upon which voters' lits are based.

The moment a man lives in unorganized territory he has at present no right to vote, but the moment we pass this Bill then he will be brought under the operation of the provisions as we have them to-day. As the Minister of Justice remarks, the new lists which will be prepared under this Bill will be prepared according to the laws of the province as they now exist, and, therefore people who have the necessary qualifications to vote in organized territory will then have the right to vote in unorganized territory. That is the whole point. Therefore, I have no hesitation in saying that I will give this Bill my entire support. I cannot speak with any personal knowledge of the operation of the election laws in the province of Manitoba, but I have no hesitation in saying from a study of the Bill and from what I have heard in this House that this Bill is going to cover a great many irregularities. Surely the people of Manitoba are not as dishonest as hon. gentlemen opposite wish to make them out. Surely if hon. gentlemen opposite have had amongst their organizers certain dishonest people who have given wrong affidavits or who have taken from the proper authorities the seal of the court and placed it in their headquarters, if hon. gentlemen have had that experience with their organizers, there is no reason to suppose that if they come into the Liberal camp they will not find men who are prepared to act honestly and to put this law into proper execution.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to name some of the irregularities in the Manitoba Election Act?

Mr. DEVLIN. I am speaking, not of irregularities in the law itself, but in the operation of the law.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Some of Mr. Leach's work possibly.

Mr. DEVLIN. No, I was referring to some of the affidavits that were fraudulently obtained, according to newspaper reports.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. Might I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Is there a provision in this Act that an enumerator can take it upon himself to be the assessor of property in unorganized territory in the province of Quebec, so as to put values on farms in order to find out whether the owners are qualified to vote in that province?

Mr. DEVLIN. We have a provision which gives a man the right to vote according to valuation. The hon. gentleman's objection is well taken, but it has no basis in fact, because the municipal councils, under the working of the provincial Act, will find out what is the valuation of that property before the owner is allowed to vote. There will be absolutely no difficulty on that score. I have no hesitation in giving my cordial support to this Bill, as I believe it is one of the best ever submitted to this House.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Mr. Speaker, I am not a lawyer but the arguments which have been advanced by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat seem to me to have been most extraordinarily mixed—so much so that I could not help coming to the conclusion that he must have a very poor notion of the provisions of this measure. Of the two argu-

ments which have been advanced from the province of Quebec up to the present, I could certainly have no hesitation whatever in giving the preference to that submitted by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk).

Mr. DEVLIN. If I were in your place, I would have no hesitation either.

Mr. LAKE. I am aware of that, but I am not speaking from a party point of view. I am speaking from the point of view of clearness, and I should certainly say that in that respect the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has been a lamentable failure. Let me call attention first of all to the fact that there has not been one argument put forward so far to justify the application of this measure to the province of British Columbia. We have not had a British Columbian declare that the working of the Dominion election law in that province is unsatisfactory, and that such a radical alteration in the law of the Dominion is required as regards that province. The only reason, it seems to me, which has induced the government to apply this Bill to that province is that the administration of the provincial law with regard to elections is honest and satisfactory and that is what this government is anxious to avoid.

Mr. D. ROSS. Admitting for the sake of argument that we have an honest voters' list in British Columbia, does my hon. friend pretend that when that list is not adapted for federal purposes we should not pass a law to adapt it for those purposes ?

Mr. LAKE. No argument has been laid before the House to show that it is not adapted for federal purposes and no complaints have been raised.

Mr. D. ROSS. Surely my hon. friend is aware, if he knows anything about the lists in British Columbia, that in several instances provincial districts and federal districts do not coincide and consequently the lists are not adapted for federal purposes.

Mr. LAKE. I am willing to admit that I know but little about the law of British Columbia, but what I say is that we have not heard any member from that province argue that there is any reason or necessity for any change. If there were no other circumstances, those in which the Bill was introduced are sufficient to create grave suspicion as to the honesty of the government. This measure is one which is bound to have most far-reaching effects. It is perhaps the most important Bill with regard to elections which has ever been brought before the people. It changes our election law in three important particulars, In this short Bill of eight pages, we find three great principals embodied. First, a complete abandonment of the secrecy of the ballot. That is a matter which deserves a Bill for itself and the long and earnest consideration of this House. The second is the abandonment of the principle of provincial franchises, which was adopted by this House, after very long and careful discussion, some years ago. Third, it adopts the principle that a company or an association incorporated for political purposes may collect and distribute without restriction an election fund of any size and thus evade all the provisions with regard to individuals. This is the Bill which was promised in the speech from the Throne at the opening of this session. The government allowed four or five months of this session to pass before bringing it down. The ordinary explanation of this delay would be that the government had been spending a great part of that time in considering the details ; but if we are to believe the Minister of Justice, that was not the case at all. According to him, its chief provisions were put on paper some four or five months before the beginning of the session and had then received the consideration of the government. Let me recall to the House words he used in moving the first reading, after we had been in session some four or five months. He said:

> The measure I am now introducing is one I committed to paper some four or five months before the present session, and with the exception of one or two details which remained for further consideration, these provinces had therefore that consideration at my hands and the hands of the government.

It would therefore seem that the government has decided upon the details of this Bill, except in one or two minor points, months and months ago and yet they wait until near the close of the session, when the members are weary with their parliamentary duties. to place this important measure before the House. The Minister of Justice explained some unimportant details of the Bill and then proceeded to say :

> The other amendments in this Bill are of possibly minor character altogether.

But let us see what the Minister of Justice describes as being of a minor character. First of all there is this section 1 which the Minister of Justice himself now admits to be the main feature of the measure. He was speaking of that which occurred in Manitoba last election when large numbers of persons had been disfranchised by the thin red line outrage, and he said :

> I am confident that the omission of such names were few in number and that there was nothing of intentional wrong-doing. However that may be, it is of interest that provision should be made in the Elections Act which will authorize and permit the officers of the law to make that redistribution of names.

That is all he said about that matter, and he goes on to explain why he considers even that necessary :

A riding for Dominion purposes may contain portions of a dozen different polling subdivisions established for provincial purposes and the officials conducting the Dominion elections, have of necessity to transcribe from the general list to a special list for the purpose of that poll, the names of the voters who properly ought to be assigned to the particular poll. I am proposing, in the Bill I have prepared, a clause which will authorize that to be done.

That is all the explanation that was given by the Minister of Justice of this most important portion of the Bill, this portion of the Bill which completely abrogates the adoption of the provincial franchise in so far as it relates to two great provinces. This want of candour, this want of honesty in the explanation of the Bill by the Minister of Justice, makes one naturally very suspicious of the intentions of the government in introducing such a measure. Another of these minor details which the Minister of Justice referred to involves the secrecy of the ballot and this is what he said about it:

I do not seek to conceal from the House the fact that to remedy this, to permit such numbered ballot or ballots containing marks of identification to be counted, is a radical departure from the whole principle of the Dominion Elections Act. It has been said by learned judges, and no doubt correctly said, that the ruling principle of the Dominion Elections Act is secrecy at all costs, secrecy even at the cost of defeating the will of the people by preventing the counting of ballots which are perfectly good when they leave the hands of the electors, but which may afterwards be vitiated by the deputy returning officer or some other officials. If it is a question whether that over-riding principle of secrecy is or is not to be encroached upon for the sake of preserving the individual vote and securing a true expression of the will of the voter and of the people, then, in my judgment, the principle of secrecy ought to give way, and not the principle of giving to the voter the means of expressing his true wish at the polls and carrying out that wish in the counting of the ballots.

How could any intelligent man say that this was a minor detail of this franchise Bill? Now, in addition to this want of candour of the Minister of Justice when he introduced the Bill, it has occurred to me that when he moved the second reading he made statements which were calculated to mislead the House and which were only partially the truth. Speaking of the thin red line outrage he said it was the returning officers who had used the thin red line, but every member of the House must have known perfectly well that that statement was a suppression of the whole truth, and that in most cases these alterations on the voters' lists were made by Mr. Leach, the organizer of the Liberal party in Manitoba. Again, the Minister of Justice stated that these alterations were authorized by the provincial law, only, that a black line was to be used, and he said that these alterations were made by officials of the provincial government, keeping back the fact that the authorization in the provincial law is only given to judges who are of course officers of the federal government. In other particulars I noticed time and again that the Minister of Justice was suppressing the true facts and was not candid with the House. Nothing could be more calculated to arouse suspicion than the statements made by that hon. gentleman both on the first reading and the second reading of the Bill. Now, the very first feature of this Bill involves a departure from the principle of adopting provincial lists for Dominion elections. I have frequently been asked on the public platform if this government had not failed to carry out all the promises it made the people before it came to power, and I have always answered that the only one promise they kept was the adoption of the provincial franchise. I regret to say that I shall have to abandon even that moderate praise for the government as to carrying out its pre-election promises. for it seems that now they have abandoned that pledge with all the rest.

All of the arguments which were made by the Minister of Justice in urging that the first clause of this Bill should be adopted were directed to the necessity for a proper and thorough revision of the lists drawn up by the provincial authorities, on the ground that no opportunity was given for such revision; and yet we find that the provision he is making is simply for the drawing up of lists by the officials of this government, and for no revision whatever, either by the officials this government may appoint or by the judges who should be appointed under the provincial law. The Bill states that after the writs of election have been issued the government shall have the lists prepared, and, as my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) pointed out, the time occupied in carrying out the provision of the provincial Act is so long that it would make it absolutely impossible in almost every case for any revision of these lists to take place. So that the Minister of Justice could not have been sincere in arguing that there was a necessity for the revision of the provincial lists. What he desires, and what hon. gentlemen opposite desire, is simply that they shall draw up their own lists subject to no revision whatever, and, in drawing up improper lists, shall be in a position to capture the country at the next general election.

The hon. Minister of Justice spoke of the administration and preparation of the lists by the provincial authorities as being an engine of tyranny and oppression. To my mind there has been nothing whatever proved in this House against the honourable, careful manner in which the provincial lists in the province of Manitoba have been prepared. But I think we had very full

and very complete proof of the tyranny and oppression which we are to expect from the officials of this government, if they are to draw up these lists, in the speech delivered here the other day by the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce), who showed the abominable manner in which an attempt had been made to steal his constituency from him at the last election by stuffing the list with the names of persons who had never existed or had left the country or had died before the list was drawn up. To the charge that there has been tyranny and oppression in the preparation and administration of the lists in Manitoba, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) gave a most exhaustive reply last night. To my mind that reply was absolutely unanswerable; it has not been answered yet, and I do not believe any attempt will be made to answer it. For every statement he made he gave chapter and text, and I am convinced that the Prime Minister sitting in his seat in the House, was more than half persuaded that he had been forced into a most improper measure by false representations on the part fo his followers. What evidence has been offered to us on the other side of fraud and oppression? We have had assertions, but the only proof we have had has been innumerable extracts from newspapers, mostly from the Manitoba 'Free Press,' which we all know is a paper with an extreme party bias, which receives an enormous amount of pecuniary assistance every year from this government. Let me instance the case of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway), who stood up in this House with a list in his hand and told us that he had lived for nearly thirty years in his present constituency, that he knew almost every man in it, and that he was prepared to say that there were a large number of names on that list which should not be there, and that a number of names had been omitted from it which should be there. He was promptly challenged to mention a name on the list that should not be there. He stated that he could give the names in his own neighbourhood, and that he would write them down and send them to the leader of the opposition if he so desired; but the fact remains that after making the boast that he did, he was not able to mention one name when called upon to to do. Then we had the proofs uttered by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole), who went sponsor for the affidavits of criminals, which were drawn up nearly a year ago, and which, although there has been a session of the legislature of Manitoba since, and although those affidavits had reference entirely to the provincial elections in Manitoba, had never yet been placed before the public or been mentioned in the Manitoba legislature. No member of that House had the hardihood to stand as godfather of such an extraordinary lot of misstatements as were contained in those affidavits. I believe that the telegram which the hon. member for Marquette read in reference to those affidavits has absolutely discredited them, and has put the government in a very bad position indeed. I do not know that I have ever read of a more discreditable incident than the reading those affidaviits before this House, in view of the fact that they had been purchased from a criminal who is even now a refugee from justice.

In the earlier part of this debate it was charged that the members of the opposition had nothing more to say in regard to the thin red line outrage, that there was nothing in it, and that we had got tired of repeating it. I think the government must be enirely without shame in regard to elections in this country, and I was not surprised to hear my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) call attention to the astounding nature of the facts which had been brought out in regard to the thin red line outrage in Manitoba, and yet members on the other side of the House seem to think nothing of it. They think it is a perfectly natural and proper thing to appoint returning officers who have so little regard for the duties of their office that they will hand over the lists to the organizer of one political party and allow him to mutilate them as he will.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. How could the hon. gentleman arrange those lists without a repetition of the thin red line episode in some form or other?

Mr. LAKE. The law provides that the returning officer himself shall make those changes. That has been already pointed out.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to point out again?

Mr. LAKE. If the hon. gentleman likes to wait, I will look it up, but it has been pointed out over and over again in this House, as he knows perfectly well. He thought he would put up a bluff that I had not looked into the election law.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I do no know what the hon. gentleman means by bluff.

Mr. LAKE. If the hon. gentleman considers his own character, he will have a pretty good idea of it. Returning officers should be men of high standing. It seems to me that since this government have been in power they have considered the appointment of returning officer to be a matter of political patronage; they have certainly used it as such in my part of the world. That is certainly one office which should be entirely removed from political patronage, that of the man who has to stand between the two great parties of this country and see that there is fair-play between them. There is no provision whatever in this Bill

for a penalty upon any returning officer who is so recreant to his duty as to do what was done by the Manitoba returning officers, who handed over the lists to an organizer of one of the great political parties.

The test case which was taken in the matter in the district of Provencher showed the extraordinary way in which the returning officer worked in with one of the political parties. It showed that the poll books were stored in the Liberal committee rooms. It showed also that aftr they were collected they were again placed in the Liberal committee rooms. Is that any place for ballot boxes before or after an exciting election, to be manipulated, handled or tampered with? I ask the Prime Minister if he considers that a right or proper thing. In my own constituency the Liberal committee room was in the same building as the office of the returning officer, one was on the upper floor and the other on the lower floor, and after the election the ballot boxes were all stored in the Liberal committee rooms. I know that, as people could see them through the windows. Further than that, I know that the election clerk who, as the right hon. gentleman knows, acts for the returning officer in certain questions, was content with holding that one office of election clerk, but also held office as secretary of the Central Liberal committee. I myself have in my possession a letter which he addressed on the day before the election to one of the deputy returning officers telling him he was to accept the votes of certain threshers who were working in that vicinity and signing himself 'Secretary Central Committee.' The case is perfectly clear, here is a man supposed to have some authority with the returning officers writing to them the day before the election, telling them what voters they were to accept and what voters not to accept. I consider there should be some provision for a severe penalty upon an election official who behaves in a partisan manner and who does not withdraw himself from all communication with one party or the other.

In reference to the thin red line scandal let me point out that after one of the constituencies had been stolen from the Conservative party and a Liberal had been elected by means of the outrage perpetrated by R. E. A. Leach, the organizer of the Liberal party, he and others who acted with him in this matter were rewarded for winning that seat for the government by being appointed to seats under the Dominion government. Leach himself was appointed inspector of land agencies in the Northwest. This I consider was simply an outrage on public decency when you consider all the talk there was over the illegal way in which Leach had manipulated these lists, thereby changing the results of the elections. I believe it is intended to encourage the corruption, I cannot see it in any other way. I believe that if persons who were corrupt in these elections in the interests of the Liberal party are to be rewarded by this government for such acts, we shall find many others who are ready to be similarly corrupt expecting like rewards. Let me say the appointment of the man who does these things to a position in the civil service is in itself an inducement to corruption in the civil service, and it certainly is a direct inducement to civil servants to take part in elections in spite of the fact that this House has declared that a civil servant shall not take part in elections either Dominion or local. All the debates in regard to the Interior Department at any rate, which have taken place in the House for the last session or two, have gone to show that no punishment will be meted out to officials of that department if they do take part in elections. In fact, I will go further and say that the statements of the minister of that department have always been more or less of an incentive to officials to help on his own party in the elections.

In regard to Mr. Leach's appointment as head of the Land Department of the Department of the Interior in the Northwest, let me read a letter from a gentleman who was a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite in the old days, who was a member of the Liberal party when he wrote this letter, although at the time he did not agree with them as to their treatment of the Liberals in the west and ran as a candidate for the provincial rights party, still calling himself a Liberal. I refer to Mr. R. L. Chisholm, who ran for the district of Battleford. Mr. Chisholm wrote:

> It is true that never before was the civil service machinery employed so extensively in this western country as during this last contest. Some officials practically abandoned their official duties during the last few weeks and worked very hard against us, particularly perhaps in this constituency. It has always been known that the civil service exerts an overpowering influence in this locality. In this contest the service, almost to a man, was disposed to stand back and see an even fight between my opponent and myself. Some were disposed at first to help me.

Mr. Chisholm had been an official in that office and naturally his brother officials were rather friendly with him than the reverse.

> But R. E. A. Leach made two or three trips here at brief intervals, and Talbot came frequently and a man named Perry, an organizer, who gets credit for our northern polls outrages, came several times, and the servants fell in one by one until at the finish they were working as they never did before. I feel a little reluctance in formulating specific charges against the civil servants here because I know that each and every one who went into the battle against me was pushed in much against his inclination and under various forms of duress.

Further on he says in reference to Leach:

I am satisfied that he is the individual that we may thank for nearly all the activity of his fellow servants here and to a large extent elsewhere in the province. I have it on very good authority that Leach is now persecuting the agent of Dominion lands here because the latter refused to act as a party tool. The agent of Dominion lands will not discuss the matter at all.

That shows how Leach immediately got to work for the party as soon as he was put in a position to do so as a reward for his services in regard to the lists in Manitoba.

Mr. KNOWLES. Nobody, of course, will challenge the statements made, but I think it is only fair to state that the reason the statements are not questioned is that the gentleman who wrote that letter is dead. Of course we will not question the statements under the circumstances.

Mr. LAKE. I am not sure but I think I had this on record before Mr. Chisholm died. I am very sorry that Mr. Chisholm, who was a most estimable gentleman, unfortunately died since that time.

Mr. OLIVER. Might I say a word in regard to the persecution of the land agent at Battleford because of his lack of partisanship in that election? It might interest the House to know that he has been persecuted by having his salary raised since that time.

Mr. LAKE. I am very glad to hear it. It is possible that the fact of this matter having been brought to the attention of the minister made him step in himself, because I do believe that when a matter of that kind comes to his personal knowledge he will not stand for that sort of thing, but he has officials in the west and he has allowed them to do this sort of thing without question. Every day I am getting fresh proof to convince me that this is the case. Now, Mr. Chisholm was not the only gentleman supporting the Liberal party who wrote to me in similar terms in regard to the interference of officials in elections. There is another gentleman, well known to the hon. gentlemen opposite, who is at the present moment, I believe, a candidate in the Liberal interest, Mr. J. T. Brown, who referred to this matter in a speech in the Legislative Assembly in Regina. He is reported as follows:

Influences working against the provincial rights party were dealt with by Mr. Brown. He said that government officials, both federal and local, had taken an active part in the recent campaign and while he did not advocate the disfranchisement of these men, he would certainly advocate that they be not encouraged in the work. They did not appear in the late campaign as ordinary individuals, but presented themselves clothed in all the authority of an official and ready to intimidate a voter at every opportunity.

This gentleman, as I have said, is a candidate of the Liberal party, and, at that time, always called himself a good Liberal:

In many cases they held out as bribes the patent to a homestead, and in some cases the bribe was paid.

With all the authority that that gentleman possesses, he made that statement.

In others it was never handed over. He knew of many instances in the Souris electoral district where the government homestead inspector held out concessions as a bribe to some electors.

Mr. Scott. You are aware of the statement made by the Hon. Frank Oliver that officials are liable to dismissal if they are reported.

Mr. Brown had read the statement of the Minister of the Interior, and he expected that Mr. Oliver would be given a chance to make good his promise in that respect. It was only by the Minister of the Interior taking the matter up that the desired results would be attained.

Mr. Brown had read the statement of the Minister of the Interior and expected that that hon. gentleman would be given a chance to make good his promise.

Mr. KNOWLES. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) what he is reading from?

Mr. LAKE. From the report of the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. KNOWLES. An official or a newspaper report?

Mr. LAKE. When I was in the assembly no official report was taken. This is the report which appeared in two local newspapers—or, later, three—and pasted in a book and considered a 'Hansard' of the proceedings. I do not think that the method has been changed since, although I have often wished to get a full account of the proceedings.

Mr. KNOWLES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) has misunderstood. From which newspaper is he quoting?

Mr. LAKE. I am not quite certain, but I think it is the Regina 'Sun.' I may add that I have had the list of officials who were working in Mr. Brown's constituency, with some statements in connection with the constituency which Mr. Brown contested at that time. I was given names of the officials but, in addition to that, I was able to lay before the House, almost immediately after the statement was made by Mr. Brown, a number of affidavits—nine or ten, I think—proving that officials of the Department of the Interior had acted as scrutineers and in other partisan ways in the elections that had just taken place. The Minister of the Interior had the opportunity, as Mr. Brown suggested, of making good what he had said, but I have yet to hear of one single dismissal of an official for taking

part in these elections and breaking the rule which had been laid down in this House against officials taking an active partisan part in the elections of members for the provincial House. I have another letter, which I shall not be able to read, from another Liberal, who was a candidate of the provincial rights party in that election. He says the same thing as the others regarding the officials in his district, and the Minister of the Interior knows that we placed case after case before him and he refused to take action. He himself has appeared on the platform with an official of his department acting as chairman in addressing a party political meeting.

Mr. OLIVER. Perhaps I may be allowed to explain, in order to prevent misapprehension of the case. The person alluded to by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) was a sub-land agent. And I would like to say, as I said before—and I have always taken the same position—that, inasmuch as we do not pay the sub-land agent for the whole of his time, nor do we pay him enough salary to give him a living—and do not pretend to; we only pay him part of his living—in the other part of his time he is as free to exercise his political rights as if we did not pay for any part of his time.

Mr. LAKE. That is the explanation the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) gives. But let me point out that this man had a regular monthly salary, $30 a month at that time. The minister knows that such an official exercises a most powerful influence in that country as being the sub-agent of the department and this gives him a considerable amount of patronage as well. I do not think it matters whether an official is high-paid or low-paid; he is an official of the whole country and is paid by the people of both political parties. The government has no right to use him for party purposes and for the advancement of the interests of one party over that of the other. I do not care if he only receives $5 a month, the position is the same; the government has no right to use him for party work as it has done practically with so many. The sub-land agents in the Northwest often get a larger salary than $30 a month. In several of the cases that were brought to the attention of the minister, the salary was ample to remunerate the official for the whole of his time; yet, as I said, I do not think the minister has taken action in any case. The resolution was passed in this House to which I have referred, and it seems to me it is the height of——

Mr. KNOWLES. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake); but I would like your ruling on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think the hon. gentleman has wandered from the motion before you in his discussion of the resolutino to which he has referred, of the cases of sub-land agents, and so on. I submit that this is not properly within the scope of a discussion on a motion for the second reading.

Mr. LAKE. I am pointing out that there should be a provision in this Bill to prevent civil servants from taking part in elections. We have referred to the fact that there are omissions in the Bill. This is a Bill for the amendment of the Elections Act, and this was promised to the country ever so long ago, and I consider it perfectly in order that I should discuss such an amendment as this. I was working up to that point that, although this House has decided by resolution that officials should not take part in elections, yet, when the government bring in an Election Bill they will not put that into the Bill, and this shows simply that the government do not intend to have that carried out.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Are you in favour of disfranchising civil servants?

Mr. LAKE. No, but I am not in favour of permitting them to take an active part in elections.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. How would you do that?

Mr. LAKE. Certainly I would not disfranchise civil servants. I have seen a little of the working of the Civil Service Act in the old country. Usually men enter the service at a pretty early age, they can enter from the age of sixteen upwards. I myself was a little more than sixteen when I entered the civil service, and one of the first things I was told was that while I had the privilege of exercising the right to vote, I must carefully abstain from active partisan work. That is the only way in which you can get a really good civil service in this country. The way in which pressure has been put upon civil servants in this country to induce them to take an active part in elections puts them in a very awkward position. One thing the government should provide in their proposed Civil Service Act is to make it absolutely clear that while the civil servant may exercise his right to vote as the expression of an individual opinion, he must not exert any political influence. To my mind this Election Bill should provide severe penalties against any man who is in the pay of the Dominion government, canvassing, addressing meetings, acting as scrutineer, or taking an active part in any other way in Dominion elections. The right hon. leader of this government has laid down the principle in forcible language that there should be no interference by civil servants either in provincial or Dominion elections. While I am upon that point, let me call his attention to the opinion of Mr. Mackenzie in regard to this question. In 1873, Mr. Mackenzie placed this resolution on the Order Paper.

That it is highly criminal in any minister or ministers or other servants under the Crown, directly or indirectly, to use the powers of office in the election of representatives to serve in parliament, and any attempt at such influence will at all times be resented by this House as aimed at its own dignity, honour and independence.

Let me submit that expression of opinion of one of the first men in this country, a man whose memory is held in the highest respect by both parties, let me submit it as worthy of adoption. Let me urge the government to put into force the principle which this House has adopted, that civil servants shall be punished who take an active part in elections.

Another matter which I have already referred to as being one of supreme importance is the abolition of the secrecy of the ballot which is involved in the Bill before the House. I read the statement of the Minister of Justice in regard to that provision. He says clearly that this measure does away with the secrecy of the ballot, and that where it comes to be a question, by the inadvertence of the returning officer in placing a mark upon the ballot, whether the ballot should be rejected or counted, it is better to have it counted. This provision means then, as pointed out by the leader of the opposition, that every ballot may be legally numbered, and that the name of the voter may be placed upon the back of it by the returning officer. Therefore every ballot which is cast in the coming elections may be legally marked by the deputy returning officer, and every voter may be identified. It seems to me that nothing should so disturb the old Liberals of this country as a sign of degeneracy in the present Liberal party, and that the government, without any compunction, introduce an amendment which does away with what used to be one of the great principles of Liberalism, the secrecy of the ballot. This measure is one providing for open voting, and there are many people in this country who believe that open voting is the better system, that it is right and proper that a man should go up to the poll in a manly way and mark his vote in the open. This measure does not provide for open voting, but it does provide that the deputy returning officer may make a mark on the ballot so that he may tell how every man votes. Of course the object of this provision is clear enough to every member of this House, but I think it is a change that the people will resent as an infringement upon their privilege of voting for whom they like. They claim the privilege of voting without any pressure being placed upon them by their employers or others upon whom they are dependent. I mistake very much the opinion of the honest people in the Northwest if they do not resent in the most vigorous manner this invasion of their rights. Large numbers of people are coming into the country from abroad, and are becoming citizens of Canada, and it will be possible, under this new provision, to put pressure upon them to vote for the government candidate. In many instances these people are dependent upon the good-will of government officials in the matter of homesteading. In this connection I would like to mention a circumstance that came to my notice the other day. An officer of this government who took an active part in the election in Prince Albert had to flee the country for having been guilty of a criminal act in holding bogus polls and making bogus voters' lists. He and two others had to flee from justice into the United States, and one of the three who was not an official at the time but who fled into the United States, was a homesteader, and this government gave him an extension of time while he was residing in the United States in order that no one else should come in and cancel his homestead. Is it not an outrage that a fugitive from justice should be allowed an extension of time in which to perform his residence duties, simply because he was fleeing from justice after having committed this outrage in the provincial elections which were being held? Furthermore, with regard to this matter of the marked ballots, let me point out how it will affect those cases in which bribery is being practised. We have seen the evidence in connection with the London election trial and other trials. We are seeing the expense and trouble that the Liberal organizers are put to in getting men to instruct deputy returning officers how to mutilate the ballots and how to have them marked so that they can be identified. And this provision of the Bill seems devised to save the Liberal party any further expense in this connection and to enable the deputy returning officers to know how every man voted so as to ensure that those who had been bribed delivered the goods.

The hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) said a few words the other day on this subject. He glossed it over. All you would have to do, he said, is to provide a penalty for the retruning officer who would be guilty of such practices. But what struck me was how significant it was that the Minister of Justice should have inserted this provision without at the same time providing a severe penalty for the returning officer who would mark ballots so that they could be identified. Either the hon. minister was careless or else it was his intention to facilitate the marking of these ballots. I think it would have been very much better if, instead of providing for the marking of ballots by the deputy returning officer, he should have provided a penalty to be inflicted upon those who wilfully marked ballots in that way, and thus put a stop to some of the bribery and corruption which is now being practised.

I do not intend to discuss at length the extraordinary provision which legalizes corruption by a company incorporated for party purposes. That provision and all the other provisions of this measure will no doubt be most thoroughly discussed in committee and we then hope to have some sweeping amendments accepted. But what occurs to me as perfectly evident is that if we accept this clause as it stands, it will allow any company to commit any of those acts of corruption which are severely forbidden to individuals.

As I said a short time ago when the First Minister was not in his seat, in my opinion the right hon. gentleman was almost persuaded by the cogent and eloquent arguments put forward by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) last night. I believe that in his heart, my right hon. friend knows that my hon. friend from Marquette was justified in the statements he made. My hon. friend (Mr. Roche) certainly proved every statement by chapter and text. I believe that the right hon. gentleman was convinced last night that the Manitoba law is fair, equitable, and just, and that he has not been truly informed as to it by the hon. gentlemen from that province who sit behind him.

What struck me just now when my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) was speaking, is, that he was perfectly willing to allow the provisions of the existing law with regard to the province of Quebec to stand as they were. He had no complaint whatever and yet the province of Quebec is in the hands of the Liberal party. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) had no objection to that, but on the other hand we find that the main reason to allowing the lists to be drawn up by the provincial authorities in Manitoba and British Columbia is the fact that the local governments of these provinces are in the hands of the opponents of the Dominion government. But we have had no suggestion made that there is anything wrong with the lists in British Columbia. I do not think that the right hon. gentleman realizes the bitterness of the feeling which exists in certain parts of this country with regard to the provisions of this Bill. Should this Bill go through, I would warn him that the people who are deprived of this most sacred right of the franchise by wholesale are likely to take the law into their own hands and commit illegal acts.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Will my hon. friend find out one clause in the Act which deprived anybody of his franchise?

Mr. LAKE. Of course there is no clause which directly deprives anybody of his franchise, but it has been clearly proved by my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Boyce) that it is quite possible people will be deprived of the franchise by the thousand. In my opinion, should this clause be carried into effect, that is bound to happen. Even if the officials appointed by the government desire to be honest, they have only a short time between the issue of a writ for the election and the election itself, to draw up all those lists, and under the Manitoba Act it would be impossible to have the lists revised. So that even if the officials desired to be honest, there can be no guarantee of their having proper lists. And further, we may expect that some dishonest men will be appointed to prepare those lists, and we shall then find people deprived of their franchise, which will cause intense bitterness of feeling. We had the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) pointing out last night that in the polling division of Beausejour, a certain number of men, who had been deprived by this thin red line outrage of their votes, entered the polls and threatened to destroy the ballot boxes. I can well imagine people from the old country, where no such interference with the rights of the electorate would be tolerated, being strongly inclined to make trouble when such outrages are committed.

The right hon. gentleman who leads this House and who holds the fate of this Bill in the hollow of his hand, will himself be personally responsible to a very large extent if this Bill goes through in its present form, if there should be such unfortunate occurrences as I have mentioned or if there should be bloodshed. After all the Prime Minister is the principal beneficiary if this Bill works out as I believe it will, to return his party to power, and he is the man who should be held mainly responsible for it. I appeal to him. He has held a foremost position in this great country of Canada for the last twelve years; he has held a foremost position before the whole world. Is he going to stultify the last few years of his prime ministership by allowing legislation to pass which in British Columbia, Manitoba and the unorganized territories of Ontario and Quebec is a violation of the principles with regard to the franchise which prevail in the other parts of Canada? Is the right hon. gentleman going to stultify his great record—for he has a record—by countenancing such an outrage? I believe the people of this country have changed their mind about the right hon. gentleman and that they will not continue him in power, but is he going to let it be said that one of the last acts of his administration was the doing away with the secrecy of the ballot? I don't believe the Prime Minister will allow such a thing to take place. I believe he will look to his future reputation and that he will step in and withdraw the obnoxious clauses of this Bill.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS (Yale-Cariboo). I think the few of us here have been sufficiently punished by listening to the long and rather discursive speech of the hon.

gentleman who has just taken his seat, and I therefore move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. FOSTER. When shall we have the next punishment?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. You will get it soon enough.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. What comes on Monday?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The next punishment.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, May 11, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE—THE ROSS RIFLE.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I will read from the 'Citizen' an article which appeared in that paper on Saturday last:

A few weeks ago in the House of Commons the Minister of Militia took occasion to deny, with much indignation, that a test of the Ross rifle had taken place in England and that it had been reported against as an inferior weapon. The statement had appeared in the 'Citizen' and we asserted that the test took place at Hythe about four years ago. The 'Citizen' is taking steps which it believes will result in the production of proof of the accuracy of its information. In the meantime it is not amiss to point out that, while the honourable minister was repudiating the statement with virtuous indignation, he has been holding from parliament the report of the test of the Ross rifle made at Woolwich two years ago in which the rifle was unreservedly condemned as a military weapon. This document has now come to light through the medium of a return to the Senate.

There are three principal misrepresentations in this article to which I would like to call attention. The first is that 'the minister denied with much indignation that a test of the Ross rifle had taken place in England,' and so forth. In the House of Commons on the 27th of February, in answer to a question put to me by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington), I stated:

1. There is, in the Department of Militia and Defence, a communication from the War Office, through the Colonial Office, dated May 1902, marked 'secret,' referring to the Ross rifle; but such correspondence does not admit of the construction implied in this question. Nobody ever pretended that there could be inter-changeability of parts between two rifles of different patterns.

It is a fact, however, that no serious inconvenience can result from the use by two forces co-operating in the field of rifles of different pattern but firing the same ammunition.

2. The same 'secret' correspondence referred to an alleged trial at Hythe of two rifles said to have been supplied by an agent of Sir Charles Ross; but subsequent correspondence established the fact that an error had been made, as no such rifles were supplied either by Sir Charles Ross, his agent or any one on his behalf.

Again, the 'Citizen' says:

The statement had appeared in the 'Citizen,' and we asserted that the test took place at Hythe about four years ago. The 'Citizen' is taking steps which it believes will result in the production of proof of the accuracy of its information.

In this House on the 13th of March I had occasion to bring up a question of privilege in this connection, taking exception as I did to this statement in the same newspaper:

Now comes the curious part of it. This correspondence, which took place in 1902, was published in a report of the British War Office for 1906, and it was only when this report was added to the collection of volumes in the library of parliament that the existence of this correspondence was discovered. Since the discovery the volume has disappeared from the shelves of the parliamentary library, and there is no record in the books to show who took it away. In other words, it has been clandestinely abstracted.

And I read the following statement from the librarian of parliament:

With regard to the foregoing you may care to have the following report:

1. No report of the nature indicated appears in the imperial parliamentary papers for 1906; see index herewith.

2. No report of the kind has ever been received in this library from any quarter whatever.

3. All the army volumes of 1906 that have been received up to date are on our shelves at this moment; not one has been taken away by anybody.

(Sgd.) MARTIN J. GRIFFIN,
Parliamentary Librarian.

With reference to the concluding mis-statement and the most important one for consideration now, the newspaper says:

It is not amiss to point out that while the hon. minister was repudiating the statement with virtuous indignation, he was withholding from parliament the report of the test of the Ross rifle made at Woolwich two years ago.

Well, I hold in my hand the papers brought down by me and laid on the table in March, 1907. They contain in full the tests referred to made by the War Office at Woolwich in 1906, covered by the following letter :

17 Victoria Street, S.W.,
October 12, 1906.

To the Hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence, Ottawa.

Sir,—With reference to the letter from your department dated 26th April last, No. 478-4, respecting the supply of samples of the Ross rifles to the War Office, I have the honour to transmit to you, herewith, for your information, a copy of a letter (dated 29th ultimo) which has reached me from that department on the subject, together with a copy of the report by the chief superintendent of ordnance factories, Royal arsenal, Woolwich, referred to therein.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
STRATHCONA,
High Commissioner.

Then follow pages 365, 366, 367 and 368 giving a full report,—much more full than has been published recently in the newspapers—of the tests which took place at Woolwich, and I repeat that this report has been before this House since the 15th of March, 1907, and before the Public Accounts Committee during the most of the time from that date to the present. There is also among these papers the reply from Sir Charles Ross, the Ross Rifle Company, at page 387, to the report of the War Office. I would further call attention to the fact that in a discussion in this House—

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Might I ask was not that report of the War Office—the so-called report of the War Office—brought before the Public Accounts Committee nearly a year ago ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It was before that committee from the 15th of March, 1907. In a debate which took place in this House on January 14, 1907, I made the following statement :

In addition to that, the Ross rifle had been subjected to the severest test by a committee of the War Office in England.

Mr. TISDALE. When?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Recently, and the report is most satisfactory from the point of view of the military experts here. They found the same defects which had been discovered here, though not all of them, and all the defects which they discovered had been remedied before this report reached us.

I simply quote this to show that I had actually mentioned the fact that there was such a report, some weeks before the papers were laid on the table, thus showing no desire whatever on my part to cover up in any way this particular report.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I would like to ask the hon. minister if it is his intention to give the impression to this House that the rifles pronounced upon by the Royal School of Musketry at Hythe were not submitted by the Militia Department or the Ross Rifle factory ? If not, has the hon. minister any means of explaining how any rifles came to be pronounced upon and if the report signed by Mr. Broderick, Lord Middleton, then Secretary of State for War, did not say that two Ross rifles had been examined by the officers of Musketry School at Hythe, in comparison with two Lee-Enfield rifles, and that the result was marked inferiority of the Ross rifle ?

Mr. SPEAKER. This matter has come up as a question of privilege and cannot be allowed to drift into a discussion. All the hon. gentleman is entitled to do is ask a question.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I shall be very happy to answer the question.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. I want to ask another ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. One at a time. Perhaps better let me answer the first.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. It is about the same subject. Take the report from the Woolwich Arsenal, I would like to ask the minister if he considers that a favourable report. He said it was considered favourable by the military experts in this country. If it be a favourable report, I would like to ask who are the experts that pronounced upon it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I read my statement which I made in the House last session and which speaks for itself. In that statement I said that the report was considered favourable, inasmuch as all the faults or defects mentioned in that report had been remedied before the report reached us. With regard to the alleged test in 1902, that is an entirely different thing. The Woolwich test took place in 1906. I think the Hythe alleged test took place in 1902, and I have already said that no Ross rifles were sent by the government nor by Sir Charles Ross nor by anybody on his behalf to Hythe, much less to be tested at Hythe.

ALLEGED IRREGULARITIES AT SOREL.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I was asked to bring down the report of Mr. Gaudet giving the result of the investigation held by him into charges against Mr. Roy of the Board of Works in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I have that report here and I beg to move :

That an order of the House do issue for a copy of the report made by Mr. Victor Gaudet as a result of the investigation held by him into charges preferred against Mr. E. Roy of the Board of Works under the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and of the evidence in connection therewith.

I will produce immediately the report. The evidence is rather bulky. I can get it copied and have it brought down as soon as possible.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BRODEUR. I beg to lay on the table the return to an order of the House of Commons for a copy of the report made by Mr. Victor Gaudet as a result of the investigation held by him into the charges preferred against Mr. E. Roy of the Board of Works in the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. LENNOX. Some time before Easter we had an amendment to the Immigration Act. It was then said that the matter was one of great urgency and that it was proposed to pass an order in council to regulate immigration into British Columbia. On the 30th of April the Minister said that a memorandum to council was being prepared and would be brought down to the House when passed. Has that order in council yet been passed, and if so, will it be brought down ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The order in council has been passed. I regret that it has not yet been brought down but it will be brought down very shortly.

QUEBEC BRIDGE COMMISSION'S REPORT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the Minister of Railways anything to report on the progress of the printing of the report of the Quebec Bridge Commission ?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railway and Canals). I have nothing to report. I am disappointed that we did not have the report before this. I shall make further inquiry about it this afternoon. That is the report proper without the evidence and exhibit.

GOVERNMENT STEAMER 'MONTCALM.'

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. Has the Minister of Marine any further information to give the House about the 'Montcalm' ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). No, except that, as I said, I have given instructions that the wreck commissioner should go down immediately to hold a preliminary investigation. He held this preliminary investigation on Friday night and Saturday morning and decided that a formal investigation should be held. I then authorized him to hold immediately the formal investigation because the crew of the 'Milwaukee' might be returning to England. I understand that he began his formal investigation this morning. I may say that the 'Montcalm' has been brought to Pointe à Carcy in Quebec harbour and is lying there under water.

Mr. FOSTER. The last two words of the minister give some information that seems to have been studiously withheld up to the present. Do I understand the minister to say that the vessel has sunk ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And do I understand the minister to intimate that the investigation will be held by Commander Spain alone ? This is the case of a government vessel in collision with a private-owned vessel, the 'Milwaukee.' It would seem as though the investigation should be a broader one than that given by a government employee.

Mr. BRODEUR. Commander Spain, it is true, is a government employee, but he is at the same time wreck commissioner and will be assisted by two assessors, according to law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who are the assessors ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know, they are selected by him. I understand that they must be two men versed in the merchant marine. I do not know who they are. They are always selected by the commissioner himself.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are any steps being taken to raise the vessel, is it possible to raise her ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh, yes, it is expected the vessel will be raised probably about the middle of this week.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are any special precautions being taken to recover the silverware aboard ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Of course.

QUESTIONS.

REPAIRS TO DREDGE 'MONTAGUE.'

Mr. W. J. ROCHE asked :

1. What amounts were paid for repairs to the dredge 'Montague' between March 31, 1907 and April 30, 1908?
2. To whom were same paid, what amount to each, and the date of each payment?
3. What persons furnished supplies to said dredge 'Montague' between above dates?

4. What was the amount of each account for such supplies, to whom paid, and the date of each payment?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1. $4,464,39.
2. See attached statement 'A.'
3 and 4. See attached statement 'B.'

BRITISH COLUMBIA FISHING LICENSES.

Mr. KENNEDY asked:

1. Were any fishing licenses issued last season to the British Columbia Packer's Association?
2. Is this a foreign corporation registered in New Jersey, and is its membership confined to British subjects?
3. Was it contrary to the regulations in force last season to issue licenses to foreign corporations or corporations whose membership was not composed exclusively of British subjects?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Yes.
2. The department has ascertained that this corporation is registered in British Columbia under the Companies Act, of British Columbia, 1897. The department is not aware as to whether each of its members is a British subject or not, and whether this corporation is registered in New Jersey.
3. The regulations do not refer at all to corporations. The practice has been to issue licenses to companies authorized to carry on business in Canada.

CHIEF ENGINEER—QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. ROBITAILLE—by Mr. J. J. Hughes—asked:

1. Prior to the collapse of the Quebec bridge who was the administrative and responsible head of the bridge company?
2. What were the Hon. S. N. Parent's functions as president of the bridge company?
3. Who recommended engineer Hoare as resident engineer for the Quebec bridge company?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. The board of directors.
2. Same functions as those of the presidents of other incorporated companies generally.
3. The company when reorganized in 1887 found him in charge as chief engineer, and by reference to return No. 16, in answer to an order of the House of Commons dated June 18, 1891, it will be seen that he was favourably recommended by Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, then chief engineer and general manager, Canadian government railways.

COST OF ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked:

1. Does the contract price of the Ross rifle $25, include cost of inspection? If not, what is the cost per rifle of inspection?
2. What inspection is necessary, and is it actually made of each rifle before its acceptance by the government?
3. Does the inspection include: (a) the quality and efficiency of each of the component parts of each rifle; (b) quality and efficiency of the component parts assembled in the completed rifle; (c) the interchangeability of parts as between different rifles?
4. Who has inspected the rifles for the government?
5. Taking into account the original contract price, cost of changes made, and the cost of inspection and management, what is the cost to the country of the Ross rifle already completed and delivered?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence):

1. (a) No. (b) $1.90 each.
2. Certain of the principal components are inspected individually and the whole assembled rifle is again inspected before being accepted by the government.
3. (a) No. Only certain principal parts are inspected as components, the remainder being inspected in the finished arm.
(b) Yes.
(c) No. Not between rifles, but the principal parts are gauged for interchangeability by standard gauges before being assembled into a rifle.
4. The inspector of small arms.
5. Contract price of rifle, $25 each; cost of inspection, $1.90 each.

Payments chargeable to Capital.

Amount expended in replacing the tools and fixtures which became obsolete in consequence of:

(a) Mark I, sight being changed to Mark II, $11,351.50.

(b) Mark II. sight being changed to Mark III. $15,000.

(c) Modifications in Mark II rifle, $3,-648.50.

(d) Change in pattern of cocking pieces, $930.

Amount expended for gauges (which will last an indefinite time), $26,237.63.

These payments are a charge against capital for the reason that they are a factor in the cost of production of all rifles of the present pattern already manufactured or to be manufactured in future, consequently the proportion to be borne by each rifle cannot now be ascertained.

CHICOUTIMI BOOM.

Mr. PERLEY asked:

1. Has the Chicoutimi Pulp Company yet paid to the government the excess of expenses over receipts for the year 1906 and 1907 in

connection with the government boom on the Saguenay river above Chicoutimi?

2. If not, what reason does the Chicoutimi Pulp Company give for not paying?

3. Does the Chicoutimi Pulp Company claim that the boom was built in the wrong place, so that a large percentage of the logs put in it are carried by the current down the river and lost?

4. Does the government purpose changing the location of the boom?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works).

1. No.

2. The company contends that the booms were not completed in 1906 and that they were not properly placed.

3. This claim has been made by the company, but not admitted by the department.

4. While not admitting the correctness of the company's contention, the engineering branch of the department is further considering the question.

TIMBER ON DOKIS RESERVE.

Mr. PERLEY asked :

1. Has the government obtained the consent of Chief Dokis himself to the sale of the timber on the Dokis Indian reserve?

2. When did the government decide to sell this timber and on what date was an order in council passed authorizing the same?

3. Has the government had a careful estimate made by experts of the quantity of timber on each of the berths advertised for sale?

4. Has the government adready decided on the upset price for the said berths?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. No.

2. Immediately upon acceptance of surrender by order in council, which order passed on March 24, 1908.

3. An estimate is being made by two experts.

4. No.

POSTAL RATES ON LETTERS.

Mr. BLAIN—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked:

1. What was the postal rate on letters at confederation?

2. What reductions have since been made and the dates of same?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. 5 cents per half ounce.

2. 1868, rate reduced from 5 cents per ½ ounce to 3 cents per ½ ounce ; 1889, rate reduced from 3 cents per ½ ounce to 3 cents per ounce ; 1899, rate reduced from 3 cents per ounce to 2 cents per ounce.

From 1868 to 1875 the drop letter rate was one cent. In 1875 letter carrier delivery was introduced and the one cent drop letter rate was continued until 1889 when it was made two cents per ounce as regards places where letter carrier delivery existed.

MAIL CONTRACTS AT RIMOUSKI.

Mr. ARMSTRONG—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What was the date of the last contract entered into by this government to carry the mails between the transatlantic steamers and Rimouski, when did said contract expire, what was the amount of the contract, the names of the contractors, and the amount paid?

2. Did the proprietors of the steamer 'Rhoda' receive payment for carrying mail during the time that the government steamer 'Lady Evelyn' was employed at that service in 1907?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General) :

1. The last contract was entered into on the 2nd July, 1904, to cover the period from opening of navigation 1905 to the close of navigation 1908. The contractor is Joseph H. Dorion, and the rate $80 per trip.

2. Yes.

BAYONETS FOR ROSS RIFLE.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

Has the government entered into any contract with the Ross Rifle Company, or any other company, person or firm for the supplying of bayonets for the Ross rifle? If so, for what quantity and at what price?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). Yes, for 52,000 bayonets and scabbards, for $5.25 each complete.

SALE OF QUARTER-SECTIONS.

Mr. LAKE—by Mr. W. J. Roche—asked :

1. Has the sale of the northeast, southeast and southwest quarters of section 35, 31, 6, west of second meridian ordered to be held at public auction been carried out? If not, why not?

2. Have any of these quarter-sections been sold by private sale? If so, which, to whom, at what date, and on what conditions?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.

2. No.

WHARF AT LADYSMITH, BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What was the cost of the wharf built by the government at Ladysmith, British Columbia, and the breakwater built at Sydney, British Columbia?

2. Were they constructed by day's labour or under contract?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. Ladysmith, $3,980.83 : Sydney, $13,-991.43.

2. Both by day's labour.

IMPORTS OF HONEY.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

What were the imports of honey into Canada for each year from 1898 to date, the amount and value, the countries from which imported, and also for the preceding 10 years?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The quantity and value of honey imported into Canada during the fiscal years from 1888 to date, by countries, has been as follows :

Fiscal years.	Countries.	Pounds.	Value.
1888	Great Britain	561	84
	United States	18,008	2,224
	China	97	4
	Total	18,666	2,312
1889	Great Britain	890	165
	United States	44,919	4,753
	China	75	4
	British West Indies	300	19
	Total	46,184	4,941
1890	Great Britain	217	42
	United States	39,249	4,602
	China	63	4
	British West Indies	56	2
	Total	39,585	4,650
1891	Great Britain	488	75
	United States	25,135	3,417
	British West Indies	376	71
	Total	25,999	3,563
1892	Great Britain	202	32
	United States	28,323	3,696
	British West Indies	174	23
	Total	28,699	3,751
1893	Great Britain	71	12
	United States	15,650	2,190
	China	91	5
	Total	15,812	2,207
1894	Great Britain	48	8
	United States	17,779	2,012
	Australasia	4,512	227
	Hawaii	3,000	216
	Total	25,339	2,463
1895	Australasia	1,492	93
	British West Indies	473	24
	China	93	1
	Spanish West Indies	81	12
	United States	9,845	1,274
	Total	11,984	1,404
1896	Australasia	.....	.....
	China	602	17
	Germany	2	1
	United States	31,448	3,486
	Total	32,052	3,504
1897	Great Britain	54	8
	China	525	15
	Hawaii	720	58
	United States	24,850	2,922
	Total	26,149	3,003
1898	Great Britain	482	30
	British West Indies	10	2
	China	222	6
	Hawaii	3,825	183
	United States	38,693	3,699
	Total	43,232	3,920
1899	Great Britain	84	13
	China	163	5
	Greece	60	15
	United States	83,581	8,546
	Total	83,888	8,579
1900	Great Britain	75	14
	British West Indies	200	13
	Austria	5,892	278
	Porto Rico	40	3
	United States	136,766	13,326
	Total	142,973	13,634
1901	Great Britain	148	21
	British West Indies	2,565	277
	Austria	13,049	574
	China	220	4
	Germany	2,800	124
	Turkey	13,574	326
	United States	97,412	9,627
	Total	129,768	10,953
1902	Great Britain	31,856	1,128
	British West Indies	18,754	674
	Austria	6,571	278
	China	320	8
	Germany	3,559	156
	United States	74,895	6,775
	Total	135,955	9,019
1903	Great Britain	5,201	177
	British West Indies	55,227	2,278
	Hong Kong	207	5
	China	391	9
	United States	60,214	5,417
	Total	121,240	7,886
1904	Great Britain	16,251	688
	British West Indies	33,785	1,408
	Hong Kong	600	11
	Austria	2,063	124
	China	580	10
	United States	65,845	7,805
	Total	119,124	10,046
1905	Great Britain	26,046	760
	Australia	2,126	129
	British West Indies	29,168	1,224
	Hong Kong	838	15
	China	282	5
	United States	57,275	7,008
	Total	115,735	9,141

Fiscal years.	Countries.	Pounds.	Value
1906	Great Britain	4,699	131
	Australia	2,368	113
	British West Indies	17,579	459
	Hong Kong	1,759	49
	China	491	12
	Greece	144	40
	United States	56,594	6,752
	Total	83,634	7,556
(9 months.)			
1907	Great Britain	8,031	290
	British West Indies	131,370	4,147
	Hong Kong	248	5
	China	738	18
	Hawaii	1,200	72
	United States	182,066	15,738
	Total	323,653	20,270
1908	Great Britain	20,510	1,172
	Australia	2,895	186
	British West Indies	325,645	10,034
	Hong Kong	866	25
	China	502	15
	Hawaii	4,080	240
	Japan	60	2
	United States	266,572	23,731
	Total	621,150	35,405

DOG-FISH REDUCTION PLANT, CANSO.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. Is the dog-fish reduction plant at Canso owned and operated by the government? If not, on what plan?
2. What officials or employees were engaged, and at what salary during the years 1907-8?
3. What is the total cost of construction to date of the wharf and plant respectively?
4. What have been the yearly operating expenses, and what have been the yearly returns therefrom?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. This plant is owned and operated by the government.
2. A. B. Cox, manager, $1,200; D. A. Hendsbee, weigher, $700; E. A. Kelley, checker, $675; extra labour was employed as required at rate of $1.50 per day, $2,100.
3. Dog-fish plant and wharf, Canso (no separate account kept), $42,130.67.
4. 1905-6 (operating, $18,323.24, 1906-7; expenses, $14,859.37, 1907-8, at works), $10,630.25.

Most of the product manufactured in 1905 and 1906 was not sold until 1907. The net amount realized for the products of 1905 and 1906 was $13,691.78. Those for 1907 have not yet been all disposed of.

DEATH OF CAPTAIN ARTHUR CLARK.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. Has any claim been presented to the government for compensation for the death of Captain Arthur Clark, who lost his life near Parry Sound, through a defective buoy on the 22nd of April, 1906?
2. If so, what action has been taken thereon by the government?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Yes.
2. Petition of right has been granted, practically the case stands for trial.

J. C. TACHE—DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. What is the position occupied and what are the duties performed by J. C. Taché in connection with the Department of Public Works?
2. Does he occupy more than one position in the employ of the department?
3. What salary does he receive in connection therewith?
4. Does he receive further perquisites, such as house rent, fuel, light, heat, service, supplies? If so, to what extent?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works):

1 and 2. He ranks as chief clerk on the permanent staff and is employed as engineer in charge of the harbour and river works in the counties of Chicoutimi and Saguenay, Que. He is also superintendent of telegraphs for the Chicoutimi district.

3. He receives $1,950 as engineer in charge of harbour and river works and $300 as superintendent of telegraphs.

4. No.

ROSS RIFLES.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. For the Ross rifles already completed and delivered to the government, what has been paid by the government; (a) on original contract price of $25 each; (b) for changes and improvements of all kinds; (c) for expenses of inspection, including staff, rent, subsistence and travel; (d) for expenses of supervision and management at Quebec and Ottawa?
2. On the above basis what has been the cost per rifle as ultimately accepted by the government?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence):

1. (a) $1,005,000. 40,000 rifles.

(b) Payments chargeable to capital: Amount expended in replacing the tools and fixtures which become obsolete in consequence of: 1. Mark I. sight being changed to Mark II., $11,351.50. 2. Mark II. sight being changed to Mark III., $15,000. 3. Modifications in Mark II. rifle, $3,648.50. 4. Change in pattern of cocking piece, $960.

(c) $76,580 not including an expenditure of $26,237.63 for gauges which will last an indefinite length of time and are, therefore, chargeable to capital.

(d) Included in answer to (c).

2. The cost per rifle is as follows: Contract price, $25 ; cost of inspection, $1.90 ; total, $26.90. The above payments set forth in answer to question 1 (b) are a charge against capital, because they are a factor in the cost of production of all rifles of the present pattern already manufactured or to be manufactured in future, consequently the proportion to be borne by each rifle cannot now be ascertained.

DEPARTMENT OF MILITIA—INSPECTION.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. Who inspects the guns and artillery for the Department of Militia, and what payments are made therefor?

2. Who inspects the saddlery and clothing, respectively, and what payments are made therefor?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence):

1. All tests and proofs are made by the War Office and paid for after the work is completed and the guns delivered. Major-General O'Grady Haly, C.B., M.V.O, is employed in connection with such inspection and is paid for his services at the rate of £500 per annum.

2. Lieut.-Colonel Robert Brown, who inspects all saddlery and is paid 2 per cent of the value thereof. Clothing is inspected by James W. Caldwell and James Robertson, who are each paid at the rate of $2,200 per annum.

DREDGING AT MIDLAND, TIFFIN AND VICTORIA HARBOURS.

Mr. BENNETT—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. How much money was paid for dredging done at Midland, Tiffin and Victoria harbours, respectively, for the season of 1907?

2. How much work was performed at each of said places, respectively, and the quantities and qualities of materials removed at each of said places in said year?

3. Who were the contractors at each of said points, the prices paid therefor for different materials in said year, and the amounts paid at each of said places for different kinds of materials?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works) :

1. Midland.. .. ..$ 54,759 64
   Tiffin.. .. .. 124,922 50
   Victoria Harbour.. .. .. .. 9,928 00

2.	Rock. (No rock).	All other materials.
Midland..		210614 c. yds.
Tiffin..	16,139	369,012 c. yds.
Victoria Harb...		124,100 c. yds.

3. (a) At Midland, Canadian Dredging and Construction Company ; at Tiffin and Victoria Harbour, Owen Sound Dredging and Construction Company.

(b)

	Rock.		All other materials.	
	Price.	Total amount.	Price.	Total amount.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Midland.....	2 25	.....	0 26	54,759 64
Tiffin.....	2 00	29,611 33	0 27	95,311 17
Victoria Harbour.	2 00	(None taken out.)	0 08	9,928 00

At Tiffin one-third of contract price was deducted for all material cast over.

EXPERIMENTAL FARM IN DISTRICT OF QUEBEC.

Mr. ROBITAILLE—by Mr. J. J. Hughes—asked:

1. Has the Minister of Agriculture received a communication from the Quebec Board of Trade asking for an experimental farm in district of Quebec?

2. What was the answer given by the minister to the above-mentioned body?

3. Is it the intention of the government to grant this request before the general elections?

4. Will an amount be appropriated for this purpose in the supplementary estimates? If so, what amount? If not, why not?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). This morning I received a copy of a resolution passed by the Quebec Board of Trade, and I have acknowledged receipt of it saying that the representations therein contained will receive the most sympathetic and careful consideration of the government.

PATENTS ISSUED TO WILLIAM HOWARD NOLAN.

Mr. SCHAFFNER asked:

When and to whom was a patent granted for the south half of 24, 1, 27, west first meridiam?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). 20th July, 1906, William Howard Nolan. In pursuance of the sale made on September 26, 1902.

DOMINION LANDS.

Mr. WILBERT McINTYRE asked:

1. What was the total acreage of land in the odd numbered sections in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta granted to railways by the government of Canada before June 30, 1896?

2. What was the total acreage in even numbered sections in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta granted to railways by the government of Canada before June 30, 1896?

3. What was the total acreage of land in odd numbered sections in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta granted to railways by the government of Canada since June 30, 1896?

4. What was the total acreage of land in even numbered sections in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta granted to railways by the government of Canada since June 30, 1896?

5. What was the total acreage of odd numbered sections otherwise disposed of than as grants to railways, including swamp lands, school lands and other lands before June 30, 1896?

6. What was the total acreage of even numbered sections otherwise disposed of than as grants to railways, including swamp lands, school lands and other lands before June 30, 1896?

7. What was the total acreage of odd numbered sections otherwise disposed of than as grants to railways, including swamp lands, school lands and other lands after June 30, 1896?

8. What was the total acreage of even numbered sections otherwise disposed of than as grants to railways, including swamp lands, school lands and other lands after June 30, 1896?

9. What acreage granted as Indian reserves was surrendered and sold by the government before 1896?

10. What acreage granted as Indian reserves was surrendered and sold by the government after 1896?

11. What was the acreage granted in homesteads before June 30, 1896?

12. What was the acreage granted in homesteads since June 30, 1896?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. The total acreage in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta in odd numbered sections of lands granted to railways before the 30th June, 1896, was 29,550,179 acres.

2. The total acreage in even numbered sections granted to railways before the 30th June, 1896, was 2,212,775 acres.

3. The acreage in odd numbered sections of land granted to railways since the 30th June, 1896, to 1st November, 1907—none.

4. The acreage in even numbered sections granted to railways since the 30th June, 1896, to 1st November, 1907—none.

5. The acreage of odd numbered sections otherwise disposed of before the 30th June, 1896, was:

Classed as swamp lands.	453,647	acs. est.
Surveyed school lands...	4,375,200	" "
Other lands..	3,155,956	" "
Total	7,984,803	" "

6. The acreage of even numbered sections disposed of before the 30th June, 1896, otherwise than as homesteads with Hudson Bay Company as excluded was:

Classed as swamp lands.	453,647	acs. est.
As sub. railways lands...	2,212,775	" "
Other lands..	2,475,485	" "
Total	5,141,907	"

Mr. W. McINTYRE.

7 The acreage of odd numbered sections otherwise disposed of since the 30th June, 1896, to 1st November, 1907, is:

Classed as swamp lands.	688,308	acs. est.
Surveyed school lands ..	1,951,500	" "
Other lands..	1,402,988	" "
Total	4,042,796	" "

8. The acreage of even numbered sections disposed of other than as homesteads with Hudson Bay Company land excluded, since the 30th June, 1896, to 1st November, 1907, is:

Classed as swamp lands.....	688,308	acs.
As subsidies railway lands..	None.	
Other lands..	2,240,505	"
Total..	2,928,813	"

9. The acreage of Indian reserves surrendered and sold before the 30th June, 1896, is 17,828 acres.

10. The acreage of Indian reserves surrendered and sold since the 30th June, 1896, to 1st November, 1907, is 198,987 acres.

11. The total acreage in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta covered by homestead entries and pre-emptions with cancellations deducted before the 30th June, 1896, is:

Pre-emptions..	1,712,960	acs.
Homesteads	6,208,440	"
Total....	7,921,400	"

12. The acreage covered by homestead entries and pre-emptions with cancellations deducted since the 30th June, 1896, to the 1st November, 1907, is:

Pre-emptions	None.	
Homesteads..	23,592,590	"

Lands disposed of by half-breed scrip:—The acreage covered by half-breed scrip before the 30th June, 1896, was, 1,526,800 acres.

The acreage covered by half-breed scrip since the 30th June, 1896, to the 1st November, 1907, is 961,910 acres.

TUG ' D. H. THOMAS.'

Mr. STANFIELD asked :

1. Is the tug ' D. H. Thomas ' subsidized by the Dominion government.

2. If so, has the government made that fact public, as valuable assistance might be rendered by the tug to vessels caught in drift ice and in distress in or near the strait of Canso?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. The Dominion Coal Company is subsidized to keep a wrecking plant for the coastal waters of the maritime provinces. The ' D. H. Thomas ' is one of the vessels belonging to the plant.

2. It was reported in the papers and stated in the House.

PURCHASE OF SEED GRAIN.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN—by Mr. Foster—asked :

1. What quantity of oats, barley and wheat did the government purchase for the seed grain distribution in the Northwest?
2. From whom did they purchase the same?
3. What prices were paid the different parties?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

	Bushels.
1. Oats purchased	1,022,853
Barley purchased	48,924
Wheat purchased	576,536

2 and 3. Detailed statements showing from whom the grain was purchased and prices paid have not yet been received from Winnipeg. All purchases were made by Mr. C. C. Castle, warehouse commissioner, Winnipeg, who is preparing a full statement of all purchases made.

BRITISH COLUMBIA—COURT OF APPEAL.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) moved :

That, on to-morrow, the House will resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to make provision for payment of annual salaries to judges to be appointed to the Court of Appeal in the province of British Columbia, as follows:—

The Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal $8,000.

Three Justices of Appeal, each $7,000.

He said : I have to state that His Excellency the Governor General, having been apprised of the subject-matter of this resolution, approves of and commends it to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT—AMENDMENT.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Aylesworth for the second reading of Bill (No. 115) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, and the proposed amendment of Mr. W. J. Roche thereto.

Mr. DUNCAN C. ROSS (Yale-Cariboo). Mr. Speaker, in the discussion of a measure dealing with the franchise of the people of this country it is rather unfortunate that so much heat and party bias should be shown. It is equally unfortunate that in the year 1908 we have not yet a perfect franchise Act upon our statute-book and that we find it necessary from time to time to make amendments that will meet complaints and remedy the evils that do exist. But, we can find consolation in the fact that in the mother of parliaments, up to 1832, they had no franchise that was worthy of the name, and it took sixty-five years after that date before they secured a Franchise Act that, in a measure, met the wishes of the people. Legislation was introduced in the Imperial parliament with reference to the franchise in 1843, in 1865, in 1878 and again in 1885, and if any amendments have been introduced since then they have been of a minor character. I think it would be interesting to know the nature of the franchise that they have in Great Britain. The statutes provide who shall be voters, what the qualification of the voter shall be and what the provisions are with respect to placing voters on the lists, or receiving names. They also provide for the functions of the revising barristers, who they shall be and the whole machinery for the arrangement of the lists, but, in England, they accept the municipal lists as the basis of the franchise. These lists are prepared by overseers appointed by the municipal authorities and these overseers receive the applications and protests against the same and they use their own discretion as to what should go on the list and who should be struck off, or who should be left on.

They complete their work; then there are revising barristers representing the imperial government who are a court of final appeal in the preparation of the lists. The point I particularly wish to emphasize is that the imperial government does not accept these lists without the right of appeal, nor would they accept provincial lists without the right of appeal had they provinces in Great Britain. In Canada we had our changing systems of registration and franchise. Provincial lists were first accepted —accepted but not without complaints and objections such as we hear in this House to-day, and these complaints came from our Conservative friends. They complained that in Nova Scotia a Franchise Act was passed which treated Conservatives unfairly in the then approaching federal election and that when this measure accomplished its object it was repealed before the next provincial election. They complained of an unfair franchise in Prince Edward Island, and so far as the Conservative party was concerned they complained wherever there was a Liberal government in power in any of the provinces. They always complained that they were being defrauded in the preparation of the lists by the party opposed to them in politics who had control of the provincial government. It is not pertinent to this debate to discuss the merits or demerits of these claims, but it surely must be accepted by both sides of the House as sound policy that a man properly qualified and anxious to vote in a federal election has the undoubted right to look to this parliament for redress of any grievance real or imaginary, and not to anybody over which this parliament has no control. Our Conservative friends passed the Dominion Franchise Act in 1885 and the last state

was worse than the first; not so much because of the violation of any correct principle but because of the cumbersome, expensive, and dishonest machinery provided to carry the legislation into effect. This legislation proved so unsatisfactory that some even of our Conservative friends wanted it repealed, and in 1894, Sir John Thompson who then led the House made an honest effort to repeal the existing law, but the influences within his party were so strong that the Bill was not passed. The House refused to accept a similar Bill introduced by Mr. Charlton in 1895, and the Conservative party went out of power in 1896 with the Dominion Franchise Act providing for Dominion lists on the statute-book. Under the Conservative Franchise Act, revision was so expensive that it was seldom attempted and sometimes elections were held on lists over two years old so that a man had to be twenty-three years of age before he could exercise his franchise in Canada. During the time the Act was in force four revisions cost nearly $2,000,000 to this country. Revising barristers were political partisans of the worst description and the record shows that even Conservatives were heartily sick of the legislation. I am bound to say—because I was not in the House in 1898—that the Liberal party went to the other extreme in their legislation of that year. They accepted provincial lists with practically no conditions attached except that the then Solicitor General sounded a note of caution in reference to these lists. I find in 'Hansard' page 3952 (1898) that the Solicitor General made this statement:

Mr. FOSTER. Would the hon. gentleman like to have an opportunity of qualifying one expression he used, that the revising barristers appointed under the legislation of 1885 were partisans of the worst possible description?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Well, yes, I will qualify the statement if it pleases the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. It is just for my hon. friend's own sake that I ask.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I was only making an historical statement.

Mr. FOSTER. But it should be true.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is a good deal of truth in it; not exactly all, but some.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Then I will say 'some.'

Mr. TAYLOR. They were most of the judges in the country.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, no.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I am willing to say almost anything that is within the realm of truth to meet the wishes of the hon. gentleman. I was proceeding to quote this statement made by the Solicitor General who introduced the Bill in 1898:

The principle of the whole Act is that we intend to adopt the provincial franchise as a basis of the franchise for the Dominion. That is our intention. It is idle for my hon. friend to assume or to suppose that we assume that the provincial franchises existing to-day will continue for all time. I cannot follow the argument of the hon. gentlemen on the other side who say that we dispossess ourselves of control over the franchise. We do not do anything of the sort. We simply adopt for the present the franchises of the provinces, but if at any time the provinces should do anything that we consider detrimental to the interests of the Dominion we are entirely free—we don't tie our hands at all—to make any change that we think proper. We do not dispossess ourselves of our control over the franchise.

The Solicitor General also said (page 4044 'Hansard,' 1898):

Of course in our view of the case we are not giving the local legislatures the power to make our franchise. We are simply adopting for our own purposes the franchise they use for theirs.

And the right hon. the leader of the House while advocating the adoption of the provincial franchise also spoke regarding what might be necessary in the future. At page 5671 'Hansard,' 1898, the right hon. gentleman is quoted as follows:

The new law we hope will be more workable and more acceptable, but still it has to be put to the test, and though we have great expectations from it, I am far from pretending that it will give full and absolute satisfaction. But time alone will test its usefulness and it was in this view that we accepted many of the amendments which were offered on the other side.

Again at page 5674, the right hon. gentleman is quoted:

I only ask hon. gentlemen opposite to give this a law a fair trial. It may be that it will not answer the purpose; it may be that we shall be the first to be deceived as regards its operations. If we are so deceived, then it will be open to hon. gentlemen opposite to attack the Act and present something which should not be the law existing before, nor the law as it will exist henceforward. For my part, I say this, and repeat it that though I have very great confidence that this new law in the future will give satisfaction, I can only express a hope and not a certainty. Time alone experience alone, will prove whether it is wise or unwise. My belief is that it is wise, and we should give it a fair trial.

Now, Sir, the right hon. the Premier and the Solicitor General, in presenting the Bill of 1898 to this House, clearly pointed out, first, that we were accepting the provincial franchise only as a matter of convenience in making our own lists, and that if any grievance should arise they should be remedied. But what was the position taken by

hon. gentlemen opposite in 1898 ? They seem to be very much exercised over legislation introduced into this House at the present time for the purpose of doing what ? For the purpose of remedying evils that have arisen since the Franchise Act of 1898 was passed. They are very much opposed to any change in the Franchise Act ; they seem anxious to have this parliament wedded to a provincial franchise without any reservations whatever ; they seem to be enamoured of the view that parliament has divested itself of all responsibility in the matter of protecting the people of this country by a federal franchise. But what was the position they took in 1898 ? Let me refer to the record. Sir Charles Tupper was leader of the Conservative party in those days. He opposed, and opposed bitterly, the legislation introduced by the government at that time. On page 2274 of 'Hansard' he is quoted as follows :

I need not at this moment go into the evidences that existed in regard to that point, further than to say that it was found that the right and power of the local legislatures to select a franchise, which was afterwards used by the Dominion, was in some cases certainly grossly abused; and so strongly was that abuse pursued, that in the province of Nova Scotia the legislature absolutely passed a Franchise Act after the general election to have an effect upon the Dominion elections, although they never intended to use it, and never did use it, for their own elections; and they repealed the Act before the local elections came on, showing they had absolutely the power to control the representation of this parliament, by adopting a policy which they did not exercise themselves and never intended to exercise. One such illustration is sufficient to prove the absolute necessity of this parliament, if it was going to occupy an independent position in the estimation of the country and the world, adopting a franchise of its own.

How can hon. gentlemen opposite reconcile the position taken by the then leader of the Conservative party with the position they are taking to-day, in objecting to a measure which has for its object the reviewing of provincial lists and the remedying of any grievances that arise in connection with those provincial lists when they are used for Dominion elections ? The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) who is a stickler for constitutional precedents, took in the House in those days, and he took very strong grounds in reference to this parliament adopting the provincial franchises without any protection to the people who wanted to vote in federal elections. He said, as reported on page 2296 of 'Hansard' :

The fathers of confederation never contemplated that the provincial lists should be used for any length of time for electing members to this House. In the British North America Act they only provided that these franchises should be used until the parliament of Canada otherwise provided; that provision was inserted for the purpose of electing the first parliament, so that when elected and parliament organized, parliament could then deal with the question as it saw fit and lay down a proper franchise law, under which members should be elected to this House.

Again, on page 2297 he is quoted as follows :

We have found in the provinces fancy franchises adopted by the provincial legislatures, to the detriment of certain classes in the community who were as well entitled to vote in the election of members to this House as any other class. And it was just because we found that evil becoming so great that it could not be tolerated any longer, that we took up the question in the Dominion parliament, and legislated as we did in 1886. The cases which the right hon. gentleman cited afford the very strongest argument why there should be one franchise law to control the election of members to this House in every province or territory of the Dominion.

Our friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) was in the House in those days. He is a striking illustration of the mellowing influences of time because he is not now nearly so ferocious in discussing public questions as he was then. So indignant was he at the thought of this parliament adopting a provincial franchise, so strong in his denunciation and so violent in his language, that he was called to order several times by the Speaker. Let me quote one of the mildest things he said about the legislation proposed by the government :

On the question of principle, I contend that it is in the best interests of the Dominion as a whole that there should be a uniform franchise list, and that it should not be delegated to the different provinces from time to time, and at all times to provide for those provinces such franchises and such lists as they might desire for the election of Dominion representatives. Take in the first place, the case of Prince Edward Island. If there is a province in the whole Dominion where the Conservative party may expect the most unmanly and most dishonest treatment it is the province of Prince Edward Island.

And there is our hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche), who howled in the House the other day at the very idea of this parliament taking to itself authority to listen to appeals against the unfair tactics of the political partisans in the province of Manitoba. He was going to stay here all summer to fight such an enormity as that. But he wailed in 1898 at the very idea of our having a provincial franchise. I am quoting from page 2586 of 'Hansard,' where he said :

The franchise, Mr. Speaker, is the basis of constitutional freedom and if we are going to have stuffed lists prepared by partsan officials, the liberty of the subject is gone. If we are going to legislate afresh upon this Franchise Bill, for decency's sake let us not

put an Act on the statute-book that will be ten times more vicious in principle than the one we repeal. What is the use of enacting fresh legislation unless we can improve on the old?

But let me give you a particular gem from the hon. member. He is complaining of our not accepting the Manitoba lists at the present time. Here is the opinion he had of the provincial lists in 1898:

However, I see by the provision of this Bill the Northwest Territories are exempted from its operation and now I ask the government to place Manitoba in the same category as the Northwest Territories, at least until such time as they can bring pressure to bear on their Liberal confreres of Manitoba to get them to wipe off the statutes of that province an Act that is now a disgrace to it, and for it, substitute a fair Act; a Franchise Act in the widest and truest sense of the term; an Act that will give a Conservative in that province an equal say in its affairs with his Liberal fellowman.

This was the opinion expressed by the hon. member for Marquette in 1898. But he is quite satisfied now to reverse that opinion and accept the Provincial Act. When the men, for whom he is the chief apologist in this House, is in power in Manitoba, he is quite prepared to accept for himself and party the political advantages to be gained through the rascality of his rascally officials in Manitoba. When, however, there was a Liberal government in office in that province in 1898, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) was the man who howled the loudest because this parliament was going to revert to the provincial lists.

We have another charming gentleman in the House, and I am sorry he is not here to-day, because I want to say kind words about him. I refer to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). We love him for his inconsistency. I think he is making a serious mistake when he devotes his time to politics at all. He ought to devote his entire time to the practice of law, because whether he be right or wrong he is equally at home in the discussion of an argument. We always admire his facility and felicity of expression and the cogency of his argument, whether he is on the right or the wrong side. Why, in 1898, he was the fighting lieutenant from the province of Quebec for the valiant Sir Charles Tupper. He was not satisfied then with protesting against reverting to the provincial lists, but was the bold bad man who introduced an amendment for the purpose of doing in 1898 what is proposed to be done in the legislation now introduced. Let me quote from his speech, page 4056 from 'Hansard':

But this much I do contend, that it was intended by the framers of our constitution that as soon as possible after confederation, with a view of welding the people together with a view of making one people of all those who inhabited British North America, we should control our own franchise, establish exactly how it should be exercised and not relinquish that franchise to the provinces, thus producing conditions of inequality, as we are now doing by this Bill.

This is the gentleman who the other day threatened to obstruct Supply and put the civil servants on bread and water. Why? Because the government is doing in 1908 what he advised the government to do in 1898. Consistency is a precious and rare jewel but it never gets within hailing distance of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk).

Then comes the noblest Tory of them all, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). He had some very strnog views in the Franchise Act in 1898. No doubt he has strong views to-day because in 1898 he told us that:

So long as I have a seat in this parliament I will contend that it is essentially necessary for the dignity and best government of Canada as a nation, that she shall have uninterrupted and absolute control of her own franchise. And I believe that the great majority of the people of this country will not be satisfied to have it otherwise.

Again he said:

I think the government would have done a useful thing for this country, and would have kept its position and that of its supporters logical and consistent, and would have made itself square with public opinion if it had allowed the plea of the opposition which is simply that in the last resort, the voters' lists shall be subject to the revision of a competent court of law.

I am bound to say that we on this side have exercised due caution in accepting the advice of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), but no doubt he will be extremely flattered to find that after ten long years of consideration we have practically determined to accept his advice. The hon. gentleman said:

So long as I have a seat in this parliament I will contend that it is essentially necessary for the dignity and best government of Canada that she should have uninterrupted and absolute control of her own franchise

The hon. gentleman did not always have a seat in parliament since then. There was an unfortunate hiatus, but no doubt this will in no way influence him in his opinion with reference to a proper Franchise Act. He told us some three years ago that, disappointed in politics, he had changed his views somewhat with reference to the education question, but I am sure that the fact that he did not always have a seat in parliament is not going to make him change his views with reference to the Franchise Act, and I feel quite confident that, in accordance with those views, we shall find him voting for the measure now introduced by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth).

These extracts I have quoted show the position which these hon. gentlemen took in 1898. I am not going to quarrel with that position. I believe it was a strong position. I believe that while it is convenient to accept provincial lists, this parliament should not, under any circumstances, divest itself of all responsibility to see that people who are entitled to vote in federal elections should be given the opportunity of voting.

Where does the leader of the opposition stand to-day on this question ? In 1898 he did not take so prominent a part in the discussion of public affairs as he does to-day, but he was then a member of this House, and he then pleaded for a court of appeal, particularly in his own province of Nova Scotia. He said that his Conservative friends were not likely to get justice down there, and he wanted a court of appeal. I say again there is nothing in the legislation we are now discussing which has anything else for object than the putting of people on the list who are entitled to be there and taking people off who should not be there. That is the only object of the measure. My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, cannot very well escape from the position which he and his party have taken in connection with this question. He also threatened obstruction. Why ? Because parliament, after ten years experience, is adopting a measure which has for its object the relief of those who think they have been unfairly dealt with by the provincial officials. He is in favour of the disfranchisement of those entitled to exercise their franchise in federal matters and of enfranchisement ignorant foreigners, made British subjects by fraudulent naturalization papers. He turns a deaf ear to the appeals of those who expect relief from this parliament from the acts of dishonest officials, acting in the interests of partisan government, and is going to stand for such a list to the point of political exhaustion.

Why does he want such a list ? Why is he opposed to an honest list in a Dominion election ? Is it because he cannot hope for success on any other list than such a list as we have in Manitoba to-day ? We say, Sir, that the time has come when a large body of voters in this country claim that abuses have crept into the system of administration in Manitoba ; and whether these charges are or are not well founded it is the bounden duty of this government and this parliament to say to those people that in so far as their franchise in federal matters is concerned, any doubts are to be removed. Can it be said that John Smith, an intelligent Canadian, a desirable citizen, a payer of taxes, who takes a keen and intelligent interest in the construction of the Hudson Bay railway, in the all red route, in the tariff, in immigration matters, in all questions of a purely federal character, who travels from his home a distance of 100 miles to the office of the registration clerk in his provincial registration district and finds that there are so many people ahead of him that the clerk has no time to take his application, and his name therefore cannot go on the list and also finds that there are others whose names go on the list by fraud—shall it be said that this man is not to get his undoubted right to exercise his franchise in federal elections ? Shall it be said that John Smith is to be left to the loving kindness and tender mercies of Bob. Rogers. This government has no control over the government of Manitoba or any other provincial government—

Mr. FOSTER. How is that for a point of order Mr. Speaker, are governments to be spoken of in that slighting way ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The reference was to a member of a provincial government. I am inclined to think the rule does not apply to members of a provincial government.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a question of taste on the part of the member speaking.

Mr. D. ROSS. I do not think the hon. gentleman has taken his point of order very seriously. This parliament has no control over the government of Manitoba or any other provincial government in the matter of making whatever provision it deems best for the granting of the franchise for provincial elections. Provincial governments can give the people, for provincial purposes, what franchise they see fit ; but this parliament has the right and it is its bounden duty to see that every man properly qualified is protected in his right to vote in a federal election. My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) who is not in the House, became rather alarmed the other evening. He sounded a note of warning to the premier that there was likely to be trouble, even bloodshed, if this legislation was passed and there was any attempt to dishonestly disfranchise the electors. I reiterate that warning. There always should be trouble if the electors are dishonestly disfranchised. As I said before there is not one single provision in this Bill which has for its object the disfranchisement of any one, and it is up to the government to see that the officials appointed under this legislation do their work honestly. Generally speaking the people of the west, whether Liberal or Conservative, want honest voters' lists and honest elections and they will stand for no other kind. But I want to sound another note of warning to the right hon. the Prime Minister and it is that the people of Manitoba, of British Columbia or of any other western province can be left to take care of any one in office there who tampers with voters' lists who gives dishonest voters' lists ; but they will

not submit to this parliament allowing such officials to disfranchise them for federal elections and they expect this parliament to protect them in their federal franchise, without any regard for the opinions of any provincial authority.

What are the complaints against the existing system ? The voters' lists in Manitoba to-day is five years old. It has been continued from year to year by Acts of the provincial legislature, with the result that it is loaded up with dead men, absentees and people without fixed residence. The courts of revision in Manitoba are constituted and organized to obstruct the proper purging of the voters' lists. The revising judge sits from 1 o'clock to 6 o'clock only. All the time can be taken up in the hearing of the evidence in one case.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That is not so.

Mr. D. ROSS. My hon. friend says that is not so.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. No. You may find an individual case—

Mr. D. ROSS. Oh, no, it is not so now, because the government of Manitoba and its officials have been making a show of righteousness during the last two or three days that they did not make in the last two or three years.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I make the statement that it never was so.

Mr. D. ROSS. It is in some cases.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Perhaps in half a dozen cases but it is not by any means the rule.

Mr. D. ROSS. I am making the statement, I am making it upon the authority of those who know, upon the authority of those in whom I have confidence, that revising barristers have sat from 1 o'clock to 6 o'clock on one day only.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. They have.

Mr. D. ROSS. And all that time could be taken up in hearing the evidence in one case.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Can you give an illustration of that having occurred ?

Mr. D. ROSS. Illustration after illustration.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Give us one.

Mr. D. ROSS. I have not one at hand, but if the hon. gentleman would read some of the speeches by hon. members for Manitoba—and they would do him a world of good—he would find numerous illustrations of what I am quoting. When six o'clock comes court is over and the other cases remain unheard ; the dead men and the others remain on the list.

Mr. D. ROSS.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. It is absolutely uncommon.

Mr. D. ROSS. Our friends do not like this.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. We like the truth.

Mr. D. ROSS. The additions to the list in Manitoba are made by registration clerks appointed by order in council by the government who also, by order in council, fix one place in each constituency to receive applications and one day in which to receive them.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That is absolutely not correct.

Mr. D. ROSS. Yes, I say the Roblin government have been showing extreme righteousness for the last two or three days or perhaps the last two or three months. I am dealing only with questions that arose during the time they had a free hand in the province of Manitoba to make voters' lists that were entirely in their own interest and denied the franchise to Liberals entitled to receive it. Applications must be made in person in Manitoba and there are numerous instances where men had to go one hundred miles to reach the registration booth. Let me quote from a speech of my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford), who said :

> I have here the name of one division where electors have to travel 400 miles to get their names on the list. In another division, if they had to make the return trip, they would have to travel 220 miles. In Swan River they would have to travel 145 miles each way.

These are illustrations to show that under the system of administration adopted by the Roblin government of Manitoba until a few weeks ago, every scheme imaginable was adopted in order to keep people off the voters' lists who were entitled to go on them. It also occurred that the registration clerk could not complete his work in one day, and those who had not an opportunity to put their applications in remained disfranchised. These are some of the grievances complained of in the province of Manitoba.

My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) made some reference to British Columbia. Let me say at the outset that the people of British Columbia have never been educated down to doing small and mean things in connection with their election contests. The voters' lists have been honestly prepared. The people do not buy votes, they do not stuff ballot boxes, and they do not switch ballots ; and generally speaking, they play the game of politics fairly, as they play all other games. But while the voters' lists are honestly prepared, they offer the gravest possible encouragement for dishonesty. They are also loaded up with dead men and absentees. In each provincial

district there is a collector of votes who is generally the government agent or the mining recorder. He receives applications to be placed on the voters' list every day in the year. The applicant can get a blank form of declaration from any officer of the government, which he fills in and signs before a postmaster, alderman, mayor, justice of the peace or member of parliament, anybody in authority; and he hands in that application to the collector of votes. The application is placed on file, and twice in the year, in May and November, a court of revision is held. If there is no protest his name remains on the list. The operation of putting a man on the list in British Columbia is purely mechanical. No one ever thinks about anything crooked being done in having his name put on the list. There is a provision for getting names off the list not entitled to be there, but it is somewhat cumbersome and expensive. When there is a change in population, those lists often bear the names of absentees and others than bona fide voters. Let me give a personal illustration. A short time ago I sent out copies of a speech to the electors of my own district, using the latest revised voters' list, and through one post office alone nearly 200 of them came back endorsed by the postmaster, 'Left the country, present address unknown.' Then we have in British Columbia a large number of new men who are entitled to go on the voters' lists, and who can send in their application to the provincial collector of votes, but their names do not get on until the first court of revision in November. I propose to quote the opinion of a gentleman who took a very keen interest in public matters in British Columbia for a number of years, I refer to Mr. John Houston, who was president of the Conservative Association in British Columbia for a number of years. He was also a member of the local House. Mr. Houston is a Conservative, but sometimes he does not work at the game, and he is rather independent in the expression of his views. In his paper, the 'Empire,' published at Prince Rupert, he writes as follows :

> British Columbia has a rotten system of registering votes, and there is no likelihood of the McBride government changing it for the better. Were the McBride government ousted from power, the Liberals would see to it that the law would be made even worse than it is.

Of course I cannot agree with that. What I am pointing out is that Mr. Houston is not a political partisan, though he was president of the Conservative Association of British Columbia ; and his criticism is directed against both parties.

Why, the reader will ask. Because neither the Conservative nor the Liberal parties in British Columbia have any desire to be fair to each other. The men who run the two parties are imbued with the idea that the people who vote have no rights that need be respected. Every voters' list in the province contains as many 'dead' names as 'live' ones; and were the names of every person qualified to vote placed on the lists once a year, it is safe to assume that few of the men now members of the legislature would have M.P.P. added to their names. At the last provincial election in one district in Kootenay, 243 names were on the voters' list at one polling place; yet less than 50 votes were polled. The others were not in the district. At another polling place in the same district, over 100 men who had the qualifications of voters were not on the list because of the clumsy methods of registration. Yet Premier McBride and his attorney general will rage with fury because the Dominion government proposes to take a hand at revising lists that have been 'dead' since 1903, and stuffed during the last six months.

Then he makes suggestions as to how the lists should be prepared. Now here is an expression of opinion from an independent source to show that in the province of British Columbia, while I am prepared to admit that the lists are prepared honestly, at the same time they are loaded up with dead men and with absentees.

Now what does this proposed legislation do ? As I understand the measure now before the House, it accepts the provincial lists as a basis for the federal lists. It provides for putting on the names of people who have been improperly left off, and it provides for striking off the names of people who should not have been put on. In the preparation of the lists it provides for nothing that will in any way interfere or disturb the lists, honestly, efficiently and completely prepared by the provincial authorities ; or in other words, if the provincial authorities prepare honest lists, complete lists, there will be nothing to do for the Dominion officials appointed under this legislation.

Mr. HERRON. Who are to be the judges whether the lists are honest or not ?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. The judges appointed under this legislation.

Mr. HERRON. They are government officials, I understand, appointed by this government.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. What I mean to say is that the judges appointed under this legislation will put on or take names off the list in accordance with the laws of the province in which they are acting ; that is, they will supplement the work which the provincial authorities ought to have done themselves ; and if the provincial authorities do their work properly there will be nothing for the Dominion revising judges to do. This Bill also provides the necessary authority to adjust the lists when there is an overlapping of constituencies. My hon.

friend from Qu'Appelle, in answer to a question of mine the other night, suggested that there was no such authority in the old Act. Well, I think there was, but when our officials attempted to exercise that authority they were prosecuted by Colin Campbell, Attorney General of Manitoba.

In British Columbia, a portion of the provincial electoral district of Yale is in the New Westminster federal district and the other portion is in the federal district of Yale-Cariboo. The Yale-Cariboo election was a deferred election. The only list available was the provincial list for the whole provincial district of Yale. I may say to the House that in British Columbia we have no well defined polling subdivisions. I remember quite well that in the year 1904 neither one of the returning officers—the returning officer in New Westminster or the returning officer in Cariboo knew what to do with this list, but finally they decided that Armstrong, the New Westminster returning officer would guess at the people whom he thought should vote in New Westminster and he would vote those on November 1, while O'Hara, the returning officer in Yale-Cariboo, would vote the balance in Yale-Cariboo on November 22. The work was done the best way they knew how and there was no complaint from either side because it was honestly done, but it afterwards developed that a small settlement south of Hope voted in New Westminster instead of Yale-Cariboo, and the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Kennedy) got a small Liberal majority to which I was entitled. The point I am making is that it is surely not arguable that there should not be some one in authority to furnish these returning officers with lists properly made and certified. It surely is not arguable that we should not have passed in this parliament such legislation as will put into the hands of returning officers lists upon which people may vote and not leave them open to prosecution at the hands of partisan officials. I may say there was no trouble in British Columbia in 1904, because everybody thought the work was honestly done although it may have been imperfectly done. But, since then there has come to us in the province of British Columbia an attorney general who would indict His Majesty the King if he thought he could make any political capital out of it, and I for one do not propose that any officer of this government who is honestly attempting to do his duty in connection with an election should be open to prosecution or persecution at the hands of partisan officials of the provincial government.

Now, Sir, regarding the other clauses of the Bill, I have but little to say. I never had much confidence in legislation intended to make people honest in election time. I have very little patience with legislation that is intended as a sop to the Pharisee and which some of those who so loudly applaud have no intention of observing. I would put a man in jail for buying the elector. I would put a man in jail for tampering with the ballot box or switching or mutilating ballots, and I think a man ought to go to jail for publishing absolutely false statements during an election campaign. But, I would not load up an election law with a lot of details which nobody intends to observe and which only bring the whole legislation into contempt and create a disregard for the bigger things that count.

A good deal has been said about the Liberal party going back on the position taken before 1896 and crystallized into legislation in 1898. Mr. Speaker, the principle of accepting provincial lists still remains, notwithstanding the proposed amendments. Nothwithstanding this legislation we still stick to the principle of accepting provincial voters' lists, and we do say that if these provincial voters' lists are honestly made there is nothing at all for any officer appointed under this proposed legislation to do. The amendments are intended to meet evils and defects that have arisen since the 1898 legislation became law. As I pointed out at the outset, the Solicitor General, who introduced that legislation, and the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who led the House at that time, stated that further legislation might be necessary to meet any evils that might arise in connection with the legislation then introduced.

Personally, I am not worried very much whether the Liberal party was theoretically right in 1898, or in any other year. I am satisfied it is right now. I am satisfied that this parliament should never divest itself of authority to ensure to the federal elector fully qualified his right to vote and notwithstanding anything that was said or done in 1898 or any other year, it would be cowardice on our part not to pass legislation that will cure the existing evils despite the onslaughts on our opponents in this House and outside of it.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Ross) and while I do not desire to accuse that hon. gentleman of intentionally making statements that are not true, I will say that if the Manitoba Act was what the hon. gentleman says it is I would be the first man to vote against that Act and to substitute such a measure as I considered to be fair. There is not one Liberal member on the other side of the House from Manitoba who will say that the hon. gentleman's statements are true. I do not know whether he intended to go as far as he did in making those statements.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I made no comment whatsoever in regard to the Manitoba

Election Act; I made my comment with reference to the administration of the law.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I take the hon. gentleman's explanation and I say there is not a Liberal member on the other side of the House from Manitoba who will substantiate the statements that he made in connection with the administration of the law of that province. We have been discussing this question for a great many days and nearly every hon. gentleman from the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) down has devoted very little time to the question outside of the province of Manitoba. That little province, against which this government is doing all it can, has been occupying a great deal of the attention of this House during the last week. I stand here to-day, Mr. Speaker, asking for only a fair franchise Act. I believe it is the right of every citizen of this country to exercise his franchise and I am not one who will stand for any law, by whomever it may be made, that will disfranchise a man who is properly qualified to vote.

Let it be remembered that the present Dominion Franchise Act was passed in 1898 at a time when, I think I am safe in saying, all the provinces in the Dominion were administered by Liberal governments. When the Liberals came to power the Franchise Act of 1885 was on the statute-book, and when they introduced their legislation in 1898 they had all those years between 1885 and 1898 to give it consideration and one would have thought that the Act they then passed would be the result of their best judgment and deliberation and knowledge. As I said, the provincial governments were then all Liberal and friendly to the Prime Minister. It is a fair question to ask the Prime Minister now : If there were Liberal governments in all the provinces to-day would we ever have heard of the Bill now before the House? I believe we would not. Surely if their Franchise Act of 1898 was good enough for the country then it ought to be good enough for the country to-day. I have a word to say with reference to the Minister of Justice. There is no man in this country who regrets more than I, that a gentleman like the Minister of Justice who has been so active in public life should be deprived of his hearing. It must be a great affliction to the hon. gentleman and I express personally my very great regret, but speaking for myself I do say it is hardly fair to this House and this country that such an important portfolio should be held by a gentleman who is absolutely unable to hear any argument that is presented after he delivers his address. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) dealt with this question admirably and left little to be said and were it not that some hon. gentlemen on the other side from the province of Manitoba have made statements which are not supported by facts I doubt if I would have taken part in the debate. Let me say again that as to the first clause in this Bill with which I am particularly concerned, my opinion is that the Minister of Justice had very little to do with it. My opinion is that the speech delivered by the hon. gentleman did not come from him, nor was it suggested by the Prime Minister of this country. I do believe it was suggested by the same man who suggested the Bill that was all printed and ready for introduction in 1904. The right hon. gentleman shakes his head. Does the right hon. gentleman mean that the Bill was not printed ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Since my hon. friend asks me the question I say most decidedly that no Bill was presented in 1904 except the Bill which came before the House.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The right hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I did not say it was presented, I said it was printed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not misunderstand my hon. friend.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I said a Bill was printed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is altogether in error.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. All right, before we get through with this question we will see whether it was or not. I accept the right hon. gentleman's statement that a Bill was not printed but I do say that the father of this present Bill was the same gentleman who fathered the Bill in 1904. But the Bill of 1904 never was read even a first time in this House and I am going to give my version of why it was not read. I believe that the Minister of Justice of that day absolutely refused to have anything to do with it. I believe it is a logical conclusion to infer that the then Minister of Justice said : In 1898 we decided to adopt the franchise of the different provinces and I am not going to stand now for making an exception of that little province of Manitoba. That is the reason the Bill was dropped. I believe, Sir, that if the same hon. gentleman were Minister of Justice to-day the same fate would come to the Bill now before the House. That is my opinion any way. But the present Minister of Justice has not felt any difficulty apparently about introducing into this House a Bill that is most certainly designed to hit at the little postage stamp province of Manitoba. There have been rumours that a compromise would be arrived at if it was agreed that the Bill should be left applicable to Manitoba and that the provisions with regard to British Columbia and the unorganized territories of Ontario and Quebec should be stricken out. Whether that is true or not I do not know but

it undoubtedly has been rumored. Now the first clause of this Bill says :

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein contained, voters' lists for the portions of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec which consist of territory not municipally organized and where there is no regular assessment or valuation roll upon which voters' lists are based, and for the several electoral districts in the provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia shall be prepared immediately after the issue of any writ——

Now, when I visited my people a short time ago I expressed my wonder to them why the province of Manitoba should be placed in exactly the same position as the unorganized backwoods of Ontario and Quebec. I wondered why it was that what was considered good enough for the backwoods should be considered good enough for Manitoba. I shall speak later about that provision for preparing the lists after the issue of the writ. The section continues :

—after the issue of any writ for an election in any such electoral district or in any electoral district composed or partly composed of such territory, or at any time when the Governor in Council so directs.

Now, I have very little confidence in that reference to the governor in council. As a matter of fact we seldom know when an election is going to take place. Generally the first definite knowledge we have of an election is the issue of the writ so that the expression after the issue of the writ practically means nothing in its working out. I should think that taking it on the average the writ for an election is usually issued about four weeks before the election. Hon. gentlemen opposite have laid great stress on the point that under the Manitoba law there is not enough time given to prepare a fair list, but under the Manitoba Act there is two months given and I would like to know how this Bill is going to remedy that when as a matter of fact the machinery under it will only be set in motion after the issue of the writ which will give only four weeks for the preparation of the lists. Now, I do not think that the Minister of Justice gave a full or candid explanation of this Bill when he moved its second reading. He knew it was a contentious matter and that it had been condemned by the Conservative and independent newspapers of the country. I therefore have to complain that the explanation given by the Minister of Justice on such an important Bill was not such as it should be. I shall quote some of the remarks of the hon. gentleman and here is one statement of his :

In 1898 the present law was passed, the old Franchise Act of 1895 was repealed and the system of adopting the voters' lists prepared for the various provinces substituted in its stead. It was contended by different hon. gentlemen that whenever you have voters' lists prepared in the municipalities upon the basis of the assessment roll you have to that extent a guarantee of substantiality and a guarantee of fairness.

Whether that be true or not I am not going to say, but the 'Globe,' the leading Liberal newspaper in the Dominion, took a very different view, and although the member for Lisgar stated the other day that the system of preparing the voters' lists was a fair one, I think I can show that in the past he expressed a very different view. The Minister of Justice continued :

The general outline of their system of preparing the voters' lists was that registration clerks were appionted for the various constituencies of the province.

I want to say that through all the speech of the Minister of Justice there is not more than a column that has reference to anything outside the province of Manitoba ; almost his whole speech dealt with the thin red line and the province of Manitoba, and as his followers on the other side have followed the same line it is only fair to assume, as I said before that this Act was intended particularly to hit at Manitoba. I continue to quote from the Minister of Justice :

And the work of the registration clerks in forming the basis of the voters' lists was afterwards revised by some member of a registration board, which consisted I think in practice of the county judges of the province, which upon the face of the statute might consist either of the county judges or of barristers of three years standing.

Now, while that statement is partially correct, I do not think it is wholly correct, and I think the Minister of Justice was hardly fair in making it. As a matter of practice the revisions in Manitoba for the last few years have been made practically by the judges but the inference has been drawn by hon. members opposite that under the law of Manitoba the revision might be before a judge or a barrister of three years standing appointed by the government. That is not the fact and the Minister of Justice should have made his statement plainer. He should have said that the revision must take place before the judges or before revising barristers of three years standing appointed by these judges, and had he said that he would have told the whole truth. The government of Manitoba have absolutely nothing to do with the appointing of those who are to revise the lists. It is the judge who revises the list in almost every instance, and if it is not the judge himself, the revision must be by a barrister whom the judge appoints. The government has no more to do with appointing these revising barristers than I have.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the present law of Manitoba.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That is the present law of Manitoba. I think I can also show that the very law which the hon. gentleman from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) advocated the other night is in great part the present law of Manitoba. The Minister of Justice continued to say :

The result is that throughout the whole province there is an overlapping. A Dominion constituency will have all round its borders an outstanding fringe consisting of portions of various surrounding provincial constituencies and in many instances the boundaries of the individual polling subdivisions in the provincial constituencies will not be coterminous with the boundaries of the Dominion constituency either.

The last part of the phrase is correct, but the first part is incorrect. I emphasize what I said before, that although hon. gentlemen opposite may not be disposed to accept any statements I may make, we on this side have the right to accept statements made by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) in explaining so important a measure. We have the right to expect that any such statements will be absolutely founded on facts, and consequently ought to be accepted. But what do we find? We find the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) saying :

The result is that throughout the whole province there is an overlapping. A Dominion constituency will have all round its borders an outstanding fringe consisting of portions of various surrounding provincial constituencies.

That statement is not correct. He went on to say :

Now, under the system of registration, as distinct from the system of preparing voters' lists with the assessment rolls as a basis, you have the voters' lists prepared for the various constituencies divided, not into polling subdivisions, but into registration districts, and the registration districts do not necessarily correspond with the polling subdivisions. They may or they may not do so, but the group of voters brought together by the registration check upon the one sheet of paper and certified to be qualified list of voters for a particular registration district consists, it may be, of men who vote in more than one polling subdivision.

Now, as a matter of fact, while it is not always the case that the registration districts correspond with the polling districts, I think that in the majority of cases they do, and that statement is not actually correct. In the majority of cases, in the majority of years, the registration districts absolutely correspond with the polling districts. I think I can safely make that statement, but you would gather from the language of the Minister of Justice that in very few cases they do. Further on, however, he makes a statement which rather contradicts that. He says :

The qualified list of voters for particular registration districts, consists, it may be, of men who vote in more than one polling subdivision.

That statement is misleading. A man cannot vote in more than one polling subdivision. It is a case of one man one vote. When a man has voted in one polling subdivision or electoral district, he cannot vote in another. Then the hon. minister goes on :

But more than that and worse than that, for the difficulty I am about to present, these voters are not in, I think I may safely say, the majority of instances, designated by the ownership of a particular piece of property.

That is hardly a fair statement either. I can show here voters' list after voters' list made up in 1897, and there are very few in which there is not the name of the township, range, section, post office and occupation. Then the minister continued :

In some cases, possibly in the greater number of cases, the voters' post office address is given, but in a great many instances, in a very large percentage of the voters' lists throughout the country, not even a post office is given, but simply the name of the man entitled to vote.

If the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) were really aware of the facts, he would never expect any one in this House or out of it, who knew anything about the matter, to accept such a statement. The cases in which only the man's name is given, without any lots, section, range or post office are exceedingly rare, and the statement is not a fair one to make in connection with the lists. The hon. minister referred to a man named Anderson, living at Louise Bridge, occupation a mason, and he said:

That is the identification of the voter, and that is the case in respect of all the names throughout the list. The voter's name, his post office and his occupation are given——

He made a different statement there :

—with no reference whatever to the property in respect of which he votes.

I call attention to that statement :

Or the exact place where he may live.

I want to tell the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) that a man does not vote in Manitoba in respect of any property. When the hon. minister made such a statement, either his intention must have been to mislead or he has never studied seriously the Manitoba Act and has been accepting blindly statements made to him by his hon. friends from that province. Here is the minister's statement :

With no reference whatever to the property in respect of which he votes.

But a man in Manitoba never votes in respect of property. There we have manhood suffrage. You are never asked whether you own any property or not.

Here comes a sentence, half a column in length, which I hope some one will be able to explain. It looks to me like a verification of the proverb that a drowning man catches at a straw. The Minister of Justice was trying to find some excuse why in 1908 this government should refuse to take the Manitoba Franchise Act—the very Act which they placed on the statute themselves. He was trying to find some excuse for going outside of that Act, and I propose to read the whole clause. I can make very little out of it:

I suppose it had not been thought of in 1898 or at any subsequent session of parliament. Possibly it was thought of in 1898 but considered not of practical importance for this reason: In 1898 the voters' lists in the province of Manitoba were not revised annually or at fixed times; they were revised whenever the Lieutenant Governor in Council so directed.

What innocent fellows they were in 1898! How little they were given to think what might happen in the future! But I have no doubt the whole thing was well thought out. Let me go on quoting the hon. minister's remarks which will show clearly that they thought it out:

Accordingly the legislation of this parliament, as passed in 1898, provided that whenever that was the case with the voters' lists of any particular province, these voters' lists should not necessarily be accepted for the purpose of elections to this House. Our statute at the present time continues to provide that where, under the laws of any province, the voters' lists for any particular electoral district or division are prepared, not at regular intervals, but at such times are fixed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, or by some other provincial or local authority, or only from time to time for the purpose of general or other elections in immediate contemplation, then the last preceding list shall be used, if it is less than a year old, but only in that event.

What the Minister of Justice, I think, was trying to point out was that surely they did not think they would be ever called upon to use the Manitoba lists. Well, granting that the province of Manitoba did not make out its lists more than once in four years, if there was an election once in three years, we would not have to use their lists, but we would any time in a year after they made up the lists. What I fail to see in his illustration is why we should not at all times adopt the lists made by the province of Manitoba.

If it is more than a year old the Dominion in that event prepares its own voters lists in the manner at present prescribed by the Dominion Elections Act and which has been on the statute-books since 1898. So that in 1898 when this legislation was passed repealing the old Franchise Act of 1885, Manitoba was not having annual revision of its lists, and was not in that sense affected by the Dominion legislation.

I say that in one year out of four it would be affected by the legislation of Manitoba.

But the provision of 1898, in the condition of things which then existed in Manitoba, was that the provincial lists of that province should be used for Dominion purposes only if there came a Dominion election when such lists were less than twelve months old, and that if such lists were at that time over twelve months old then the Dominion would prepare its own lists.

Now, he says:

That possibly is the explanation of the circumstance that no special provision was made in 1898 for the case of such overlapping as I have been describing.

Would not overlapping exist exactly the same in any way after the first year after the revision of the Manitoba lists? I say that argument is not clear nor is it a valid reason; it is not an argument that will appeal to members of this House or to the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) as a reason why in 1898 they did not foresee this state of affairs and why they are now introducing legislation trying to remedy it. The Minister of Justice went out of his way to refer, if he will pardon me for saying it, in an undignified way for a man in his position, to the manner in which we made up our lists. His language was more suited to the stump than to parliament. He said:

The Manitoba legislature provided by the statute of 1904, (repealing the provisions as to voters' lists which had theretofore existed in this province) that their registration should take place annually. It is true it was a sort of peculiar registration but it was what they called registration at all events.

I am prepared to prove to fair-minded men that we have not only 'a sort of registration,' but that we have a system of registration and a system of revision that for fairness and honesty and opportunity to Liberals and Conservatives alike to exercise their franchise is not excelled in any province. When the Minister of Justice sees fit to refer to our registration as a sort of registration he has failed to read and to be thoroughly seized of all that registration means in that country. He went on:

It was not registration preparing lists de novo by requiring each man who claimed the right to vote to appear before the official appointed for the purpose and state his claim, but it was the taking of the existing lists by the registration clerk and the adding to such lists or the revision of them on his part by making the changes which it might appear to be necessary. Accordingly we have the legislature of Manitoba in the spring of 1904, by

the enactment I have referred to, making their provincial voters' lists revisable at regular annual intervals and no longer, at only such times as should be fixed by the government of the province. The effect was at once to make this provision of our Elections Act which authorized the Dominion authorities to prepare lists for the province of Manitoba no longer applicable to Manitoba.

I would like to know how he can justify that statement. He goes on to refer to the registration of 1903 as being made solely and entirely for the provincial elections. I take no exception to that statement, that was the duty of the officials. He proceeded:

Under these circumstances they were not prepared by the officials who were engaged in the work with any idea of their being used in Dominion elections.

What should they do? What was the point he was trying to make? The duty of the provincial legislature was to make up a list for the provincial election and it is the duty of the Dominion government, according to their own laws, to take that list and use it for Dominion elections as they have always done.

They were not prepared in any way with reference to Dominion constituencies or Dominion polling subdivisions but with no other thought than the provincial limits I have mentioned.

I understand that this condition of affairs does not exist in Manitoba alone, that this overlapping, to which he must be referring here, exists in nearly every province. I know from reliable authority that it exists in Ontario, not only in the unorganized but also in the organized parts which this Bill will not touch.

The Minister proceeded to speak of the size of some of the constituencies, and said :

We were investigating specially at that time the conditions with regard to the three constituencies of Selkirk, Provencher and Macdonald and the size of these constituencies was stated to be in round figures: Selkirk, 100 miles wide by 210 miles in length; Provencher, 50 miles by 115 miles, and Macdonald, 80 miles by 86.

It could be proven that there are constituencies in this province just as large as that.

Suppose you had a constituency extending with regard to its width as far as from Toronto to Trenton, and so far as its length as far as from Toronto to Brockville, and you had a returning officer appointed for that whole territory, 100 miles one way and 210 miles in the other, and you place in his hands a series of voters' lists amounting to perhaps 4,000 or 5,000 voters in all, scattered over that territory, and with no other guide than at most the number of the lot and very probably with no other guide than the post office or possibly not even a post office, to enable him to say whether or not a particular voter is within these boundaries; why it is manifestly impossible that any man unless he has travelled from end to end of the province and from end to end of the constituency and unless he has a local knowledge greater far than the average citizen possesses, it is manifestly impossible that he would be able to do anything more than make one may say a guess, or secure such information as he could with reference to an individual and endeavour to make in that way lists which should be appropriate and legal for the purposes required.

That condition might exist in a very few outlying portions of Manitoba. Take the constituency of Selkirk. No doubt in the northern portion of that constituency there are some scattered voters, but when the hon. member for that constituency comes to speak I hope he will tell us how many people there are away up in the north and how many men have to travel 100 miles in order to register. There is no question that these cases are exceedingly exceptional.

The Minister of Justice, almost at the close of his speech, said :

I do not wish in the least to be misunderstood, and I assure you I am not in any degree blinking the situation, nor am I unwilling to take the fullest responsibility for the measure of redress as I believe this to be, which I am presenting to the House in the Bill now under consideration. Not only were there, in many instances throughout Manitoba the redistribution of names I have pointed out as absolutely requisite under this system of registration by registration districts, of these districts not corresponding to the boundaries of the Dominion constituency, but there was also a similar redistributing of names in cases where that was made requisite because of the Dominion returning officers subdividing polling divisions as they had existed for provincial purposes.

Here the Minister of Justice makes a statement not in agreement with the statements, to which I have referred, in the earlier portion of his address.

In many cases, the registration districts of the province, which were supposed to correspond with the polling divisions, and which, I presume, in the main did correspond.

That is a fair statement.

The polling subdivisions in southern Manitoba practically correspond with the immigration districts. Then you may ask why call them registration districts? I think there is a very fair explanation, when you are registering you are not polling, you register at a certain time, you poll at another time.

He does not say in every case. You would judge from the statement of the Minister of Justice to which I referred at the beginning, that they rarely if ever correspond ; but when he gets along this far he seems to have forgoten what he said

at first. He now says that they are supposed to correspond—'and which I presume in the main they did correspond ?'

Mr. MILLER. Is that your opinion, that in the main they did correspond ?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That is my opinion, that in the majority of cases the polling subdivisions correspond with the registration districts. For instance, this year and many other years they absolutely correspond. I think that is the rule. I do not think the provision that the registration clerk shall be appointed from every polling subdivision, is carried out in every case, but that is the principle upon which they appoint their registration clerks.

Now, this is not a matter of political differences; it is a matter of men entitled to vote being physically unable to record their votes between 9 and 5 o'clock on polling day, simply because they were too far distant from the pole to make the journey. . . In the whole province, I suppose, there is a matter of 50,000 names to be handled upon the voters' lists. I think, if you have 10 returning officers sent down with 50,000 names, 5,000 on the average for each one to distribute according to their proper polling subdivisions, to do that work in the four weeks that pass between the receipt of the writ and the receipt of these lists, and the polling day, to get together the necessary information and do the best they can—

I think I have proved that about four weeks was all that the Minister of Justice was going to give to do this work, and if it is impossible to do it in the four weeks, why is it impossible to do it in about six weeks given by the provincial government? It is about two months from the time the machinery starts until polling day. Then he goes on :

That that should take place, you have a condition of things that calls for a change, and calls for legislation in this parliament which would make it impossible, so far as human foresight can do so, that the same state of things should occur again; and that is the whole purpose of the legislation in question so far as this provision of it is concerned.

And further on :

Whatever the reason, the result has been that the time allowed for the revision in each year since then has been, according to the view at any rate of the one political party, entirely inadequate for the purpose. The statute requires notices of appeal from the registration clerk to be given within a certain number of days from the closing of the work of the registration clerk. The statute empowers the Lieutentant Governor in Council to fix the number of days upon which the revising officer, judge or barrister shall sit on his work, and when the day fixed by the proclamation for the concluding of that hearing of appeals or revising work is passed, there is no power on the part of the officer to continue his work, no matter how much may remain to be done and no matter how many appeals may remain unheard.

Now it does seem to me that this Act gives the revising officer, who, is the judge, the power mentioned by the Minister of Justice in this statement. I will read clause 61 of the Manitoba Act :

In order to give full and due effect to the powers of the board, the said board may provide for any proceeding, matter or thing for which express provision has not been herein made, or for which only partial provision has been made; or, where it shall be found that the time allowed to do any act is insufficient and an alteration or extension of such time, and any alteration of dates consequent thereon, shall appear to be necessary, the board may declare that such alteration shall be made, and thereupon the same shall be made and take effect accordingly.

Not being a lawyer, it seems to me that gives the revising officer, who is the judge, the power, if he thinks there is not sufficient time for the revision at any particular place, to extend the time. I would like the First Minister, if he has not examined that clause, to look into it.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. What is the date of the Act ?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. 1904, revised to 1906. If that has been changed, I am not aware of it, but I do not think that clause has been repealed :

It is alleged that such men are of one political party, that their names are left off right and left by the registration clerks, that their only means of getting on the list and obtaining the right to exercise their franchise is by appeal to the judge, and that the judge is given, it may be for a whole constituency, but one day between the hours of ten and five within which to do the work of days or weeks.

That is an unfair statement, I do not care who makes it. A challenge has been thrown out by a Winnipeg paper, which covers past time, that $25 will be paid for every man our adversaries can find who, being a legally qualified voter, has presented himself to the registration clerk in Manitoba and has been refused the right to have his name put on the list. That challenge has been printed and sent abroad, and I intend to quote it before I am through. Now the Minister of Justice was not making a fair statement when he said that these men are of one political party and their names are left off right and left. I make the statement that the Liberals in the province of Manitoba, and I challenge contradiction, have absolutely the same opportunity and the same privilege of getting on the voters' lists as the Conservatives. When the Minister of Justice says that the judge has only one day between the hours of 10 and 5 to do the work, he is in error, perhaps it is a clerical error, because the actual time is from 11 to 6. However, that shows

what I have been trying to prove, that the Minister of Justice did not make himself very familiar with the Manitoba Act before he attempted to discuss it, when he introduced this Bill on the 9th of March. He says :

In the constituencies of Kildonan and St. Andrew's—

That may be an error of 'Hansard,' because Kildonan and St. Andrew's are all in one constituency.

But without questioning what the merits or demerits of the provincial system may be, I say that it is manifest that any system, no matter how good, may be administered that it will be oppressive and unjust, and that there is at any rate ground for complaint that the present system in Manitoba as at present administered in the preparation of the voters' lists, is an engine of tyranny——

That is the definition given by the Minister of Justice to this House of an Act in the province of Manitoba which can be absolutely proven to be fair.

—and oppression as against the party that is opposed to the provincial government.

That is a statement which is absolutely unfair, to say the least.

In the condition which now exists in Manitoba, with voters' lists which were prepared more than five years ago, with voters' lists that have never been since that time effectively revised, with voters' lists therefore that contain the names of hundreds of men who are either dead or departed from the province, we have lists that need revision.

The man on the street would infer from the remarks of the hon. Minister of Justice that since 1904 we had never had a revision of the lists when, as a matter of fact, every year the names of dead men and absentees are taken from the list, the lists are verified and the names of men who have come of age or who have come to the province during the year are added to the list. Is it any wonder, after reading over the remarks of the Minister of Justice, that I made the statement which I did at the beginning of my speech ?

We have lists that ought to be submitted to the work of a revising officer, a county judge or a barrister according to the Manitoba system, with time given him within which he can effectively do that work——

Will the Prime Minister tell me how he is going to get time to do that work if he has not time now ? He is going to begin to put the machinery in operation after the issuing of the writ, and if so it is absolutely impossible for him to do that work and the Minister of Justice failed to explain that when stating the objects of his Bill.

—of revision, within which he can effectively purge the lists of dead men and of absentees, the presence of which upon these lists is but an invitation and a temptation to impersonation.

I suppose there has never been any impersonation going on in the province of Ontario. I am not going to refer to that to-day, but I think we have very good evidence that the impersonation has not all been in the province of Manitoba.

We have lists from which the names of hundreds of men in Manitoba are absent—hundreds of men who, whether rightly or wrongly, claim the right to be upon those lists, and the right to exercise their franchise; men who claim at any rate that they have been prevented from having their claims adjudicated by the insufficiency of the time allowed under the statute for the purpose of revision.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are all the remarks that I have to make in connection with the speech of the Minister of Justice. I have tried to be fair. I have read his words and, in finishing my references to the Minister of Justice, I repeat the statement that I made at the outset, that his remarks were very unfair. They were unfair to his own people. The members on the other side of the House had a right to expect a fair definition of this Bill from the Minister of Justice, and I have tried to prove that his statements are not statements that can be borne out by the facts.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. When the House rose at six o'clock, I had finished dealing with what I believe to have been the unfair exposition made by the Minister of Justice of the provisions of the Manitoba Franchise Act. Let me point out that when this government saw fit to make a new franchise Act in 1898, they found the boundaries of the federal districts coterminous with those of the provincial districts all over Canada. It has been argued by gentlemen on the other side that this condition does not exist to-day. But if it does not exist it is because this present federal government changed the boundaries of the federal electoral districts, and it is they who are to blame. The great underlying principle of the Manitoba Franchise Act of 1903, was a personal registration. The present Manitoba government was impressed with the fact that personal registration was the fairest way to compile a voters' list and so they adopted that principle. They came to power in 1899, but they did not change the Election Act until 1903. The Roblin government believed that the law in force when they came to power was most unfair in the manner in which it provided for the preparation of the voters' lists, and the best evidence that it was unfair is the very large number of names

which the Conservatives of Manitoba at great expense and labour had removed from these lists. In 1899, 1,925 names were added to the lists and 5,446 names were stricken off by the court of revision. The Conservative party achieved this end at the cost of a great deal of money and a great deal of labour, but the results were successful and money expended in cleansing these lists was not wasted because we were able to defeat the Greenway government which had inflicted such a Franchise Act on the province. Let me show the contract in the city of Winnipeg alone between the results of the revision on the Greenway Franchise Act lists as compared with the results under the legislation of the Conservative party. In 1899, there were but three electoral divisions in the city of Winnipeg and in Winnipeg centre we got 971 names removed from the lists, in Winnipeg north 649 names, and in Winnipeg south, 909 names removed or a total of 2,529. In view of these figures I do not think it requires much argument on my part to prove that these lists were stuffed. Then the Conservative government provided for personal registration and this was the result: In 1904 in Winnipeg centre, ten names were stricken off by the court of revision, in Winnipeg north, nineteen names, and in Winnipeg south twenty-five names, or fifty-four names in all, as compared with 2,529 when our Liberal friends made up the electoral lists. In 1905, ninety-three names were removed from the list in Winnipeg centre, fifty-eight names in Winnipeg north and sixty-seven names in Winnipeg south or a total of 218. In 1907, there were four divisions in Winnipeg and in Winnipeg centre thirteen names were removed from the list, in Winnipeg north, seventeen, in Winnipeg south five, and in Winnipeg west twenty-one, or a total of fifty-six. These facts will prove the difference between the lists prepared under the Greenway government and the lists prepared under the Roblin government, and the contrast is not creditable at all to the Greenway Franchise Act. I shall cite to the House some statements dealing with the question of voters' lists made up from the municipal assessment roll as compared with lists which are made up from personal registration. I shall quote from the 'Free Press' which is not only a Liberal paper but which in my opinion is a paper controlled by the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton).

I may say in passing that the very best evidence of that is to be found in a recent occurrence in the city of Winnipeg, when we were told that the present member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) was solicited to become a candidate for that city. I do not think there is very much doubt in the mind of anybody in the western province that that article was inspired by the hon. member for Brandon himself. We could get any amount of evidence that this paper is under the control of that hon. gentleman and is practically owned by him, and this is the paper from which I quote. On June 11, 1892, the 'Free Press' made these remarks:

The registration clerk at Morris has compiled a fraudulent list in the interests of the government, most probably at the direct instance of the government, and doubtless in the expectation that his rascally work would be aided and abetted by the revising officers. The registration clerk in Beautiful Plains in suspicious harmony with the action of his Morris confrère, has deliberately refused to enter a large number of names that have been lawfully tendered him.

Now, I would like any hon. gentleman opposite or anybody else to prove that any man qualified to be placed on the voters' list in Manitoba has ever been refused. We have a challenge to that effect; so there is an opening for any man to make some money. If he can show that there are any such he can get $25 for each case.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Is that a retroactive challenge?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Yes, and I will place it retroactively on 'Hansard' before I get through.

Mr. KNOWLES. May I ask the hon. gentleman if that offer would hold good in law or is it only a bluff?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I am not a lawyer. There is the challenge made openly.

Mr. KNOWLES. The hon. gentleman knows that a promise made without consideration does not amount to a snap of the fingers.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I claim that it has the fullest consideration, knowing well the facts on which it is founded. There is the challenge, and if the hon. gentleman wants to make $25—I know he does not need it—or $100, let him get four cases and then he can prove whether it is legal or not.

Mr. KNOWLES. I would just like to say, lest it might be misunderstood before the country, that the hon. gentleman's statement that I do not need $25 is about as true as anything else he has said to-night.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. If you cannot make it, that is pretty good proof that you cannot find a case. The challenge is as open to my hon. friend as to any other citizen of Canada. The 'Free Press' goes on to say:

These registration clerks, who are appointed to perform the necessary clerical labour in preparing the lists are assuming the function of the revising officers and deciding for themselves what names shall go on. They are doing this, not because they believe they have any right or judgment in the matter, but because, if they were not to do it, there would be no opportunity to play their tricks and bedevil the lists. They are forced to take

upon themselves the authority of revising officers, in addition to their own, in order that they might decide against the reception of names now and again in order to weaken the enemy. If the lists are to be stuffed and otherwise manipulated, it must be done in the preliminary stages of registration. Clerks who are up to what is expected of them must, therefore, refuse applications, even if attested by affidavit, while there is absolutely no check whatever except their own consciences, to the addition of improper names. Such work as this could not be left to the revising officers. The lists must be doctored before they reach the court of revision; hence the necessity for unscrupulous clerks who do not hesitate to usurp the functions of a court, supposed to be established for the purpose of insuring honest lists. The Act never contemplated that discretionary powers, such as we have seen exercised, should be given the registration clerks. Their duty is to enter all names known to themselves as qualified electors and to receive and enter all applications supported by affidavit.

Should there be any errors in the preparation of the lists, the work of rectifying them belongs to the revising officers who are appointed for that sole special purpose. This is the plain meaning of the Act, and it is impossible that registration clerks or any others can mistake it. The fact, therefore, that clerks have gone out of their road to doctor the lists is evidence of fraudulent intent.

Let the opposition everywhere be vigilant against these frauds. It is an outrage that they should be thus forced into the defence of their rights, rights that should never be assailed. But so it is; and until better methods prevail they must make the best of it. Should there be the least disposition on the part of the revising officers to refuse them the amplest justice, then, if they be men determined not to be trampled upon, they will know how to protect themselves. Fraudulent lists must be purged, let the cost be what it will.

I can assure you, as I stated a little while ago, that it cost the Conservative party thousands of dollars to perfect that list. Under date of June 13, 1892, the 'Free Press' published the following warning to electors under large headlines :

The number of electors left off the list in Winnipeg is simply alarming. Immediate attention is necessary if you wish to vote.

In the 'Free Press' issue of June 14 a list of electors left off in South Winnipeg aggregating 500 names is published. In the issue of June 15, Winnipeg Centre list is published, showing 750 names left off the list. In the issue of June 16, Winnipeg North lists are published,showing 500 names left off, or aggregating 1,700 names left off the lists of three Winnipegs. Here are some editorial comments made in the 'Free Press' of June 13, 1892, in reference to the constituency of Beautiful Plains :

This is the way in which the 'Neepawa Register' independent if not neutral in local politics, speaks of the Beautiful Plains list: 'The voters' lists for Beautiful Plains are out. Much has been said against them, and, in all conscience, they are bad enough, though not as iniquitous as at first reported. It would appear that the registration clerk lent his influence to elect Mr. Crawford by an unfair compilation of the lists. Members of Mr. Davidson's committee inform us that between seventy-five and eighty names have been left off. It is said that eighteen such names have been omitted in Neepawa, while there are names in both town and country that have no right to be there.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What was the result of the election at that time?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I am not prepared to say. Then, here are some editorial extracts from the 'Free Press' of July 8, 1892 :

Have we not an Election Act passed at the sacrifice of principle and intended to give a dishonest advantage to the party in power? Did we not see in that surreptitious amendment to 'The Real Property Act' last session, and in the brazen falsehoods over the public accounts, and in that asylum bread contract, how unscrupulous individual members of it are ready to serve a political friend or to advance their own political interests ? Go back over the whole four years and sum it up, and you will see with us that this government has been dishonest all through and will continue to be dishonest if we give it our votes.

The question has been discussed in this House as to which was the better way to make up a voters' list—by adopting municipal registration or by adopting the principle of personal registration. On that subject the Toronto 'Globe' of July 22, 1892, said this :

The system of compiling voters' lists in Ontario under the recent 'Manhood Suffrage Act' has broken down. This is the testimony of the Toronto 'Globe.' The making of the lists is left to the assessors and clerks of the municipalities.

In small towns and municipalities the system works out all right. It is when tested in the larger centres of population that it proves to be a failure. To illustrate, it is estimated that in Toronto there are 8,000 appeals made in behalf of citizens whose names were left off the lists compiled a few weeks ago. These appeals involved a great deal of labour and not a little expense, and they go for nothing three years out of four, unless there happens to be a bye-election. There is no finality, says the 'Globe,' for judging from the past the list for next year must be gone over in the same way. And it adds: there is an easy way out of all this. Let the active party men, instead of trying to gain advantage over each other, often by questionable means, in preparation of the lists, join hands in advocating a system that will make it easy to compile the lists and give no advantage to either party.

That is what I claim we have in Manitoba —a list that gives the same identical advantages to either party, whether Grit or Tory. What does it say ?

A scheme of personal registration is needed. Every year, before the preparation of the lists, the city clerk should be empowered to open offices in each of the six wards of the city, and there electors who desire to vote could sign their names and addresses, at the same time making declaration as to their qualifications.

I have here an extract from the 'Free Press' of October 24, 1895:

In more than as many days Mr. Moffett, registration clerk for the electoral division of South Winnipeg, has received not more than fifteen applications to be registered as voters on the list that is now being prepared. In the other divisions the number of applications is not estimated, but both the clerks agree in saying that there is little or no interest manifested. If this is the condition of things in Winnipeg, where registration is so convenient we can hardly imagine what it is in rural constituencies, where the farmers are overrun with work and the conveniences are by no means so great. The effect of this apathy is to leave the entire work of compilation in the hands of the registration clerks.

And the registration system of the Greenway government worked out in that way. The registration was practically left in the hands of the registration clerks. Even when the registration closed any particular day, there would be hundreds of names handed in to the registration clerk—something which cannot occur to-day. I intend to prove how that cannot occur to-day before I take my seat:

The entire work of compilation is in the hands of the registration clerks, who can put on or take off whatever names they please. It may be said that this is the fault of the electors themselves, who can attend and see that their names are duly registered as they wish. This is quite true, but it is primarily the fault of the law which encourages the electors to believe that somehow or other their names will be registered as voters without the necessity of any trouble on their part.

That condition cannot exist to-day. The elector absolutely knows that the only way his name can get on the list and he can become a voter is by attending the registration and applying to have his name put on. If he is ill or absent from the country, there are forms for registering; but the House will agree that there are not many of these cases. The great bulk of the men who are on the voters' lists in Manitoba are men who have personally signed and registered on the day or days of registration.

The government takes those lists into their own hands by appointing registration clerks who are to compile them by providing that they shall be made up of former lists, Dominion lists, assessment rolls and other available sources of every description. They virtually invite the electors to leave the whole matter with the registration clerks.

So says the Winnipeg 'Free Press':

The whole principle is wrong. The government in the first place should have no connection with the lists. All registration should be made on the voluntary application from the voters themselves.

That is what the 'Free Press' wanted and that is what we have got. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway), who was then first minister of Manitoba, had something to say about this. The 'Free Press' of January 14, 1896, had this to say on the Greenway Election Act:

The provincial election will be over in a day or two. When the legislature is called for the despatch of business, as it will be in a very short time, it could not do better than remove from the province the reproach of the present election law, so far as it has to do with the voters' lists. Mr. Greenway has induced a party franchise scheme. When an election is pending, he sends his party friends into a constituency to act as registrars. These party friends collect the names of voters, and if there is any objection to the lists thus prepared, the voter has the right to appeal to another member of the Liberal association.

That means simply this, that they are not only to be registrars but are also to be revisers appointed by the party:

—appeal to another member of a Liberal association except where a judge revises the lists and any such cases are rare.

I would have expected the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) to be in favour of this as the basis upon which the lists are founded, namely, municipal assessment work. Mr. Greenway would now have the voters' lists compiled by municipal clerks. In the Liberal platform adopted March 24, 1903, the following is stated:

We declare in favour of a simple method of preparing the voters' lists, to be based upon the lists of resident ratepayers compiled by the municipal authorities and supplemented by personal registration.

That is what the liberal party and the Greenway government said when they adopted their platform of 1903, but that does not seem consistent with the views expressed by the hon. member for Lisgar some years before:

It has always been the desire of the Liberal party to leave the preparation of the voters' list in the hands of the municipal clerk, and although the compilation of the lists in 1888 by enumerators had been satisfactory, it was determined in 1889 to introduce a measure providing that the work should be done by municipal clerks. This act was passed in 1889. The lists throughout the provinces in 1889 are made up from the municipal lists which were compiled by the municipal clerks. The result was that the lists were, almost without exception, utterly bad. They contain a multitude of names which should not have appeared, and the residents who were not owners or tenants of real estate were left off in wholesale numbers. There is hardly a constituency in the province in which an examination of the lists of electors made up under the Act of 1889 will not show that it is the most in-

correct and defective list ever made up for legislative elections for the territory which it covers. Fortunately there was only one election (Portage la Prairie) held upon the lists of 1899. It was found also that work of getting proper returns from the municipal clerks was so slow and unsatisfactory that in a great many cases the list of 1889 was not completed and revised until 1890. The Portage la Prairie list for 1889, for instance, was not completed until April 30, too late to be used for the municipal elections of 1889 (the municipal and legislative lists being compiled together.) The experiment of having municipal clerks compile voters' lists for legislative purposes was thus given a fair trial, and turned out a dismal failure.

Mr. Greenway also, on the floor of the legislature in 1901, denounced such a system on the ground that it would tend to introduce party politics in the municipal affairs. That was a very good argument. My Conservative friends do not always agree with me, but that makes no difference and we can agree that municipal interests should not be mixed up with either local or federal politics. I believe that our municipal elections should be on an absolutely independent basis, and should have no connection with either federal or provincial politics—and in that I believe Mr. Greenway agrees with me.

The present Act passed by the Roblin government has been given a trial and everywhere the best opinion is that it is the fairest and most impartial piece of legislation ever enacted and placed upon a statute-book. The preparation of the list is entirely removed from government control and influence.

It is only fair to say that that statement probably refers to the Act of 1903, to which I shall refer at greater length a little later on.

The county court judges have the appointment of the registration clerks and revising officers; and non-partisans are selected. The result is that an honest expression of the people on the acts of the government in power is possible. Dead men and absentees have banished from the list.

We can make that statement with confidence from this side of the House. The list as it is revised from year to year in Manitoba is practically free from dead men and absentees. You cannot say that there will not be on it the names of some who are dead as deaths may have occurred since the revision was made, but the principle of the Bill remains the same, to give a clean list, a list which is not stuffed and a list free from the names of dead men and absentees. That is one of the great principles of the existing Manitoba Act.

This government is trying to take particular pains in the little province of Manitoba to do away with that list and to substitute for it a Bill that, according to the Minister of Justice himself, gives only, about four weeks to inaugurate all the machinery necessary to conduct an election in that province. There seems to be a misapprehension on the part of some members. I heard a very intelligent member say today that he thought, even after all we have said, that the judges do not revise our lists, that they are revised by other officers and that the judges came in only on an appeal from the revising officers to the judge. That absolutely is not the case, and I want to make it very clear that the only people who revise the lists in our province are judges or barristers of three years' standing who are appointed by the judges. The government have absolutely nothing to do with the appointment of revising officers.

Mr. D. ROSS. If that is so now, how does the present Bill change it ?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The government is to appoint its own officers.

Mr. D. ROSS. As I understand the Bill it does not in any way affect the revising officers in each province.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Here is what it says :

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein contained, voters' lists for the portions of the province of Ontario and Quebec which consist of territory not municipally organized and where there is no regular assessment or valuation roll upon which voters' lists are based and for the several electoral districts in the provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia shall be prepared immediately after the issue of any writ for an election in any such electoral district or in any electoral district composed or partly composed of such territory: or at any time when the Governor in Council so directs; and for the purpose of preparing and giving effect to such voters' lists the Governor in Council——

That is the Dominion Governor in Council :

--may appoint all necessary officers and confer upon them all necessary powers.

The great trouble I find with the hon. gentlemen opposite, from the Minister of Justice down, is that they have not made themselves conversant with the Manitoba laws of to-day. I would recommend them to spend a night or even a Sunday in studying them.

I wish to deal with some of the statements of my friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford). He is not a drinking man—I do not want to be unparliamentary—but I know he always keeps his head ; therefore I wondered that an intelligent man such as I believe him to be would make such statements as he has made. I hope and I believe that I can confound him if I do not dumbfound him out of his own mouth. He started off by saying :

The judges have no control over the courts of revision.

Is there any other Liberal who would like to make that statement.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I repeat the statement that the judges have no control over the time fixed for revision; that is, the order in council passed by the Manitoba government fixes the dates on which the judges sit and the hours they shall sit; and no business done outside of those hours is acceptable to the government of Manitoba; if anything is done by the judges outside of those hours it is declared invalid and not allowed to go into force.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I did not know what was away back in the deeper recesses of the hon. gentleman's mind. Here is what he said as reported in 'Hansard':

The judges have no control over the courts of revision——

A statement which is absolutely not borne out by the facts. The judges have full control over the court of revision in almost every respect. I drew the attention of the hon. member for Selkirk to that to-day and quoted section 61 of our Act. He was surprised and did not believe that section was there.

Mr. D. ROSS. Have the judges power over the time and place of sitting of the court of revision in Manitoba?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Here is another gentleman to whom I shall have to give some information. Here is clause 61:

In order to give full and due effect to the power of the board——

That is the registration board which is composed of judges and no others.

—the said board may provide for any proceeding, matter or thing for which express provision has not herein been made or for which only partial provision has been made; or where it shall be found that the time allowed to do any act is insufficient and the alteration or extension of such time and any alteration of dates consequent thereon shall appear to be necessary, the board may declare that such alteration shall be made and thereupon the same shall be made and take effect accordingly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The executive council of the province of Manitoba have power to fix the dates, places and times at which the court of revision shall sit, and the clause which provides for that is section 22. subsection 3, from which the hon. gentleman has quoted.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I am not quoting from any subsection at all.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then you had better get the Act.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I have the Act, and I will pass it over to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SCHAFFNER.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am quoting from the Election Act of Manitoba, subsection 3 of section 22:

The date——

That is to fix the date:

—or dates on, the place or places at, and the hours between, which applications for registration and the correction and striking off names of electors will be received and shall be concluded in each electoral division.

Now section 65, subsection 11:

The revising officer shall also receive and deal with the applications of all persons to be registered as electors who shall be present at the time fixed for the closing of the court of revision, notwithstanding that the time so fixed shall have elapsed.

It does not allow for dealing with the polls after the hour fixed by order in council. Following that up, the Attorney General of Manitoba, where there were thirty-eight names added to one poll after the hour provided by the statute, struck those names off the voters' list and disfranchised the whole thirty-eight voters.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I have already read section 61 which was revised up to 1908, so that is about as late as we can get it. I will read the clause again for the benefit of the hon. gentleman:

In order to give full and due effect to the powers of the board, the said board may provide for any proceeding, matter or thing for which express provision has not been herein made, or for which only partial provision has been made; or, where it shall be found that the time allowed to do any act is insufficient and an alteration or extension of such time, and any alteration of dates consequent thereon, shall appear to be necessary, the board may declare that such alteration may be made, and thereupon the same shall be made and take effect accordingly.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. In what year was that clause passed?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. In 1904, re-enacted in 1908, and has never been removed. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish again to refer to some remarks of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford). I have been able to stir him up already. His statement that the judges will have no control over the court of revision is absolutely not borne out by the facts. This is what the hon. member says:

While I do not approve of the Manitoba law in its entirety . . . the greatest trouble we have in that province lies in the administration of the law.

He there admits that we have a good law.

The time allowed by the executive council of Manitoba to revise the list is five hours in the day, from one to six o'clock p.m.

He is speaking there of Beautiful Plains. Now this hon. gentleman and many other hon. gentlemen have tried to create the impression that from one o'clock until six in the evening was all the time allowed for revision. Now let me inform the House that in Manitoba we have forty-one constituencies, and in every one of them with the exception of six. the time allowed for revision is from 11 o'clock until 6 o'clock, without any intermission. Now we have heard some one talking about two hours. There may have been some years individual cases of so short a time, I will not say there are not, but I do say that if hon. gentlemen opposite want to be fair they will state the rule and state the exception. I am not saying that in every place the time is from 11 o'clock till 6, but I am saying that with the exception of six constituencies the time is from 11 o'clock until 6. Now the hon. gentleman makes another announcement, speaking of Beautiful Plains :

> Only during those five hours can the judge act in connection with the revision of the lists.

I have read from the Act to show that if the revision was not completed within the time fixed by the statute, the officials had full power to extend the time until the revision was completed. Then the hon. gentleman speaks in connection with the polling subdivisions. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) stated that the Hon. Mr. Mickle who leads the opposition, spoke favourably of our list. So he did; and I say that in the local legislature of Manitoba not a single member of the opposition has ever introduced an amendment to that Election Act during all the time the Roblin government has been in power. The hon. gentleman from Portage la Prairie said this :

> That law Mr. Mickle, I think, approved of, and I am prepared to-night to say that the provisions of that law met my views more completely than any other law that I know of with reference to the preparation of the voters' lists. It was practically independent of any political or partisan manipulation; it was free from it altogether. But that did not suit our Tory friends.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is that the law we have got to-day?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. No, and I am going to explain that the statement made by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie was absolutely astray from the facts. He says that that Act was entirely done away with —those were his words—'That Act was entirely done away with.' I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether it was entirely done away with or not. There were some changes, but when an hon. gentleman stands up and makes a sweeping assertion like that he ought to be able to back it up and I claim that he cannot back it up because it is not in accordance with the facts and I propose to prove it. I would like to know if, in the Act that we have to-day, the same great underlying of principle of personal registration does not exist. That was the great principle underlying the Act of 1903. Have we made any change in the blank forms that we use and which I propose to put on record ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. How many sections of the Act were repealed ?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That is begging the question. The hon. gentleman's statement was that it was entirely swept off the statute-book.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to make an explanation now.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. You want to make an explanation ? There is your statement.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The question was as to whether the principle of the Act of 1903 had been entirely wiped out. I say so now.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I say again that I do not know what is away back in the deep recesses of the hon. gentleman's mind, but I must take what he says to the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Sixty-eight sections were repealed.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That is not what you say here. Why do you not say what you said in the House before ? The hon. gentleman said that the Act was swept off the statute-book and I say that such a statement is not a fact, that the great principle of personal registration was initiated then and exists to-day. I say that the blank forms that were used for putting men on the list, for putting men off the lists, for absentees, for illness or any of those things, remain to-day on the statute-book the same as they were in 1903. To-day we have revision by judges. It was by judges in 1903. These are the most important provisions of the statute. There was no repeal at that time of the clauses providing for a revision by judges and there is no repeal to-day. Yet the hon. member for Portage la Prairie says that the Roblin government completely wiped the legislation of 1903 off the statute-book. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie was delighted with our law of 1903. Mr. Mickle, the leader of the opposition, was also delighted with it. The law of 1903, the hon. gentleman says, gave the Liberal the same opportunity as the Tory and that the lists were based upon the principle of personal registration. It was at that time that we did away with the old Greenway Act and introduced a Conservative Act providing for personal registration in making up the voters' lists. I have proved, I think, out of the mouth of the hon. gentleman himself, that the great bulk of the names, numbering 50,000 or 60,000,

were put upon the lists under a fair law which met with the approval of the leader of the opposition in Manitoba, Mr. Mickle, and my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie. It is wonderful that the hon. member for Portage la Prairie should get up and confess what a grand law this is and then proceed to find fault with it. The hon. gentleman tried to make some point out of the number of days that we give for registration now as compared with the number of days that were given for registration in 1903. I will just take three lists. As the Minister of Justice said the other day, I just happened to pick up these three lists. One is for the electoral division of Beautiful Plains, one is for the electoral division of Avondale and the third is for the electoral division of Mountain. My hon. friends on the other side of the House have tried to show that according to this Act of 1903 there was lots of time given for registration, that there was a whole week, six days, and that there was a registration clerk placed in each one of these registration divisions, which is absolutely correct. But, I ask the House to consider this. What had we to do then ? We had an absolutely new list to make out. Every voter in the province, no matter how long he had lived there, had to go and register. But, he is not required to do that again. When we made our annual revisions after that it was only the man who had become of age or the man who had come from England or some other place and had become qualified by residence, whose name had to be added to those lists. It would not have been just to have put the country to the expense of having a whole week of registration and a large number of men employed in order to add a few names. That would be absolutely ridiculous. But, this shows the unfair way in which some hon. gentlemen on the other side have tried to present this fact to the country. They have sought to show that our Act was unfair because in 1903 we gave six days and six clerks for registration, whereas, we now only give one day and one clerk in each place. Now, let us take the case of Beautiful Plains. I think my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie will agree with me that in Manitoba there are not any more, if any, qualified voters in a local electoral district to-day than there were in 1903. There have been changes no doubt, but Manitoba to-day is a comparatively old settled place and it is almost a question if there are not as many voters going to Alberta and Saskatchewan as there are going from any electoral division in Ontario. So, I think I will not be contradicted by any hon. gentleman opposite when I say that there is about the same number of voters on the lists to-day as there was in 1903. In 1903, when they were made up by personal registration, we had, in Beautiful Plains, to add over 2,000 names —2,002. How many did we have to add in 1907 ? We had to add 188. I will ask any hon. gentlemen if we required as many days and as many registration clerks to add 188 names as we did to add 2,000 ? That is the way it works out. In Beautiful Plains in 1903 there were 96 days which, if you work it out, will give an average of 21 names per day.

In 1907 there would only be 17 per day, which proves conclusively that if we had as many days and as many registry clerks these gentlemen opposite would be the very first to complain about the terrible expense involved. Let me point out that in Avondale in 1903 they had to register 1,547 names and in 1907 they had to register only 147. Carried out in the same way it proves beyond doubt that there is every opportunity given at the present time to every man who wants to register. In the electoral division of Mountain there were 2,303 names added in 1903 when we had six days and six clerks, and in 1907 there were only 158 added. Will any one attempt to argue from these facts that the Manitoba government is not doing its duty in reducing the number of days and the number of registration clerks ? The Minister of Justice stated that the voters on the electoral lists in Manitoba were not properly designated. I can get the lists of all the electoral divisions. I have a large number of them here, and I don't think these gentlemen opposite can find a dozen names after which the occupation, the section, the range, the township, and the post office address is not given. I think that is a pretty fair description of a voter. I don't believe that any law we could place on the statute-book would be perfect, but comparing this Bill which is now proposed to us with the splendid system in the province of Manitoba, I should think the Bill we are discussing is about as imperfect a thing as could be produced. Let us see the days and hours on which the registration clerks of the different electoral districts of Manitoba will be at work in the registration which will take place in a few days. In the electoral division of Arthur they have eight days, in Assinaboine, 10 days, Avondale, 6 days, Beautiful Plains 11 days —the government have been so good to the hon. gentleman from Beautiful Plains (Mr. Crawford) that they have given him 3 days in the town of Neepawa in which to register the names—Birtle 6 days, Carron 11 days, Dauphin 15 days, Deloraine 10 days, Dufferin 14 days.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you mean the office is held open that many days ?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. In every electoral district the number of days which I give are the days on which new men who are not on the list have an opportunity to register.

Mr. CARVELL. This year ?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. This year.

Mr. CARVELL. Does that mean consecutive days ?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. They are consecutive days.

Mr. CARVELL. Does that mean that the clerk opens his court and keeps it open for 10 or 14 days consecutively in the one place?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I did not say that and it would be very unfair if he did so because that would mean that the voters would have a long way to go to register and there would then be some reason for hon. gentlemen opposite to protest. The registration clerk moves around the different parts of the local constituencies to make it convenient for the voters to register and the great aim and desire of the Manitoba government is to give a fair and honest and consistent voters' list.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Will the hon. gentleman tell the House in what year they made these decided improvements in the operation of the Elections Act ?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That question is about as irrelevant as many other questions asked by the hon. gentleman, but I would answer that they do not do that every year although they do it a great many years. This is not the first year by any means that it has been carried out. In a year when there is no idea of having either a provincial or a Dominion election it might not be made quite as complete but I am giving you the operation of the law as it is at the present time. In Emmerson they have 12 days, in Gilbert Plains 21 days,—Gilbert Plains is a rather large constituency and they give the voters in the outlying district an opportunity to register—Gimli 21 days, Gladstone 20 days, Hamiota 9 days, Kildonan and St. Andrews 13 days, Killarney 10 days, Lakeside 9 days, Lansdowne 21 days, Manitou 11 days, Minnedosa 16 days, Morden 10 days, Morris 11 days, Portage la Prairie 6 days, Rhineland 6 days, Rockwood 12 days, Russel 14 days, St. Boniface 10 days, South Brandon 9 days, Springfield 12 days, Turtle Mountain 11 days and Virden 8 days. These are the number of days which the provincial government gives the people to register their votes in each constituency this year. Hon. gentlemen opposite have also tried to show that the registration office is open only a few hours during the day, but let us see how that works out. The Manitoba government gives the people 392 days in which to register their votes this year and in that whole number there are only three days in which there is not full time allowed. Surely gentlemen opposite are catching at straws when they are forced to have recourse to such an argument to discredit the Manitoba Act and to bolster up this diabolical thing we have presented to us here as a franchise Act. In one of these three days there is 7 hours allowed, in one 6 hours, and in the other 4 hours. You cannot find a two-hour business from top to bottom. In all the 392 cases except 3 the full time is given, if I am not mistaken—from nine to twelve and from one to six. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie says :

In the local division from which I come they established sixteen registration places appointing a registration clerk for each of these sixteen registration places. These registration clerks had to receive applications there for one whole week, from Monday morning May 25, until Saturday night May 30, and the hours were from 9 a.m. to 10 p.m., giving ample time for the people to register. They were not confined to a couple of hours as has been the case in the last few years or to half a day, but they were allowed six days and sixteen registration places in my constituency.

The hon. gentleman referred to the challenge which appeared in the 'Winnipeg Telegram.' Now, I propose to put this challenge on 'Hansard' :

Another Challenge.

The Bole affidavits were designed to back up the plea that Liberal electors have not had a fair deal in the past. The 'Telegram' has as much faith in the fairness and impartiality of the lists which have been prepared in the past under the existing Manitoba Election Act as it has in the belief that the coming preparation of the lists will be conducted fairly. Firm in this confidence the 'Telegram' will pay $25 to any qualified elector, who not being on the voters' lists and applying in the regular manner was refused the right to register in the last revision of the Manitoba voters' list. Moreover the 'Telegram' is willing, if any claim or claims be made to have them decided by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, from whose decision there shall be no appeal.

So much for the coming registration. Our Liberal friends were not satisfied with that. They wanted a retroactive challenge, and here is the retroactive one—I am sorry the Prime Minister is not in his seat :

A Fair Offer.

The 'Telegram' will pay the sum of $25 to any elector in the province of Manitoba who is not already on the voters' lists who is refused registration if he applies in the regular manner and is legally qualified to vote under our law. Should any claim or claims be made under this offer each case to be referred to Hon. C. J. Mickle, leader of His Majesty's loyal opposition in the Manitoba legislature from whose decision there shall be no appeal. Should any award be made, one half the amount is to be paid to the elector who has been refused registration and the other half to the Winnipeg General hospital.

If we ever got the present Bill on the statute-book, which we never shall, I wonder if any challenge like that would be given. It could not be given, for the reason that it would be absolutely impossible in the time designated in this Bill to properly revise the lists.

Before I take my seat I cannot help referring to the thin red line. Our good friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) undertook to read out of a book something about Mr. Leach, the gentleman to whom the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) gave such a splendid character the other day. He started to read an anecdote ; it read like a novel ; and I wanted him to continue it ; but as he would not do so, I am going to complete the document. I will make him the best believer in the Manitoba voters' list that we have in Manitoba :

In Manitoba as elsewhere, the original election lists are prepared under provincial law. Those for 1904 were reprinted at the bureau at Ottawa for the Dominion elections and sent to the returning officers. A number of these officers turned over the lists to Mr. Leach in Winnipeg.

The hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. member for Portage la Prairie tried to read into the evidence of Mr. Knott, who was down here from Winnipeg giving evidence, that he had said that that was a legal Act. I can find nowhere in the evidence that Mr. Knott made that confession. Mr. Knott said that in every case it was illegal. I ask the hon. members of this House if it was legal to hand over the voters' lists in a number of federal constituencies in Manitoba to a gentleman who secreted himself, and marked those lists to suit the Liberal party of Manitoba. We have every reason to believe that Mr. Leach, before those lists were handed over to him, had had his men make a very careful canvass all over the province of Manitoba ; so that he knew who were the supporters of this government and who were opposed to them, and was in a splendid position, when he and his assistants met in the star-chamber in the Bank of Commerce building in the city of Winnipeg, to prepare the lists to suit the Liberal party. Hon gentlemen opposite are fond of leaving the impression on this House that this difficulty arose in constituencies which overlapped, that is, Dominion constituencies which overlapped local constituencies. Now, I want to point out and emphasize the fact that there never was a prosecution in Manitoba upon the thin red line except where that device had been applied to disfranchise electors in polling subdivisions wholly within an electoral division, and had absolutely nothing to do with the overlapping of constituencies. Every transaction was in connection with those polling subdivisions lying wholly within an electoral division. But I am sorry to say that that is on a par with many of the arguments which have been produced on the other side of the House in connection with this great question ; and no object should be dearer to the heart of every man in this House than to give to every man who has the right to vote the privilege of voting without manipulation by any party, whether Tory or Grit.

A number of these officers turned over the lists to Mr. Leach in Winnipeg——

Absolutely unconstitutional, I should say.

It was the duty of the returning officer to arrange for polling places and decide where each elector should vote. Instead of doing this themselves, those officers who obeyed the party instructions, handed over the task to Mr. Leach's office. From the organizer the lists went back to the returning officers beautifully carved up.

There is no mistake about that. Nobody can dispute it.

Hundreds of names were erased with red lines. Conservative voters, whose names were thus struck out, had no knowledge of the change until they appeared at the polls originally designated for them and asked for ballots. Some of them were then told that their names were probably on a list in some other polling place, though if they were not government supporters they could not learn what place it was.

I would not be reading this evidence, had I not been compelled to by the hon. gentleman who refused to accommodate me by reading it himself. I have therefore to supply the omission :

Hundreds went from village to village all election day looking for their poll and never finding it. Hundreds who were struck off in one place were never registered in another. Hundreds were transferred to polls farther from their homes than the one where they expected to vote and too far to be reached after they had learned the facts. No Conservative had any way of knowing before he went to the poll what had happened. The rearranged lists were not posted as the law required, but private notice was given to Liberals who might have been transferred. Mr. Leach was not an election official. He was not openly known in the case until afterwards. But he had his agents all over the province beforehand ascertaining the political sympathies of the electors and preparing for this splendid operation.

I want now to read some of the evidence which was given before the commission of which the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) was chairman :

Q. You carried out the work in the same way as the rest of the work in this office—in such a way that information as to what was being done did not go outside, as far as you know?—A. It did not get outside.

Mr. WHITE. Whose evidence is that ?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Mr. Leach's evidence.

Q. Except to the Liberal organization and the persons you thought entitled to the information?—A. We did not take any pains to notify our opponents.

Q. But you took care to keep your work from your opponents. You were doing your

work as effectively as possible?—A. It turned out to be effective.

And the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) wants this Bill to be effective in a similar way. Speaking in this House on the subject he warned the right hon. the First Minister that if he wanted to get a single member from Manitoba elected to support him, he had better do some thing with the voters' lists. And that is what the government have undertaken to do. The hon. gentleman was quite right. Public opinion in Manitoba, after considering the conduct of this government from 1898 down to 1904, when the brothers-in-law had full sway, has come to the conclusion that if the government does not make this election Bill fair and honest, there will not be one Liberal returned from that province.

Some of the men concerned in this conspiracy to defraud the electorate were prosecuted and a number escaped to the United States. Several pleaded innocence and the judges differed as to their personal criminality. Others escaped on legal technicalities, but the main facts were well established. One deputy returning officer swore that he took the original lists into the office of Mr. Leach, who undertook to fix it for him. He left the paper with Mr. Leach, and afterwards it came back to him with a number of the names struck off. And though the returning officer was responsible, he did not take the trouble to ascertain whether these names had been struck off properly or not. He admitted that in his own evidence.

Q. You did not know anything about the lists?—A. No.

Q. There may have been different lists altogether so far as you know?—A. Yes.

Q. They may have been the lists of Macdonald and Winnipeg?—A. They may have been.

Q. You took the word of Mr. Leach that these were the lists such as they may be?—A. Yes.

There is the evidence given before this commission by the returning officer who should have done this work but instead turned it over to Mr. Leach. He admitted that he left the red line list open in the Liberal committee room after it had been fixed. This was in Provencher, where 568 were disfranchised and the government majority was ten. Does any one doubt that that constituency was stolen ? There can be absolutely no doubt that it was. In one polling place thirteen were struck off and all Conservatives. In other polling division, the red line went through fifteen names, every one Conservatives, who had voted in that place for years. One incident occurred at Beauséjour where forty-one names were struck out by the thin red line. Government supporters, whose names were erased, were placed in other lists and notified beforehand so that they knew where to vote. Eighteen electors who had expected to vote in that poll were not so notified and could not get information to show them where they ought to go. In this instance the outraged men forced the returning officer to take their ballots and record them as having voted. He put the ballots in envelopes. It was explained that one of the eighteen had made a mistake marking his ballot and thus unintentionally voted for the government candidate. They counted the votes in these envelopes where these men insisted on exercising the franchise, and in the end they showed sixteen Conservatives and two government ballots. The election day was on the 3rd of November and Mr. Leach received a new years gift of an office with $2,000 a year.

Before resuming my seat, I want to call a little attention to the hon. gentleman who represents Winnipeg (Mr. Bole).

Mr. HENDERSON. He is bowled out.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I do not know whether it is because he is bowled out, but he is rarely ever here.

Since his election he has spent very little time in this House. He was here for a short time the other day and referred to the leader of the opposition as taking up a great space in 'Hansard' with quotations; in his own speech, about the only one he has made this session, there is about a column of his own expression and for the balance of the time he read affidavits. I was struck, and I have no doubt other members were also, by the number of apologies he made for reading those affidavits. I do not wonder at that now, in the light of what has transpired. The hon. member remained long enough to read the affidavits, he then retired from the chamber and has not been seen since. These affidavits had been made by a man named Rudneski and they have proved rather a boomerang to our hon. friends. I have here a facsimile of the cheque on the Merchants' Bank of Canada, Winnipeg, by means of which Mr. F. Walton, the organizer of the Liberal party in Manitoba, paid Rudneski $25 for eight men's affidavits. This has turned out to be not a very honourable affair in which the hon. member for Winnipeg has been engaged. The memorandum attached to the affidavit reads :

This was in payment of the affidavits used in the House by Mr. D. W. Bole. Note memo. made on the cheque that it was for eight men's affidavits. The cheque was accepted on the back by Rudneski, but the acceptance being in blue ink was not reproduced in the copy.

We cannot produce the cheque but this facsimile answers my purpose.

We have some more affidavits and I shall not apologize for placing them on the re-

cords of the House. I shall read these affidavits from the 'Tribune' of Winnipeg, a paper which supported our Liberal friends very enthusiastically in the last local election in Manitoba. The article containing them is as follows :

In government circles yesterday considerable stir was created by the action of D. W. Bole, M.P., in the federal house on Wednesday, when he read a number of affidavits from Galicians in the city, which went to show that foreigners were naturalized wholesale, by the Conservatives during the last election, and that bribery, fraud and corruption was practised to an enormous extent in North Winnipeg, so that the Liberal candidate could be defeated.

Mr. Bole in the affidavits read mentioned the names of a number of prominent workers in the Conservative party in connection with these alleged frauds, and yesterday affidavits denying the allegations made, and affirming that some of the men making the affidavits read by Mr. Bole are fugitives from justice, and cannot be considered reliable men to support the charges made.

W. H. Hastings, in adition to making his affidavit denying the charges made, made public the fact that he held a cheque for $25 given to Theodore Rudneski by Mr. George Walton, who was Liberal organizer, in payment, he alleges, for the eight affidavits held by Mr. Bole, a number of which he read in the federal House on Wednesday last.

The Liberals in reply contend that the cheque was given in good faith for services rendered.

The following is the affidavit made by W. H. Hastings, the Conservative organizer, during the March elections:—

Dominion of Canada, province of Ontario, to wit:

In the matter of the naturalization of foreigners in the city of Winnipeg, in the year A.D. 1907—

I, Wiliam Henry Hastings, of the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba, barrister-at-law, do solemnly declare that I have read in the morning issue of the Manitoba 'Free Press' of this date, what purports to be a copy of an affidavit of one Theodore Rudneski, made on the 31st day of March, A.D., 1907, and read in the House of Commons at Ottawa by Mr. Bole, the member for Winnipeg, during the debate upon the Aylesworth Bill yesterday.

(2) The said Rudneski was employed in my office during the provincial campaign of 1907 merely as a copying clerk and his principal and only work was wrapping up and sending out campaign literature.

(3) I never discussed, directly or indirectly, with the said Rudneski, the naturalization of foreigners, either in the city of Winnipeg or any other part of Manitoba; I never placed him in charge of any committee or allowed his name to be placed on any committee in connection with that campaign.

(4) The statements regarding the mode of procedure in the naturalization of foreigners as set forth in the said affidavit, are, so far as I am concerned, absolutely false and without any foundation whatever, and so far as I know all naturalization papers put through the court for or upon behalf of the Conservative party were so put through in proper and regular form.

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

(Signed) W. H. HASTINGS.

Declared before me at the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba, this 7th day of May, A.D. 1908.

BENJ. L. DEACON,
A Commissioner in B. R., &c.

R. C. Irving, inspector of legal offices for the provincial government, who was mentioned in an affidavit read by Mr. Bole, has replied with the following affidavit denying the charge:—

Dominion of Canada, province of Manitoba, to wit:

In the matter of the naturalization of aliens in the year 1907.

I, Robert Chrystal Irving, of the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba, do sclemnly declare:

(1)—That I have seen the affidavit purporting to be made by one Theodore Rudneski.

(2)—That the statements made in clause 14 of the said affidavit are false.

(3)—That I never received at the hands of the said Theodore Rudneski any applications for naturalization.

(4)—That I never by instructions or innuendo suggested antedating such applications.

(5)—That I never stated I could get applications through the court in a few days without notice.

(6)—That the statement in clause 15 of said affidavit is false.

(7)—That I know nothing whatever of the instructions mentioned in clause 16 of said affidavit that 450 sets of naturalization papers were to be handed to me by the 4th day of February, and further that I did not receive such papers.

(8)—That the statement made in paragraph 17, of said affidavit, that on February 4, 125 applications for naturalization were delivered to me is absolutely false.

(9)—That the statement made by the said Theodore Rudneski in clause 18 of his affidavit that I handed him personally 450 naturalization certificates is without foundation and absolutely false.

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

(Sgd.) R. C. IRVING,

Declared before me at the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba, this 7th day of May, A.D. 1908.

CHARLES S. TUPPER,
A Commissioner in B. R., &c.

Here is an affidavit by the registrar of the county court :

Dominion of Canada, province of Manitoba ; to wit:

In the matter of naturalization of aliens in the Winnipeg county court, in the year, 1907.

I, L. N. Betourney, of the city of St. Boniface, in the province of Manitoba, do solemnly declare

(1)—Since the amendment to the Naturalization Act requiring three weeks' notice to be given to the court by aliens applying for naturalization, no applications have been read in open court and no certificates of naturalization have been issued by me, without such notice having been given by such aliens as required by law.

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

(Sgd.) L. N. BETOURNEY.

Declared before me at the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba, this 7th day of May, A.D. 1908.

AUGUSTUS MILLS,
A Commissioner in B.R., &c.

I do not think I need read any more affidavits. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to make clear the way in which we make up our Manitoba lists. In referring to the manner in which they were made up under the Greenway administration, I said that it was possible, and I believe it had occurred, that in the local constituency of Turtle Mountain, which is within my own constituency, the lists were made up in such a manner that 10, 20 or 50 names might be handed in, and we believe were handed in, after the close of the registration at the end of the day. Now, I want to show how impossible it would be for such a thing to happen under the present registration laws. I hold in my hand the Manitoba Election Act and the provisions regarding registration. Every man who is registered according to our law must subscribe to this form. First:

1. What is your Christian name, surname, place of residence, occupation and post office address?

2. Are you of the full age of twenty-one years?

3. Are you a British subject by birth or naturalization, and which?

4. Have you resided in the province of Manitoba for one year prior to the date of this your application to be registered an elector within this electoral division?

Let me say in fairness to some hon. gentlemen opposite that they have tried to make a great deal out of the fact that we require a man to be a resident a year in the province of Manitoba, even though he is a British subject. The other night when the hon. member for Portage la Prairie was speaking I asked him who made the law. It was made under a Conservative administration, the Norquay administration, who made the qualification six months in the province and one month in the riding. The Greenway government changed that from six months to one year, and I said the other night that I had an impression that the hon. member for Portage la Prairie was in the local House at that very time. Our government in that province now is ever ready to do anything that is in the line of fairness and justice, and they have continued that qualification; the applicant must have resided in the province of Manitoba for one year.

5. Have you resided or had your chief place of abode in this electoral division for a continuous period of three months prior to the date of this your application to be registered an elector within this electoral division?

6. Are you in any respect disqualified from being registered an elector in this electoral division under 'The Manitoba Election Act'?

7. Do you now reside in the electoral division for which you now apply to be registered an elector? On what premises do you reside?

8. Is your name at present on the list of electors for this electoral division?

9. Have you applied for and been registered an elector in any other electoral division in the province during the current period of registration?

10. Is your name on the list of electors for any electoral division in the province? If so, give the name.

Now, here is the declaration that every man who goes on our voters' list has to sign:

I, , do solemnly declare that the foregoing answers in writing to the above interrogatories are true and correct in substance and in fact, and I make this declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of 'The Canada Evidence Act, 1893.'

All persons who are not ill or absent have to subscribe to that form of declaration. Now, here is the form of notice to registration clerks which is used in the case of persons unable to apply for registration, owing to sickness or other physical disability:

Take notice that I, , of claim to be entitled to be registered as an elector in polling division No. in the electoral division . That my place of residence is that I am physically unable to apply personally for registration as aforesaid. That I am entitled to be registered, and to become an elector in and for the said electoral division of .

Here is the form of notice to registration clerk on behalf of an absentee:

Take notice that I, John Smith, on behalf of Andrew Jones, claim that he is entitled to be registered in the electoral division of Turtle Mountain; and that I know the said Andrew Jones well, and have a personal knowledge of the facts herein stated. That the place of residence of the said Andrew Jones is ; that he is unable by physical inability to apply for personal registration; that he is entitled to registration in said polling subdivision, and to become an elector in and for the said electoral division of Turtle Mountain.

In any one of these three ways, so far as I know, a man can get on the voters' list in the province of Manitoba. A Lib-

eral who comes up to the mark, takes the declaration, or signs it being ill, or gets some one else in his absence to sign for him, gets on the voters' list just as well as a Conservative—absolutely no difference. There is not the same opportunity as that which existed at the end of the day under the old Greenway Act to put in names. Under that Act, at the end of the day you could hand in any number of names. There was nothing to show that you could not do that. Take this registration record and you begin with A—Aitkens, Andrews, or any other name beginning with A is registered on that page. Then you have names beginning with B, C, D, E, or whatever the initial letter may be and it goes on in the same way. At the end of each day the registration clerk is not only obliged to sign this list, but he is absolutely bound by law to sign at the end of all these names. He signs at the end of each day's work. That prevents any tampering with the lists. When six o'clock arrives he has to sign after all these different names and if a page is not signed it is because there have been no names added under that particular letter of the alphabet. There are so many good things about this Manitoba Act that one could talk for weeks about it. I wonder how they ever got such a perfect Act as we have on our statute-book in Manitoba. In making the claims that I have for this Act I have endeavoured to stick strictly to the law and the facts, and I think I can go further and show that it has been carried out practically to the letter. It may be said that no franchise Act is carried out just to the letter, but I doubt if there can be very many cases brought forward to show that such a criticism can be made with respect to the Manitoba Act. To show to what extent these hon. gentlemen are driven one gets up and tries to show that three men at Morris, out of the immense number that we have on the voters' lists were not put on in the right way. I am not going into that question. The judge put them on. Granting that these men were not put on according to law, is it not pretty good evidence that the law is fairly administered when hon. gentlemen opposite can only produce these three cases in support of their statement that the law has not been properly administered? If we have such a good law why change it? I tried, as I stated this afternoon, to discover in the speech of the Minister of Justice, the justification of the government in changing this law, but I was unable to do so. Instead of giving any real reason for the change the Minister of Justice spent most of his time talking about the province of Manitoba.

What was the position of hon. gentlemen opposite in 1898 when they introduced the existing Franchise Act? They had been in opposition for some time. They had had ample opportunity to consider a franchise

Act and we all know that in 1893, in the city of Ottawa, there were a number of planks drawn up at a Liberal convention. I think it has been proven pretty conclusively that the only one of these planks that they were prepared to stand by was the plank by which they pledged themselves to change the Franchise Act by adopting the provincial lists for federal purposes. That was the one plank upon which they stood and now, on the eve of absolutely losing the confidence of the people, of going into opposition, they are going to break that pledge. I was in hopes that this government would go out of power with one single bright spot at least on their record, but it seems now that that hope is not to be realized. Had not the Prime Minister when in opposition thought out this question of a franchise Act? Let us see what he said when he undertook to establish a franchise Act in 1898. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) quoted these words and I am not going over them all but there are some of them that it is utterly impossible for even the Prime Minister to get around. He said that the question of the franchise and of the preparation of voters' lists was absolutely a matter of civil rights and was therefore within provincial jurisdiction, and it was not right for the parliament of Canada to interfere with that; when any province established its franchise and prepared its voters' lists, for the election of its members to its legislature, that franchise and these voters' lists should stand good for the election by the electors of that province of members of this House of Commons. That is very clear, it cannot be mistaken and I believe it was the result of a well thought out principle. Then the right hon. gentleman said:

> Our policy is that the franchise under which the members of this House should be elected is the franchise under which members of the local legislatures are elected. This is the position which we have taken from the beginning——

> But it does not seem to be the position that they are going to take in the end.

> —this is the position we maintain at this moment.

That was in 1898. Then, at page 2281 of 'Hansard' the Prime Minister says:

> I now come to this proposition, which I lay down as a principle of good government, that under a federative government such as our own it is better that there should be only the franchise as regards the provinces and the Dominion—the same franchise should serve to elect members of this House as to elect members of the local legislatures.

At page 2282 the Prime Minister says:

> The regulation of the franchise is, above all things, a domestic matter which concerns and ought to be regulated by the local legislatures and not by this parliament.

At page 3967 :

There can be no doubt what the policy of the government is on this subject.

There is no doubt about that. They had come to the conclusion that this thing was right :

We have introduced the principles and have fought for it for many years——

They could not have fought for it without having thought it out.

—that the franchise ought to be regulated by the provincial legislatures, that it is for them to decide whether or not the Indians should be admitted to vote or not.

He goes on to say that :

The same authority which regulates the franchise for the local legislature should also regulate it for the Dominion parliament.

Again :

We are satisfied to have them prepared by either the provincial or the municipal authorities.

Now, one excuse given for the introduction of this Bill so far as Manitoba is concerned is that the Manitoba list is not made up by municipal authority, but we can see from the statement of the Prime Minister that he is not particular whether the list is made up by municipal authority or by the provincial government. In reference to the action of Mr. Heap—who by the way I may say is a Liberal—that question was fully and exhaustively dealt with by the member for Marquette (Mr. Roche), but I wish to correct a statement which was made by members on the other side of the House in reference to Judge Walker in connection with that indictment. It will be remembered that Mr. Heap added a certain number of names to the list after his jurisdiction had expired and that Judge Walker had certified to this list as he did to the others, but the fact is that Judge Walker issued an entirely different certificate in that case from the usual certificate given by him. The usual certificate given by Judge Walker is the following :

I, David Marr Walker, chairman of the board of registration, do hereby certify that the annexed is a true copy of the names, residence and occupation of the persons appearing on the several registers of the electoral division of Springfield, and duly qualified to appear as such electors for the said electoral division.

D. M. WALKER.

But in the Lac du Bonnet case the following was the certificate given :

I, David Marr Walker, chairman of the board of registration, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the names, residence and occupation of the persons appearing on registration register of registration district number 2, of the electoral division of Springfield, added at the adjourned meeting of the court of revision held at Lac du Bonnet, on the 24th day of June, 1903.

D. M. WALKER.

Any one who reads these two certificates will see the very vital distinction which is made in the latter case, and that they are not the same certificates at all. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have taken up more of the time of the House than I intended, but in a sense I do not regret it. I am deeply in earnest about this matter. If there is one province in the Dominion of Canada to which this Bill should not apply and as to which there is no reason it should apply, it is the province of Manitoba. I ask the Prime Minister to take our Election Act, to take the manner in which our votes are registered and our lists prepared and to consider all the conditions, and I think he must come to the conclusion that the Franchise Act and the manner in which it is administered in Manitoba is fair and just to all parties. It is probable that you can not get any Franchise Act which is absolutely without some defects, but I assert without fear of contradiction that in no province of the Dominion to-day has the election law been more fairly and justly administered than in Manitoba. Why then does the government seek to pick out Manitoba for exceptional treatment ? No doubt British Columbia and the unorganized territories of Quebec and Ontario are included in the Bill, but that was done no doubt so that the fact of picking out Manitoba alone would not be so glaring. I speak with no disrespect to the people who live in the unorganized territory of Ontario and Quebec but I would like to know why it is that the province of Manitoba is put in the same class with them. We want honest and fair lists in Manitoba, we want the Liberals to have the same opportunity for registration as the Conservatives have ; we do not want to do injustice to anybody, and in that spirit the law has been carried out in my province. Why then should the province be interfered with ? One of the members spoke the other night about bloodshed and I do not know what he meant by that, but I do say that so far as I am concerned, after the 27th of June I will be staying here at as great a sacrifice as any member of this House, but I am prepared to make that sacrifice. The Conservative members of Manitoba are standing for a principle which they are prepared to defend to the last, and I believe that we, as well as every member on this side of the House, are determined to resort to every constitutional and legitimate means to prevent this Bill becoming the law of Canada.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON (Selkirk). I do not intend to detain the House at any great length but I feel it incumbent on me to reply to some of the remarks addressed to the House by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche). At page 8270 of 'Hansard'

he refers to the difficulties that the Conservatives had in Manitoba in the year 1899 in trying to clean up the electoral lists preparatory to a provincial election; but I think it would be interesting for him to know the troubles we had in my own constituency in 1906 in trying to purge the lists of that year. The hon. member for Souris has been telling us for the last three hours about certain happenings in Manitoba and amongst other things he said that in 1899 it cost the Conservatives about $30,000 to clean up the provincial lists. Perhaps it may astonish him when I tell him that when we undertook to do some cleaning of the provincial lists previous to the last provincial election it cost us in my own county about one-tenth of the sum he named, and the results I think will be surprising to him. In the local division of Rockwood we added 102 names and struck off 264 or a total of 366.

In Gimli we added 81 and struck off 45; in Springfield we added 160 and struck off 111; in Kildonan and St. Andrews we added 122 and struck off 127; total for the four constituencies, 1,012; average for each constituency, 253. The Conservative changes in 1899 for 40 constituencies were 7,371, an average for each constituency of 184¼, or 68¾ less changes in each constituency than we had in 1906. Any hon. gentleman can verify that from the voters' lists which I have here and which I will lay on the table of the House. I leave in for the purpose of this comparison the three Winnipeg constituencies. If we took these out the comparison would show much more to the advantage of the Greenway Act. Therefore,I think it will be fair for us to say that that much-abused Act was certainly a very favourable Act compared with the Act we now have on the statute-book. As far as I am concerned, I have not very much objection to the present Act in Manitoba; it is not the Act itself that I have objection to, but the administration of it by order in council. There is nothing stable about the Act; we do not know from year to year what we may expect. In the last six years every year they have given us something different from what we have had every other year, so that we do not know what to expect. We hear to-day that a new proclamation has been issued—they are going to give us more time for revision. This just goes to show why this matter should be in the hands of the Dominion authorities. I do not want it to be in the hands of partisans on the other side, because I know what we have been treated to in the past.

Mr. LANCASTER. Do you want partisans on your own side?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. No, I do not want that. In my speech in 1905 I said that if we had a Municipal Act such as they have in the province of Ontario, I would be satisfied.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What did Mr. Greenway say?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I am not speaking of what Mr. Greenway said; I am speaking for myself.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The hon. gentleman was supporting Mr. Greenway in the legislature at the time.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Yes, and I have nothing to regret in the support I gave that hon. gentleman for twelve years. We had the best government in Manitoba then that we have ever had. I will just show you, by a table I have here, the difference between this Act and the Greenway Act as to the time given for registration. In 1903 they gave 1,980 days; in 1904, 347 days; in 1905, 40 days; in 1908 they are giving us 392 days. I have not the figures for 1906 and 1907, but they were different from every one of these others. Every year since 1903 we have had a different basis; we do not know what to expect, because the law is not a law on the statute-book, but a law by order in council—that is the objection I have to it.

Mr. STAPLES. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if there is anything different in the Bill before the House?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. It is a principle of the present government to adopt the municipal lists. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who has just spoken if the present Manitoba law is such a good law, what would be the difference if this government revised the list and gave it to us in the proper time? What we object to is that we have not the proper time for revision.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Act proposed does not give more time than the one on the statute-book.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. That can be changed, I suppose, in committee. I would like to point out that one great objection to the present law is that just as soon as the list is made up by the registration clerk, he takes the book away and we may not see it again. We cannot see who are on that list or who are not on it. Under the Greenway Act, just as soon as the registration clerk made up the list he had to have it printed; that was before revision. I will read the clauses of that Act from the statutes of 1891:

The registration clerk shall forthwith, after the closing of the list, cause to be printed at the printing office directed by the clerk of the executive council, two hundred copies of said list of electors and shall at least thirty days before the date fixed for the court of revision cause one copy of said printed list to be posted up in the following places in the electoral division:

(a) Every county court office;
(b) Every post office;

(c) Every public school house;
(d) Every municipal hall or office;
And shall mail to the following persons each fifteen copies thereof :
(a) The member of the legislative assembly for the electoral division last elected;
(b) The defeated candidate for the electoral division at the last election;
And one copy, to each mayor, reeve, councillor and alderman in the electoral division.
The registration clerk shall be bound to furnish to any person applying for the same, copies of said printed list, for a fee of not more than 20 cents for each copy; provided that such registration clerk must retain a sufficient number of copies of said printed list for the purposes required by this Act.

I may say that we wanted a list in the province of Manitoba during the last three months for purposes of organization and it cost us $40 to get what we required from the Roblin government, and we had hard work to get the number required. I want to point out another feature of the Greenway Act, that is, the time provided for revision. Section 16 says :

When it has been determined to make and revise a list of electors in one or more electoral divisions, the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall, by proclamation, appoint a proper person, to be called 'The Registration Clerk,' for each of such electoral divisions ; and, by such proclamation, fix the date for the closing of the list in each electoral division by the registration clerk. Such date shall not be less than four weeks from the date of such proclamation.

Section 20 says :

Forthwith after appointment such judge or barrister shall fix a day, hour and place, for the revision of the list for each electoral division for which he has been appointed, and shall notify the registration clerk in each case. Such day shall not be less than six weeks after the day fixed for the closing of the list by the registration clerk. Such judge or barrister may fix separate days and places for different portions of an electoral division if deemed advisable on account of distance.

In a few days the registration clerks will be going to about five places in my district. I understand the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) to say that the registration districts and the polling districts are conterminous. That is not the case, for in that part of Rockwood, which is in the county of Selkirk, we have 5 registration districts and 9 polling divisions, and in Kildonan we have 13 registration districts and 17 polling divisions ; the others I think are conterminous. In my opinion there is no comparison between the two Acts. The only objection raised against the Greenway Act was as to enumerators. The enumerator had to take the last voters' list of the province of Manitoba, the last Dominion list, and the municipal lists, and from them he had to make up a list, and any one could get on by application. The hon. member for Marquette said there was a difficulty in a voter getting on by application. I think there might possibly be found one of the men they have now appointed as registration clerks that will perhaps not be just the fair thing. That is all I have to say now, so far as Mr. Greenway's Act is concerned.

The other night the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche), at page 8283 of 'Hansard,' made a very strong appeal to the First Minister, and pointed out to the right hon. gentleman that he ought to be influenced by the opinion of the Hon. Chas. Mickle regarding the Act. Let me just quote what the Hon. Charles Mickle said when the amendment to the 1902 Act was being moved in 1904. In resuming the debate on the Election Act, he said :

In resuming the debate on the Election Act amendments Mr. Mickle stated that it was usual in such cases for the government to give some explanations, not merely as to why a new measure was introduced, but also for any new departure from principles heretofore accepted and acted upon. The Bill before the House involved radical departures from established precedent and from the policy the government had before pursued; but no explanations had been offered by the attorney general in his speech on the reason for those departures. The essence of the existing election law was the principle of personal registration, and in the amending law that principle had been abandoned. From the beginning to the end of the attorney general's address there had been no explanation of this abandonment. True, he had gone over the amending clauses with some care and particularity, but no explanation or defence of the new principles involved in the Bill had been forthcoming.

One thing, however, was very plain, and must be admitted by everyone who examined the Bill—that in substance it was a capitulation on the part of the government to the soundness of the principles for which the Liberal party in Manitoba had long contended.

Mr. Mickle stated that in the past few years there had been some important changes in the Franchise Act of the province. The Franchise Act of the Greenway government had been based on the municipal lists. When this government came to power they found fault with this principle and succeeded in getting a new principle adopted which had now been in force some years.

In defence of the principles underlying the present Franchise Act, much might be said. Three main features were embodied in the present law—personal registration, the placing the making of the voters' lists in the hands of the judges, and the educational test. The new law did away with some of the most objectionable features of the old. Some of the Liberals had taken exception to the principle of personal registration, as being inconvenient, troublesome and cumbersome. These objections were now removed, for the principle the government introduced and fought for had entirely disappeared. The new Act provided that the list, with annual alterations, should exist for the next twenty or thirty years. The principle of personal registration, as Mr. Mickle understood it, implied personal registration for the preparation of every list.

From this principle and practice the new Act was an entire departure.

Another advantage claimed under the present Act was that the making of the lists was taken out of the hands of partisan officials and put in the hands of the judges. This provision, also, was wiped out by the proposed legislation. It was reasonable and fairly satisfactory in practice under the present Act, but now it was done away with. Henceforth the registration clerks were to be appointed by the government. True, there was still a board of registration, but it was not for the receiving of names but for the appointment of revising officers. If the principle adopted under the present Act had the merits claimed, what reason was there for the changes now sought to be introduced?

Regarding the third principle in the present law, that the voters' lists should be prepared for each general election, Mr. Mickle said that by this means the public was apprised of the approaching contest, and took the necessary interest therein to register. But the new Act provides for annual lists, whether or not an election was impending. The inevitable result would be that three years out of the four, the apathy of the electors would make the so-called revision useless.

Mr. Mickle then went on to point out that the Act was vague in many important respects. As he understood it, there was to be only one place in each electoral division for registering. In many of the larger constituencies this would impose much hardship on those desirous of registering. This provision he disapproved. The hours of registration, and the number of days were not specified.

I think that when the hon. member for Marquette appeals to the right hon. First Minister to take cognizance of the opinion of Mr. Mickle, it was not this opinion he wished the right hon. gentleman to follow.

There is another question I would like to take up and that is regarding the statement made by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche), on page 8298 of 'Hansard,' and which has to do with the thin red line. He said:

And now, I come to a discussion of the 'thin red line.' We are not afraid to discuss this, as the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) seemed to think we should be. What does the 'thin red line' mean? The voters' lists sent by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to the various returning officers in Manitoba previous to the last Dominion election were mutilated, and mutilated illegally, and scores and hundreds—how many it is impossible to say—of Conservatives were disfranchised by Leach and his associates through the mutilation of these lists.

Again on page 8300, he said:

In my own constituency there was very little overlapping——

He had evidently changed a little when he made these remarks—

In my own constituency there was very little overlapping, just a small portion of three municipalities, one of which is in the unorganized districts. And still there were 1,900 names through which the red line operated.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON.

The hon. gentleman was taking the statement of Mr. Rogers, and he went on to say:

I am not going to say that those 1,900 names were absolutely disfranchised. It was impossible for me to tell. We did not have an investigation in the constituency of Marquette, and why? I knew the returning officer was an honest man, he was a personal friend of my own, and he himself could not stoop to anything in this character.

And on page 8304, he said:

The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) says that there was no complaint in my riding. Why? Because Mr. Leach did not mutilate the lists. He did not transfer the names. They had a returning officer who did that work, and if what the hon. gentleman states is correct, I presume he did it honourably.

After I heard what the hon. member had to say on this point, I would ask how does he account for having remained silent while listening to the untrue and misleading statement made on August 3, 1906, by Mr. Rogers at a meeting held in Minnedosa. Why did he not there say what we heard him say here the other day as regards the honesty of the returning officer? The other night, in the speech he made on this subject to which I have referred, the hon. member for Marquette said it was impossible for him to say how many votes were struck off in Marquette on the occasion of the last Dominion election. Now I have a better opinion of the hon. gentleman than to believe that statement. If he has not the time himself, he could for a very small expenditure, engage someone to go over the voters' list in the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and check us the actual names, if any, which were struck off the lists in his county. But these gentlemen do not want the truth and would rather back up a statement which they know is not correct. I have been going up and down in the county of Selkirk in the past four years and have never as yet met a man who said that he had lost his vote during the election of 1904 through being left off the list.

Mr. STAPLES. From whom is the hon. gentleman quoting?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I am making comments on the remarks made by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche).

Mr. STAPLES. From what document are you reading now?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I am not reading from any document. I was reading from remarks made by the hon. member for Marquette in this House, and I am now commenting on them.

Mr. STAPLES. The hon. gentleman is reading a document and I want to know what it is.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I am saying that I have been going up and down in the county of Selkirk for the last four years and have never yet met a man who claimed that he had lost his vote during the election of 1904 through having been left off the list. If any had been left off, I certainly would have heard of it. If any large number of voters, say 100 instead of 1,406—the number given by Mr. Rogers at Minnedosa—had been left off, I must have heard of it.

Mr. STAPLES. Who said that?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I am saying it.

Mr. STAPLES. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has not the right to read the remarks he is making. He can only read the remarks made by somebody else.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is the rule that an hon. member may not read his speech, but I am not aware that the hon. gentleman is doing so.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I wish to refer to a few extracts which I have made from the Winnipeg 'Telegram' of August 4, 1906, from a report of a speech made by the Hon. Robert Rogers, at Minnedosa. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) was present on that occasion. Mr. Rogers is reported in this way:

In dealing with the thin red line outrage by which thousands of Manitoba electors were deprived of their franchise, Mr. Rogers presented a telling array of statistics carefully prepared to show the extent of the nefarious practices brought into use by the Liberal organizer to steal seats for the Laurier administration at the last general elections by giving the number of names struck off in each constituency and the majority obtained by the candidates.

Mr. Rogers showed that in each of the four ridings that went Liberal, far more than enough names were struck off to steal the seat for the Liberal candidate, while in each of the three constituencies won by the Conservatives their majorities would have been much larger had the lists not been tampered with.

What would Dr. Roche's majority have been, said Mr. Rogers, had the thin red line not have been operated in his constituency? What would Dr. Schaffner's, what would Mr. Staples' majority have been? And where would Mr. Greenway, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Crawford and Mr. Cyr be to-day had it not been for the handiwork of the Liberal organizer?

Astounding statement.

Mr. Rogers in dealing with the question of publication of the voters' list gave the most astounding statement of the extent to which the Liberal organizer previous to the last Dominion election operated in the destroying of the franchise of many good citizens. He submitted statistics showing the number of electors struck off in each constituency and the majority obtained by the candidate of either party.

Mr. Rogers gave the figures as follows:

I wish for the information of the House to place on 'Hansard' the figures given for the constituency of Marquette represented by my hon. friend (Mr. W. J. Roche):

Hamiota.

District.	No. struck off.
1..	48
2..	112
3..	69
4..	52
5..	147
6..	64
7..	172
8..	60
9..	53
Total..	777

As I understand, at the last local election there were only 737 Tory votes polled in the local constituency of Hamiota, and yet this gentleman in the presence of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) made that statement and the hon. member did not open his mouth to contradict it.

Minnedosa.

District.	No. struck off.
1..	25
2..	16
3..	89
4..	0
5..	67
6..	0
7..	0
8..	117
9..	0
10..	77
11..	51
Total..	442

This hon. gentleman cannot give me the names of ten men in the district who were struck off and yet he did not say a word at this meeting when it was stated that 1,919 were struck off in Marquette.

Mr. STAPLES. Does the hon. member mean to say there were not that many red lines drawn through the names of the respective people as stated by Mr. Rogers in the various subdivisions in that riding?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. If he had said red lines, that would have been another matter, but he said disfranchised.

Mr. STAPLES. That is what he said, that there were red lines, just as you have read. Further than that, if you will produce to me the lists as returned to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery here by the deputy returning officers, I will show you there were that many.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. The figures given for the local constituencies of Birtle and Russel were:

Birtle.

District.	No. struck off.
1..	13
2..	76
3..	0
4..	0
5..	0
6..	0
7..	0
8..	0
9..	0
10..	50
11..	19
Total..	158

Russell.

District.	No. struck off.
1..	62
2..	0
3..	87
4..	14
5..	66
6..	54
7..	72
8..	63
9..	124
Total..	542

After listening to that statement as given by Mr. Rogers in his own district in reference to which he must have known that the figures were not correct, because Mr. Rogers said that these men were disfranchised, here is what the member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) is reported to have said(:

Dr. Roche, who spoke last, contended that Mr. Waddell's record was such that no fair-minded man could turn him out and asked for the same loyal support for his friend that had been accorded him at the last Dominion election. The Doctor was in a particularly happy vein and touched humorously on the many scandals which had been unearthed at Ottawa during the last session which had been called many times the 'scandal session.' The Atlantic Trading Company deal, 'Arctic' steamer exploit and others of these disgusting revelations were lucidly explained by the speaker before resuming his seat.

For the information of the House I shall place on 'Hansard' a statement of the figures for the county of Selkirk as given by this gentleman, Mr. Rogers, at the same meeting at Minnedosa :

Springfield.

District.	No. struck off.
1..	15
2..	72
3..	41
4..	73
5..	83
6..	0
7..	0
8..	33
9..	4
10..	0
11..	0
Total..	321

Here is my own home district :

Mr. S. J. JACKSON.

Rockwood.

District.	No. struck off.
1..	14
2..	119
3..	5
4..	0
6..	58
7..	0
8..	270
Total..	466

I had charge of that particular district. I was only nominated 40 days before the election and had not time to go over the whole county, and I would say that not one man was disfranchised there. I would ask any hon. gentleman to point out one man left off the list out of 1,500 names. I am known there, I have lived there for 28 years, this is my 21st session in the legislature and in this House and nothing would hurt me more than such a condition as that. Is it likely that there is one particle of truth in that statement ?

Mr. STAPLES. Produce to me the list and I shall show the red line through every one of those names.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. The red line does not disfranchise. I will now give the figures for Kildonan and St. Andrews.

Kildonan and St. Andrews.

District.	No. struck off.
1 and 2..	0
3..	131
4..	42
5..	8
6..	114
7 and 8..	0
9..	115
10..	0
11..	100
12..	12
13..	9
14 to 17..	0
Total..	531

I have two small polls in the district of Assiniboia, with about 88 voters. Hon. Robert Rogers states there were struck off there the following numbers :

Assiniboia.

District.	No. struck off.
9..	22
10..	66
Total..	88

I might say that I furnished the information which enabled the official in charge to distribute the votes in those polls because they both overlapped into St. Charles in Macdonald represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Staples). I would ask him now if he knows of a single man there who was disfranchised and whose case justified the statement that 22 and 66 were disfranchised there. I know every man in those two polls——

Mr. STAPLES. If the hon. gentleman will go to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and get the list I shall show him the red line drawn through that many names.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. That is not the question.

Mr. STAPLES. That is what Mr. Rogers stated, you can call it disfranchise or what you please.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I have the list right here, an exact copy, furnished by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. The hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) I know is a reasonable gentleman, and if he will give me an hour to-morrow I will convince him that in that particular list that is divided between himself and me out of Assiniboia, there was not a single man left off.

Mr. STAPLES. I say that red lines were drawn through that very list, and that is what Mr. Rogers said.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. That is not what the Conservative press all over the country are saying.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in understanding that the hon. gentleman has a list there from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery ?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Yes, as furnished to me by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. It is the list printed by this government and used by the deputy returning officer.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. It is not the list, it is a copy.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. It is a copy of the list that is sent from the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on application. Now I would like to point out the absurdity of Mr. Rogers' statement. Now in my home poll, the Stonewall poll, he says there were 270 names disfranchised, 270 votes struck off. In my speech of 1905 I held the opinion that our returning officers had just as much right to change the polls as the returning officers of the Roblin government. In the very heart of my district, in Springfield, where there were eleven returning officers in the preceding election, when the Roblin government had an election in 1903 their returning officers increased the number of polls to thirteen. While I was in the local House supporting the Greenway government, I always had a poll in the centre of the township of Grassmere for the convenience of the people. I did not feel like making good Grits travel twelve miles to vote, and I took twelve sections and added them to the village of Stonewall. As soon as the Roblin government came in they thought it would not hurt the people to travel twelve miles to the Stonewall polls, and they moved that poll from the centre of the township and made them all go to Stonewall to vote. When I was nominated I was asked to select a returning officer. Hon. gentlemen opposite know very well that that is the custom, there is nothing private about my doing that. It is an open secret that I, as the candidate supporting the government, was asked to give the name of the returning officer, and I gave the name. Now it is also an open secret that the returning officer consults the member who recommended him, as the member has greater knowledge of the conditions and knows what point would best suit the convenience of the people. And so this Mr. Duggan, who was appointed returning officer, consulted me and I advised him that we had just as much right to increase the number of polls as the returning officers of the Roblin government had, and I laid out a poll down in Grassmere right in the centre of the township. There were 346 names on the Stonewall list for the whole township and village.

Mr. STAPLES. What authority had you to lay out the polls ?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. We had authority in the statutes ; we considered we had the same authority that the Roblin government returning officers had. Anyway, we went on and did it, and it was satisfactory to the people. Now there was a list of 346 names, and my returning officer had to transfer two of those lists. He scored out 200 names from the list used in the Grassmere poll, and the number of votes on the Grassmere list was scored out of the Stonewall poll. There were in all 346 names that were lined out. It was necessary to do that, whether in red ink or black ink. Now let hon. gentlemen opposite point out one man in that poll that lost his vote, though they were all scored out. I am telling this to show the absurdity of the statement made by these hon. gentlemen.

Mr. STAPLES. Was there any overlapping in that poll ?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. None whatever. It was right in the interior, the poll of that township, right in the middle of the county; yet there were nearly 300 disfranchised according to Mr. Rogers and not a man lost his vote. Now let me point out how Mr. Rogers' statements have been scattered all over Canada. For instance, here is what the 'Mail and Empire' says:

There is indignation in parliamentary circles over the fact that Mr. Leach, the government official who operated the 'thin red line' in Manitoba, has been appointed to supervise the distribution of seed grain in the Northwest. This politician was formerly Liberal organizer for Manitoba. At the last election it was found by persons who came to vote in many of the constituencies that their names

had been crossed off the lists by a thin red line. It is estimated that fully 10,000 voters were disfranchised as a consequence.

Now take the Montreal 'Gazette,' another good paper:

The Montreal 'Gazette' recalls the 'thin red line' episode at the last federal elections by which 9,000 voters were disfranchised and points out that the appointment of thin-red-line Leach to supervise the distribution of seed grain is not really a cause for the surprise that was expressed in parliament but perfectly in line with all the customs and practices of the present government. The 'Gazette' gives a brief biography of Leach and comments on the policy of Liberalism in retaining such men in its service.

Then it goes on further:

The matter has often been discussed in parliament. Mr. Leach or those working under his direction drew red lines through the names of known or presumed voters, and disfranchised them. In Portage la Prairie, 1,395 names were erased; in Selkirk, 1,406 names; in Lisgar, 1,131 names; and so on.

Now the 'Edmonton Journal'—I do not know whether that is Conservative or Liberal; perhaps the Minister of the Interior can tell:

The erasion of the names of over 9,000 Conservatives from the electoral lists of the province of Manitoba, just prior to the general elections of 1904, and by which outrage the Liberals stole three seats in that province, was sufficient to recommend Mr. Leach to the farmers of this country as an adept distributor of political gains, if nothing else.

Then the Montreal 'Gazette' has another editorial:

Mr. Leach or those working under his direction drew red lines through the names of known or presumed Conservative voters, and disfranchised them. In Portage la Prairie 1,395 names were erased; in Selkirk, 1,406 names; in Lisgar, 1,131 names; and so on. These names had been regularly put on the lists by the proper officers; the lists had been sent to Ottawa and duly printed. Their removal by a partisan acting for the Liberal machine was an outrage that would have provoked widespread denunciation in any community not rotten with partisan bigotry.

In the Ottawa 'Journal,' we find:

In the election of 1904 (when Mr. Leach was party organizer in Manitoba) the original voters' lists were prepared under the provincial law, reprinted at Ottawa, and sent to the returning officers in Manitoba, a number of whom turned over their lists to Mr. Leach. From his hands the lists went back with hundreds of names erased in red ink. In nearly every case the name so erased was that of a Conservative. Some were probably on the list at some other polling place, though they could not learn where to go. Hundreds went in search, but could not find where to vote. Hundreds were erased in one division and not placed at another, and hundreds were transferred to places too distant to reach after learning how they had been fooled. The number of Conservative voters thus disfranchised was estimated at over 9,000. In Provencher 500 Conservatives were discarded and there the government majority was ten.

With a fund of nearly three millions at his disposal on what appears to be the eve of another general election, it should not be difficult, knowing the man's record, to imagine the particular sort of seed sowing Mr. Leach will indulge in most extensively. That the harvest he will provide for will be one of Reform majorities may easily be believed.

Well, I do not think that it is necessary for me to read many more extracts. But I will just read one more:

'Thin Red Line' Manipulator will distribute Seed Grain.

This is taken from the 'Mail and Empire.'

Regina, Sask., Feb. 13.—R. E. A. Leach, the Liberal politician who was involved in the 'thin red line' outrage, has arrived in the city to superintend the work of the seed grain loans, to be made by the Dominion government. Offices have been taken, and a staff of forty will be engaged for the next three months. Leach states that from 25,000 to 50,000 applications for seed grain are looked for.

There is nothing very bad in the last quotation only showing the intent to fasten a stigma on Mr. Leach's character. In the year 1905 after the Dominion election, as you may remember, Mr. Leach was arrested. I may say that I have a pretty good knowledge of the Tory party and the way they manipulate things in Manitoba, and a determined effort was made in the last Dominion election to terrorize the voters in my constituency. They had their provincial police up in the northern part of the province, up in the parts where the foreigners were, and these men would throw open their coats to show their stars and in that way terrorize the voters. They arrested a returning officer in my constituency before anything wrong was done. In 1905 there certainly were 12 or 14 names struck off the list. But Mr. Duggan was arrested in Selkirk about 11 o'clock in the morning and there was nothing communicated so far as I know to the Winnipeg authorities before one or two o'clock in the afternoon from Beausejour. They also arrested Mr. Walton and took Mr. Calverly to jail. I was myself at Stonewall, but we had too many of our friends in that district for them to do anything. They tried to tyrannize the northern district. They had men sent up there as constables with that object in view. That is what we are up against with this government in Manitoba. They will not stick at anything. I have no hesitation in saying that the government of Manitoba will stick at nothing at an election and the consequence is that we have to fight in order to hold our own. We have been doing that for the last 20

years and I think we can do it for a few years yet. After all these charges were made against Mr. Leach in the different courts and after everything that took place regarding his case, here is the wind up :

TORIES WITHDRAW ALL CHARGES AGAINST 'THIN RED LINE' LEACH.

Attorney General of Manitoba makes application at Manitoba Assize Court to have all Prosecutions dropped—Straight Confession of Falsity of outrageous charges formerly made.

That is pretty good.

Winnipeg, March 3.—The Conservatives threw up the sponge completely at the assize court to-day by making application for nolle prosequi in the celebrated cases brought by them against R. E. A. Leach and other Liberals in connection with the last Dominion general elections in Manitoba. Their action to-day is the most abject confession of having made totally unwarrantable charges of wrong-doing against Mr. Leach and three returning officers; charges for which they had not a tittle of evidence and the withdrawal of which to-day is positive proof that they had no evidence.

Yes, these hon. gentlemen, although they have seen this in the paper, still go on with their charges. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) repeats these charges, and even, I am sorry to say, our hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), spoke disapprovingly of the idea of Mr. Leach being entrusted with some work in connection with the distribution of seed grain when there is absolutely nothing against this man.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman honestly think that any returning officer was justified, in view of the oath of office he took, to receive the lists from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, in handing these lists over to the organizer of a political party and to give him the right to advise him and map out the polling subdivisions?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Well, would it have been right to go to the organizer of the Conservative party?

Mr. SPROULE. No, it would not.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I think if I had been the returning officer I would have gone to a friend who knew something about the matter and asked him to give me all the information he had in his possession, and Mr. Leach, being the organizer, was the man who had this information. There is no one that the returning officer could have gone to who was better informed upon the subject.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentlemen think that the fact that Mr. Leach was the organizer of the party was enough to create a want of confidence in what was done on the part of those on the other side, and does he not think that it is very desirable to avoid that?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I never considered the matter very much in that way. We did what was right in connection with the voters' lists, and if these gentlemen wanted to find fault they would find fault anyway as they always do. It does not make any difference how we manage matters, they are always finding fault. I will just continue this quotation :

The incident to-day came about in the following manner. When Chief Justice Howell had concluded his address to the grand jury at the assizes he asked if there were any cases ready to be heard. E. L. Howell, solicitor for the accused in the prosecution against L. Duggan, J. C. Jickling and A. Ayote, returning officers for Selkirk, Macdonald and Provencher respectively in the last federal election and R. E. A. Leach, called the attention of the court to these cases. Thereupon deputy Attorney General Patterson, acting for the Attorney General of Manitoba, stated to the court that a stay of proceedings had been granted and all the indictments dropped.

This marks the close of the famous and much advertised 'thin red line' cases over which Conservatives throughout Canada have attempted to make party capital for three years past.

An hon. MEMBER. What paper is that?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. The Regina 'Leader.' I have known Mr. Leach for a number of years. I know that he was an honest farmer in the Brandon district and a teacher of a Sunday school class in the Methodist church.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I do not think that would hurt him any. I have never heard of one single thing being uttered against Mr. Leach's character in the province of Manitoba. He did what he was asked to do, and I think he did it in a very fair manner. The hon. member for East Grey will understand that when a man is put up against a list like this it is hard for him to tell what to do. What is the returning officer going to do when he is put up against such a list as was presented to me? When I came down here I sent for a list for the electoral division of Selkirk on which there were 8,000 and some odd names and 5,000 of which belonged to the constituency of Selkirk. I say we should have something from the Dominion government to provide that when we send the returning officer the list he may carry it home with him and lay out the polling subdivisions.

Mr. SPROULE. When the returning officer in my division applied to me to make the polling subdivisions I told him to consult the clerk of the council who was as well informed on that subject as any one and who, I thought, could give him more assistance than any one else, and for myself

or any agent of mine to interfere would be very improper in my judgment.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I can understand the hon. gentleman doing that in an old-settled district, but if he lived in a district in which there are 14,000,000 acres of land and in which there are lots of men without any qualification at all on the voters' list he would understand how difficult it was to adopt that procedure. I went over this list four years ago and I found that I was 200 or 300 votes out in my calculation, and I am pretty good at figuring. But I just want to pass on to another subject that has been mentioned by the leader of the opposition. The hon. leader of the opposition has challenged any one to point out any man who was actually disfranchised during the last year or two by this Act. He wanted the names. I shall read from the 'Free Press' of June 17, 1903, an article dated June 16, from Beausejour which will perhaps give some new information about the Lac du Bonnet case and which has not been given to the House before.

Beausejour, June 16.—The court of revision for Springfield constituency was not closed here yesterday, but Mr. Fred. Heap, the revising barrister, after considering representations made to him, adjourned the court to meet at Lac du Bonnet on Wednesday, June 24th.

At the court of revision here yesterday, a man named McLeod, from Lac du Bonnet applied to be registered. He informed the court that out of fifty electors who resided at Lac du Bonnet but one had registered during registration week, while he himself was the only one who applied for registration at the court of revision. The remainder would be disfranchised unless the court adjourned to Lac du Bonnet.

It appeared from statements which were made to the court, by the candidates, and by Mr. Madden, the reeve of Brokenhead municipality, that the responsibility for this state of affairs rests upon the registration board. In dividing Springfield into registration districts, they included Lac du Bonnet in a district, the polling booth for which was placed at Cromwell. Cromwell is distant from Lac du Bonnet as the crow flies, about twenty miles, but the two places are separated by an impassible morass. In order to register, the residents of Lac du Bonnet would have been obliged to travel by train over the branch line from Lac du Bonnet to Molson, thence along the main line to Beausejour, and from that point they would have to drive eight miles to Cromwell. The only train service to Lac du Bonnet is a weekly train which leaves Molson every Wednesday forenoon, runs down to Lac du Bonnet and returns in the afternoon. The electors of Lac du Bonnet were therefore unable to present themselves at the registration booth. The only man who registered propelled himself from Lac du Bonnet to Molson by hand car, then proceeded by railway train to Beausejour, and thence to Cromwell. The matter was very fully debated by parties cognizant of the facts at the court of revision here yesterday, and it was pointed out to the revising barrister that the people of Lac du Bonnet had been allowed to believe at the time of registration that the court of revision would adjourn to that point in order to enable them to register their names. Mr. Heap, the revising barrister, expessed a willingness to proceed at once to Lac du Bonnet, but objection was taken to this by Mr. Corbett, the Conservative candidate, and Mr. Madden, the reeve of Brokenhead, who requested that time be given to allow due notification to the people of the Brokenhead district. Mr. Heap accordingly fixed the date as above mentioned, namely, Wednesday, June 24.

On that day, Mr. Heap will go down to Lac du Bonnet on the one train that runs each week. In the interval the electors will all be notified, and it is hoped they will all be present and enroll themselves during the hour or so which will elapse before the train begins its return journey.

The feeling here is that Mr. Heap has taken the only honest course to prevent the disfranchisement of the residents of an important settlement, and his action is universally approved by people of all shades of politics.

Mr. STAPLES. What paper is that from?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. The Manitoba 'Free Press.'

Mr. STAPLES. Is it an editorial ?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. No, it is from their correspondent at Beausejour.

Mr. STAPLES. Was Mr. Heap a revising barrister under the law on the day of the adjourned court ?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. If you want my opinion I would say he was.

Mr. STAPLES. Judge Walker says different.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I do not think the hon. gentleman has any authority for such a statement. I will now place on 'Hansard' a list of electors which may be interesting to the hon. leader of the opposition. The hon. gentleman asked for the name of a single one who had been disfranchised, and I give him this list :

List of electors, electoral division of Springfield. Registration district No. 2. Being names added at the adjourned court of revision held on the 24th day of June, A.D. 1903, at Lac du Bonnet.

Allard, Frank, Lac du Bonnet, laborer
Adams, Cyrus, Lac du Bonnet, laborer
Benard, Renie, Lac du Bonnet, shoemaker
Buckmaster, A. H., Lac du Bonnet, laborer
Benard, Clifford, Lac du Bonnet, barber
Blaikie, Chas. H., Lac du Bonnet
Cavanagh, Michael, Lac du Bonnet, laborer
Chann, Victor, Lac du Bonnet, laborer
Campbell, R. N., Lac du Bonnet, bookkeeper
Donald, Edward, Lac du Bonnet, laborer
Dalquist, Peter, Lac du Bonnet, laborer.
Dufresne, Daniel, Lac du Bonnet, laborer
Fores, Chas., Lac du Bonnet, laborer
Gagnon, David, Lac du Bonnet, laborer
Gaudry, Godfrey, Lac du Bonnet, laborer

Halliday, Wm. D., Lac du Bonnet, laborer
Halcro, Arch., Lac du Bonnet, laborer
Heard, Alex., Lac du Bonnet, laborer
Houston, Thos., Lac du Bonnet, laborer
Hanson, John, Lac du Bonnet, laborer
Isbester, Alex., Lac du Bonnet, laborer
Juneau, Camille, Lac du Bonnet, laborer
McLeod, Duncan, Lac du Bonnet, laborer
McLeod, Angus, Lac du Bonnet, farmer
McLeod, Thomas, Lac du Bonnet, laborer
McNabb, John E., Lac du Bonnet, laborer
McLennon, Arch., Lac du Bonnet, laborer
Pruden, Andrew J., Lac du Bonnet, laborer
Phillips, John, Lac du Bonnet, laborer
Rennie, Wm. James, Lac du Bonnet, laborer
Robidoux, Rudolph, Lac du Bonnet, laborer
Sinclair, Wm., Lac du Bonnet, laborer
Spence, Alex., Lac du Bonnet, laborer
Tallman, Walter, Lac du Bonnet, brick-maker
Thompson, John, laborer
Turcotte, John, Lac du Bonnet, laborer
Wellway, Thos. H., Lac du Bonnet, cook
Wood, John, Lac du Bonnet, laborer

This was returned by Mr. Heap to D. M. Walker, who was the senior judge of the county court and chairman of the board and Judge Walker attached to the list the following certificate :

Winnipeg, June 29, 1903.

I, David Marr Walker, chairman of the board of registration, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the names, residence and occupation of the persons appearing on registration register of registration district No. 2 of the electoral division of Springfield, added at the adjourned meeting of the court of revision held at Lac du Bonnet on the 24th day of June, 1903.

(Signed) D. M. WALKER.

Mr. STAPLES. Is that the same declaration as the judge signed to the other lists ?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. This declaration is sufficient for me and I think it would be sufficient for any court in the land.

Mr. STAPLES. Is it the declaration set out in the statute ?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. He certifies these names were added at the adjourned meeting of the court of revision.

Mr. STAPLES. Does he say they were qualified electors?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. He certifies that they appear on the registration register of registration district No. 2 and that they were added at an adjourned Court of Revision. Now I will give you some more information in connection with this matter. I quote from the 'Free Press' of Monday, July 20, 1903 :

The outrageous blocking out of over a hundred duly qualified electors in Centre Winnipeg from the court of revision, though it was declared by the Court of King's Bench a grossly unjust and illegal procedure, nevertheless remains effective, thanks to the steps taken before the Court of King's Bench could give judgment to put it out of the power of that court to remedy the injustice done. As a result, over a hundred duly qualified electors in Centre Winnipeg will not be allowed to record their votes to-day. They have been disfranchised, though they complied exactly with the provisions of the law.

The case of the thirty-eight voters of Lac du Bonnet is still more glaring. These men would have been absolutely unable to register had not the revising officer, Mr. Heap, of Selkirk, adjourned the court of revision to Lac du Bonnet for their benefit.

For the course he took—which was upheld by the judgment of the Court of King's Bench in the Centre Winnipeg case—Mr. Heap had dire threats launched against him by Mr. Colin H. Campbell, Attorney General by grace of Mr. R. P. Roblin. But Mr. Heap, undeterred, went straight ahead and did his duty.

But Mr. Colin H. Campbell has had a card up his sleeve.

There are nine subdivisions in the constituency of Springfield, Lac du Bonnet being in the record. The voters' list for the constituency has been prepared in nine sections, one for each subdivision; and the thirty-eight Lac du Bonnet electors have been added in an appendix at the end.

The list furnished to the deputy returning officer for use in subdivision No. 2, Springfield, to-day is the second section of the list for Springfield. That is all he has been given; the appendix containing the names of the Lac du Bonnet electors, has not been furnished to him. He has been strictly instructed that he is to allow no one to vote whose names is not on the partial list put into his hands.

What do the honest electors think of this deliberate disfranchising of registered voters?

I quote from the Manitoba 'Free Press, June 26, 1903 :

Mr. Fred. Heap, of Selkirk, the revising officer for the constituency of Springfield, set a noteworthy example of the conscientiousness and fearlessness which a public official should bring to the discharge of his duties.

He held the court of revision for Springfield on June 15 at Beausejour and when 5 o'clock arrived instead of closing the revision proceedings and declaring his functions as revising officer ended he announced it adjourned to Lac du Bonnet. This he did in order to allow the residents of the latter place to register. Had he not done so they would have been disfranchised. When Mr. Heap announced the adjourning of the court of revision, both the Liberal and Conservative candidates were present.

By agreement Wednesday was fixed upon as the date to which the adjournment should be made. Wednesday accordingly Mr. Heap went to Lac du Bonnet and registered 38 electors. In adjourning the court of revision as he did Mr. Heap braved the terrors of the Roblin government. Mr. Attorney General Campbell notified him that if he did not at once sign his books and turn them in the chief of provincial police would be despatched to Selkirk to bring both him and the books to Winnipeg, but the launching of the thunderbolt by Mr. Campbell did not cause Mr. Heap a tremor. He went straight ahead and did his duty and he has a complete vindication in the fact that the 38 electors in Lac du Bon-

net who are now on the list would have been disfranchised had he closed the court of revision at 5 o'clock on June 15.

As the 'Free Press' has already explained there is only one train a week on the Lac du Bonnet branch. It runs on Wednesday going out from Molson on the Canadian Pacific Railway main line in the morning and coming back in the evening. This made it impossible for the electors of Lac du Bonnet either to register at the booth appointed for the registration district to which they belong or to attend the court of revision at Beausejour. Had Mr. Heap not taken the course he did despite the fulminations of the Attorney General, these electors would have been barred out from the exercise of their franchise. Every fair-minded man will applaud Mr. Heap's action and condemn the Attorney General's resort to intimidation.

Mr. AVERY. What are you reading from ?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. The Manitoba 'Free Press.' Now, Mr. Speaker, the other day the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) referred to Mr. Heap as a partisan revising officer. I do not think he knows Mr. Heap or he would not speak of him in that way. I have known Mr. Heap for something like 12 years and he was then a Conservative. He did not do anything for me in the last campaign of 1904. I can say that if there is a fair man who is above any partisan feeling in the whole province of Manitoba it is Mr. Fred Heap, and I know him very well. I do not know that he voted for me, as he was not in any way active. He did not attend any meetings in my behalf, and I do not know him to be a partisan at all. I have never known him to take any active part in a political campaign till last year. If there is any man in Manitoba who is non-partisan, he is the man. These 38 men were disfranchised so far as the election of 1903 was concerned. In the list of 1904 I find only 14 of those names. If we had a stable list, the whole 38 names would have been on that list, and could only have been struck off for cause. I find in my list for the federal constituency of Selkirk for 1907 there are only nine of those men ; all the others were struck off, so that they have been disfranchised. In connection with this matter, it has been charged that some one in the Attorney General's office tore off a page and a half of the list. Here is the sworn evidence of O. B. Harvey, who was returning officer in Springfield in the election of 1903, as to a list of electors at Lac du Bonnet who were deprived of their votes. He said :

I didn't deprive them of their votes; it was the board of registration. We knew that a page and a half of names had been torn off, but he said I am not sure they were torn off in my presence.

Mr. Howell.—Did you have a list with this page and a half in your possession?

Witness.—Yes, I had it.

Mr. Howell.—Who mutilated the list by tearing off those names?

Witness.—I cannot say.

This witness was the returning officer for Springfield, and he made eleven polling divisions out of nine furnished him from the lists.

Now, I would like to show how the present law affects the constituency which I have the honour to represent in this House.

The Revised Statutes of Manitoba, volumn 1, 1902, page 859, clause 47, provides that the registration clerk shall enter on his register the name, occupation and residence of applicants. There does not appear to be any post offices required by this clause to be put after qualification of voters, but we find that in the Statutes of Manitoba, assented to on the 8th day of February, 1904, page 27, section 15, also the Manitoba Elections' Act, 1904, chapter 52, page 10, section 31 provides for the post office being put after the qualification of voters. Now this statute was passed three months before the 1904 voters' list was made up, and yet the post office address of 8,234 voters is not on the list out of a total number of 8,338 as shown on the list sent me by the King's Printer, only 159 voters being put on the list in a proper manner as set forth in the statutes. Also in the Manitoba Statutes of 1906, page 64, clause 31, provides for the post office address. Though this applies only to Winnipeg city and Brandon divisions. I have also here a partial list of the county of Selkirk for the year 1906, made up from Manitoba lists on which the last provincial elections were run, and out of 5,566 names on said list 2,877 names are without post office addresses. When an appeal is made to strike off any name it is necessary to notify the registration clerk as shown by form No. 9, page 75, Manitoba Elections Act, 1904. Now, this application to strike off a name must give the name and post office address of the party appealed against. You put in your appeal and where there is no post office address on the list you must simply guess at the post office, as my district is so large and scattered that it is impossible to swear to the post office address of the majority of the voters. When you come before the judge or barrister, who sits at the point, tens, yes hundreds, of miles away from the voter appealed against, you find it impossible in most cases to present evidence which will enable the revising officer to strike off the name. Now, I would like to ask any hon. member of this House what he would do if he was up against a list such as was furnished me by the King's Printer of this government when he was asked by me to send a copy of the voters' list for the county of Selkirk, and which I now lay on the table for the information of hon. gentlemen. I might say further that in anticipation of a coming Dominion elec-

tion I asked a gentleman well qualified for the work to prepare me a list for the county of Selkirk as taken from the list used in the provincial election of 1907. After some weeks' work he sent me a list which was supposed to contain the names of all those entitled to vote at the present time in that county. Upon examination I find that the voters in two suburbs in Winnipeg, Lincoln Park and Elmwood, had not been included by him in the list for the county of Selkirk, and these voters were now in North Winnipeg for the provincial purposes, but still remain in my county for the purpose of a Dominion election. Upon looking up the municipal list which I had for this ward seven of the city of Winnipeg, I found that it contained 922 names. He also omitted to put on this list 127 names which are in the local division of St. Boniface, but belong to the county of Selkirk for the purpose of a Dominion election. The lists as furnished to the returning officers by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery are in such shape that I would challenge any two honourable gentlemen to go over these lists and prepare an identical list. I have gone over them several times and every time with a different result.

I mention this to show the difficulties we are up against in asking our Dominion returning officers to make a proper list for any county in the province of Manitoba from the present provincial lists. For the information of the House I will give particulars regarding this 1904 list which appertained to the county which I have the honour to represent in this House. In the county of Selkirk are two complete electoral divisions and parts of four others. The list for Kildonan and St. Andrews contains 1,942 names, all in Selkirk. The list for Springfield contains 1,090, all in Selkirk. The list for Assiniboia contains 1,002 names, 89 of which belong to Selkirk and 913 to Macdonald. The list for Gimli contains 1,234 names, 594 of which belong to Selkirk and 640 to Dauphin. The list for Rockwood contains 1,706 names, 1,381 of which belong to Selkirk and 325 to Macdonald. The list for St. Boniface contains 1,414 names, 127 of which belong to Selkirk and 1,287 to Provencher. The names on these 6 electoral divisions total up to 8,388 ; of these names 5,222 belong to the county of Selkirk ; 640 to Dauphin, 1,238 to Macdonald and 1,287 to Provencher, or a total of 3,165 names which have to be taken off the lists as furnished to the returning officer by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. I would like to make an explanation here. When I was speaking on this subject in May, 1905, I made the statement that there were 9,000 names on the list sent me by the King's Printer of which only 4,824 votes were in the county of Selkirk. I now find, as stated a moment ago, that the exact figures are 8,388 and 5,223.

Just here, Mr. Speaker, I will give you a list of the registration districts in the electoral divisions of Kildonan and St. Andrews, Rockwood, Springfield, and Gimli, as set forth in the 'Manitoba Gazette' of April, 1907, and give the distance from the place where the registration was held to the towns where the judge sat on the court of revision.

Electoral division of Kildonan and St. Andrews, on Monday morning, May 27 :

Lots 71 and 72 Kildonan, at the house of Stanley Lane, distance to Selkirk, 20 miles.

On Monday afternoon May 27, the house of John T. Haywood on lot 111 Middlechurch, distance from Selkirk, 16 miles.

On Tuesday morning, May 28, at the reading room St. Andrews, distance from Selkirk, 7 miles.

On Tuesday afternoon, May 28, at the Council chamber, St. Clements, distance from Selkirk, 4 miles.

On Wednesday, May 29, at the house of Jacob Anton, Winnipeg Beach, distance from Selkirk, 30 miles.

On Thursday, May 30, at the house of E. L. Carter, on section 12, township, 6, range 3, east, distance from Selkirk, 20 miles.

On Friday and Saturday, May 31 and June 1st at the Town Hall Selkirk.

On Monday afternoon, June 3, at the house of Benjamin Davis on section 20, township 15, range 6, east, distance from Selkirk, 22 miles.

On Tuesday afternoon, June 4, at the school house, Balsam Bay, a distance from Selkirk, 40 miles.

On Thursday, June 6, at the house of J. B. Chevrefils, on River lot 22, Fort Alexander, distance from Selkirk, 80 miles.

Electoral division of Gimli, Court of Revision, Gimli :

On Monday morning, May 27, at the house of S. G. Nordan, on section 23, township 22, range 3, east, distance from Gimli, 23 miles.

On Tuesday, May 28, at the house of G. Helgason, on section 5, township 21, range 3, east, a distance from Gimli of 20 miles.

On Wednesday, May 29, at the Baldwin hall, Gimli.

On Friday, May 31, at the post office, Pleasant Home, a distance from Gimli of 21 miles.

On Tuesday, June 4, at the Lindar Hall, Lindar, a distance from Gimli of 119 miles by the only possible route.

On Wednesday, June 5, at the Markland Hall, Markland, a distance from Gimli of 140 miles by the only possible route.

On Friday, June 7, at the house of John Blue on section 10, township 21, range 7, west, a distance from Gimli of 140 miles, by the only possible route. These registration divisions have been changed some by a recent Gazette, but the court of revision for my district remains at Gimli.

Electoral division of Rockwood :

On Monday, May 27, at the house of W. McNeil, Teulon, a distance from Stonewall of 20 miles.

On Tuesday, May 28, at Skinkles Hall, Balmoral, distance from Stonewall, 8 miles.

On Wednesday, May 29, at the registry office, Stonewall.

On Thursday, May 30, at the house of William Mitchell, Stony Mountain, distance from Stonewall, 7 miles.

On Friday, May 31, at the house of A. M. Campbell, on section 10, township 14, range 1, east, distance from Stonewall, 40 miles.

And referring to this registration district. I might say that no such person as A. M. Campbell resides on the quarter-section described.

On Saturday, June 1, at the house of David Porteous, on section 9, township 14, range 2, west, distance from Stonewall, 17 miles.

On Monday, June 3, at the house of A. R. Henderson, on section 20, township 15, range 3, west, distance from Stonewall, 34 miles.

On Tuesday, June 4, in the Council chamber, St. Laurent, distance from Stonewall, 48 miles.

On Wednesday, June 25, at the house of L. Ward, on section 30, township 16, range 1, west, distance from Stonewall, 27 miles.

Electoral division of Springfield :

On Monday afternoon, May 27, at the house of John Fetterly, on section 30, township 10, range 8, east, a distance from Beauséjour of 60 miles, by train the only route at the time of revision.

On Tuesday afternoon, May 28, at the house of O. B. Harvey, on section 24, township 10, range 4, east, a distance from Beauséjour, of 50 miles by train.

On Wednesday, May 29, at the post office Springfield, a distance from Beauséjour of 35 miles by train.

On Thursday, May 30, at the house of W. G. Stebbing, on section 14, township 12, range 6, east, a distance from Beausejour of 11 miles.

On Friday, May 31, at the house of R. J. Gerradr, Tyndal, a distance from Beauséjour, of 7 miles.

On Saturday, June 1, at the House of R. Bethel, Beauséjour.

On Thursday, June 6 at the house of John McLeod, Whitemouth, a distance from Beauséjour of 25 miles.

On Saturday, June 8, at the house of Antoine Monezhenski, Cromwell, a distance from Beauséjour of 7 miles.

If the persons qualified to be put on as voters do not receive notice of the time of registration or for any other reason do not appear at the place fixed for registration, they have to travel the distances mentioned to get on the list, and from reliable information obtained by me in the year 1905, hundreds of British subjects, in other ways qualified, were unable to get on the lists for the county of Selkirk and were consequently disfranchised, something no hon. gentleman in this House should for a moment justify.

There is quite a large settlement at or near Berens River and around Snake Island on Lake Winnipeg, and the average distance from there to Balsam Bay, where the voter had to go to register would be about 125 miles by water; and it is impossible to go by land which would not be any shorter. Last spring navigation opened in these parts on June 18, and the time fixed for registration was ended the first week in June. The consequence being that no names were added to poll No. 14 and only two struck off, the reason being that they had moved to Selkirk, the town where the court of revision was held.

I will give a few instances of the distances people have to travel if they wish to attend the courts of revision and this applies to the revision shortly to take place:

Fisher river to Gimli, 130 miles.
Hecla, Big island to Gimli, 50 miles.
Wells mill, Humbug bay, to Gimli, 90 miles.
Georges island to Selkirk, 200 miles.
Little Grand rapids to Selkirk, 266 miles.
Berens river to Selkirk, 160 miles.
Badthroat river to Selkirk, 90 miles.
Fort Alexander to Selkirk, 80 miles.

As far as Berens river is concerned, it is a farce to send a registration clerk there now. No mail goes up there at this season and the men are out fishing, so that there are none there at present. If a man there wants to get on the list, he has to travel down the distance mentioned by me.

Mr. STAPLES. What date does the registration clerk sit at this particular place ?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. June 6.

Mr. STAPLES. Will navigation be open then ?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. It may be. Last year it was open June 18 at Berens river.

Mr. STAPLES. Does no mail go in there ?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. For six weeks in the fall and six weeks in the spring there is no mail to that point.

Mr. STAPLES. Did you have registration there under the Greenway administration ?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. We sent a man up in the spring to round up the votes.

Mr. HENDERSON. To round up the Grits.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche), the other evening, challenged the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) regarding a statement he made as to this distance people had to go

to register in my district. Just before the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) came into the chamber he asked me what was the furthest distance any voter had to travel in my district to register, and I said one hundred miles. The hon. member for Marquette said he had taken the map and found that there was a registration district within thirty miles of the northern boundary of Manitoba. But he should have cast his eye east and he would have seen that there was a distance of 110 miles up the Berens river where there was no registration district, and if he had looked up the census map, he would have found that there was a settlement of 133 people there. They are not all entitled to go on the list but a considerable number are. It is a Hudson bay settlement and has quite a half-breed population. It takes three days to get there, so that in making the statement he did the hon. member for Lisgar was absolutely correct.

I wish now to draw attention to another point. Rockwood and Springfield courts of revision last year were both on the same day, making it impossible for the Dominion member to be present at one of these places, Stonewall and Beauséjour. This is an awkward thing for a Dominion constituency and its representative. It is impossible for him to attend all the courts of revision. In my district they have two or three sittings on the same day at different places. I would like to attend the courts while I am a member for the Dominion House but it is simply impossible. These courts are laid out to suit the local constituencies, and that is why the Dominion should take hold of the matter and arrange it to suit the Dominion constituency. The courts of revision should be held on different dates in the different districts of a Dominion constituency.

Let me refer to the proclamation in the 'Manitoba Gazette,' No. 17, April 25, 1908, which shows the short time given at the court of revision, and the time is statutory, judges and barristers having no power to extend it.

Assiniboia court of revision, June 27, last day of registration June 1st. The Assiniboia time is fair, twenty-five days. That is the best in my county.

Gimli, court of revision, 16th of June, last day of registration, June 6,—only nine days between the date of registration and the court of revision, and it is a difficult district to get over.

In Kildonan and St. Andrews there was only 12 days, in Rockwood 13 days, in St. Boniface 24 days, in Springfield 5 days.

In 1904 in Assiniboia there were 23 days, in Gimli 19 days, in Kildonan and St. Andrews 18 days, in Rockwood 8 days, in Springfield 5 days, and in St. Boniface 18 days.

The hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) stated that he understood nearly all the registration districts and the poll districts were coterminous. That is not so in regard to this district. In Kildonan and St. Andrews in 1904 there were 17 polls and only 10 registration districts.

I might state for the information of the House the size of some of the local constituencies. Gimli has an area of 156 by 54 miles, Kildonan and St. Andrews an area of 72 by 168 miles, Springfield an area of 42 by 84 miles and Rockwood of 30 by 42 miles.

The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) asked the Minister of Justice who arranged the lists for the local elections. I do not know what answer the minister gave him but I may say that for the local elections of 1903, the returning officers arranged the lists. I have here a letter from Mr. J. Hooper showing that 13 returning officers made more polls than were allowed, as claimed by him, according to the law. This shows that it is nothing new for returning officers in that part of the country to make more polls than are laid down by the registration divisions.

One deputy returning officer in my constituency left the province really to avoid the annoyance he was put to on account of the harassing tactics of the Roblin government and this federal government will have to see to it in the future that their election officers shall have protection and shall not be worried to death by a partisan government.

There is one point to which I wish to call the attention of the Prime minister and the Minister of Justice. Under the Manitoba law there is no power to increase the number of polls, the 1903 polls must stand under the present law. I would ask any hon. gentleman oposite to point out any power vested by the Manitoba statute in any one, from the Governor General down, to increase the number of polls in a local constituency. In the constituency of Selkirk, which I have the honour to represent, the census of 1901, upon which the last redistribution was founded gave a population of 24,021. The polls as laid down in 1903 in the local lists suit that census and though the population of Selkirk in 1906 was 39,093, there was no change in the number of polls nor can there be until the Manitoba law is changed. So this Bill before its passage should have a provision inserted curing this defect. From 1901 to 1906 the population of Selkirk increased 15,072, and since 1906, I can safely say 5,000 more have been added. Now this increase of population is scatterred over a very large and rough country and it is absolutely necessary that at least 20 new polls should be established; if this parliament does not wish to practically disfranchise a very large number of

hard working and honest farmers. For of my own knowledge I can say that a large majority of this increase are men located on farms. The attention of the Minister of Justice is especially directed to this point, as it is one of immense importance to Selkirk, Provencher and Dauphin, each of these three counties having increased at about the same rate. In the spring of 1905, one year after the last general elections, I took a trip up to Snake Island, about 100 miles from the town of Selkirk. A Mr. Raymond, who kept a general store, gave me a list of over 30 British subjects of over 21 years of age, who should be on the list but were disfranchised owing to the methods of compiling the lists. Most of these men were fishermen and many of them were born in the province.

The present Bill, with some amendments, for we can hardly expect any Bill to pass through the House without some amendment, will, I believe, cure many of the defects as far as lists are concerned, with which we are at present troubled in Manitoba. I do not wish any partisan compilation of lists ; all I wish for is a list that will be just and fair to all concerned and will secure a full and free expression of the will of the electors. It has been claimed by one hon. gentleman that if there had been a fair list, I would have been defeated by 1,000. That is not borne out by the experience of the local elections. In the local elections in the spring of 1904 one of the local counties in my riding, was carried by the Liberals by 256 in the part that was in the county of Selkirk, this one Gimli being a fractional division, another by 185 ; we lost one by 40 and another by one; in two polls in Assiniboia, which are in my riding there was a local Liberal majority of 25. My majority was slightly over 500 in 1904, and we had a Liberal majority of over 400 in the local campaign. You can understand that the Roblin government having control of all matters in connection with the running of provincial elections there would certainly be no disfranchisement of any Conservative voters in the local election.

Mr. W. WRIGHT (Muskoka). Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the Bill before the House will touch the riding, I have the honour to represent, I may be pardoned for discussing it for a short time. It is Bill No. 115, to amend the Dominion Elections Act introduced by the Minister of Justice. There are many good features in the Bill. I do not purpose entering into a discussion of its various clauses, but shall confine myself to section 9a, which reads as follows :

9a. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein contained, voters' lists for the portions of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec which consist of territory not municipally organized and where there is no regular assessment or valuation roll upon which voters' lists are based and for the several electoral districts in the provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia, shall be prepared immediately after the issue of any writ for an election in any such electoral district or in any electoral district composed or partly composed of such territory, or at any time when the Governor in Council so directs; and for the purpose of preparing and giving effect to such voters' lists the Governor in Council may appoint all necessary officers and confer upon them all necessary powers.

I shall briefly refer to the position of the two parties in regard to this matter. The Conservatives in this House have been charged with inconsistency, inasmuch as they have objected to the introduction of this measure giving to the Dominion parliament a measure of control over the election machinery in connection with Dominion elections. Now, the Conservatives in the past have endorsed the compilation of the voters' lists under the control of the Dominion parliament, and they placed an Act upon the statute-book a good many years ago under which they held several elections. The Reform party came into power pledged to do away with the Dominion Franchise Act and adopt the Acts of the provinces, and they did so. I believe they did this on the plea of economy. They claimed that it would be cheaper, and they pinned their faith to the Acts of the various legislatures and asserted that they could be worked out to the satisfaction of the people. Now, what we have found objectionable in the Provincial Acts consists mainly in the following points: We have objected because the qualification is different in the several provinces; manhood suffrage prevails in some and a property qualification in others. Another reason was that residence was required in some places and not required in others. In some provinces they have one man one vote ; in other places a man can vote as many times as he can qualify, and can only be limited by the number of constituencies he may be able to reach. Then the provinces have different methods of making voters' lists, and the lists are compiled at different times. So in adopting the various lists we have found a great deal of objection, we have found it difficult to compile lists suitable for the whole Dominion.

Now, how far does this Bill go towards curing these objections? I do not find that it touches a single objection that the Conservatives have raised to the provincial franchise lists. If the provincial franchise were adopted with a view to economy, then every move that has been made since would meet with the objection that they are increasing the cost. Now, what is the necessity for introducing this measure? It is claimed that in the province of Manitoba there has been some difficulty with regard to the adoption of the provincial lists.

Charges have been made across the floor of the House, and counter charges have been made; I do not propose to go into a discussion of these charges. I propose, however, to say a few words as regards the province of Ontario. Now, our method of compiling voters' lists may date I suppose from the return of the rolls by the assessor. Over a large portion of the province this is done on the last day of April. There is then a period of fourteen days given for anybody to appeal who thinks he has been improperly assessed, or that any of his neighbours have been improperly assessed. At the end of that fourteen days the council, or a committee of the council, is appointed a court of revision, and they sit upon appeals. After they have rendered their verdict the clerk takes the roll and compiles a voters' list off that roll. He compiles it in three parts. In part 1 he puts down the names of all persons qualified to vote at both parliamentary and municipal elections. In part 2 he puts down all the names that are qualified to vote at municipal elections only, and in part 3 those who are qualified to vote at parliamentary elections only. As soon as these have been printed they are posted up, and thirty days' notice is given to enable any person aggrieved to put in an appeal. If an appeal is made inside of 30 days the district judge, or the county judge, as the case may be, takes up the matter. He states the day on which he will hold a court, so that in every case there is a court provided, and a judge sits and hears all appeals and renders his verdict accordingly. After the judge has held his court he then gives a certain length of time in order than anybody who has been inadvertently left off the list may appeal to be put on. Then he sends the list to the clerk of the Crown in Chancery, where it is further dealt with. Then comes in a provision found, not in the Ontario statute, but in the old Dominion Elections Act, which requires these lists to be completed by the judge 60 days before the nomination of candidates or the issuing of the writ, I forget which. Now, I want to point out that all this legal machinery is considered necessary before these lists can be used in order that the rights of every one may be safeguarded, and that everybody may have a right to vote who is qualified to be placed upon the voters' lists. Now, what is the necessity of the 60 days' delay after the completion of the list? I apprehend that it is to allow the lists to be printed at the Government Printing Office in Ottawa, and that ample time may be given the proofreaders to see that no names are left off that were sent in to them. Then the list is sent back to the various municipalities that the candidates who are running for parliament may become conversant with them before they use them in the election. Now, if all that machinery is necessary, and we have found it necessary in Ontario in the organized territory that is not brought under the scope of this Bill, would it be safe, I ask, to adopt a measure such as this that would allow the government to start its legal machinery immediately after the writs are issued? I say that it would be utterly impossible to start that machinery after the writs are issued and at the same time to safeguard the rights of all men who have a right to the franchise. Any attempt to do anything of that kind will lead to the disfranchisement of hundreds and thousands of people in the territory that will be brought under the scope of this measure.

One very strong objection was made by the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) that there was not sufficient time under the Ontario Act properly to make up the lists in the unorganized territory. Now, if there is not sufficient time under the machinery that has been provided by the Ontario government in the unorganized territory, what will be said of the opportunity that will be provided under this Bill that will require the whole thing to be done inside of five weeks? If we take the last election as a criterion we can come to no other conclusion but that the election will take place in about five weeks after the issue of the writs. Let us see how that will work out. The writs are issued. The compilation of the lists is placed in the hands of certain enumerators—I am dealing now with the unorganized portion, we will say, of Ontario or Quebec. The same argument I presume would apply to Manitoba or British Columbia. The enumerators start out to perform their work. We have found it necessary in Ontario to give 30 days' notice that people may become conversant with the fact that the court will be held.

We will suppose that they give 30 days notice and the people are given an opportunity to have their names placed on the list; some people feel aggrieved because they have been left off by the enumerator who ever he may be. He is not an official of standing, he need not be a lawyer or a judge; he may be anybody and the presumption is that he will be a strong party man. He will sit in court and if he has left anybody off or if anybody is put on who should not be put on there will be an appeal. Is it possible that there can be an appeal before the judge and that these lists can be completed and placed in the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for use in election? The thing is an absurdity. It cannot be done and any attempt to do anything of the kind will result in robbing the people of their rights to a large extent in this country. In the unorganized districts of Ontario we have had a law that has allowed the compilation of lists about every three years and we have had a provision in the Dominion Elections Act to meet

that discrepancy. I think that probably I had better read the provision that we have already so as to show there is no necessity for further legislation to make this matter workable. I will read the sub-section (a) of section 8 which is to be found at page 59 of the Dominion Elections Act :

In case the lists mentioned in the last preceding section have been prepared for more than one year, new voters' lists shall be prepared, and the Governor in Council may, for the purpose of preparing and giving effect to such new voters' lists, appoint all necessary officers and confer upon them all necessary powers.

2. In the preparation of such lists, the provisions of the laws of the province regulating the preparation and revision and bringing into force of the provincial voters' lists in such cases, shall, as far as possible, be obseved and followed.

That was probably necessary in order that we should be able to make the voters' lists of that province workable for Dominion purposes. I have no quarrel with that provision of the Act and I only point it out to show that everything has been provided for. That has been supplemented by a provision in the Ontario Elections Act passed during the last winter for the revision of the voters' lists in the unorganized portions of Ontario every twelve months. There is absolutely no reason for touching Ontario in this matter in any shape or form.

Mr. CRAWFORD. How are the lists going to be prepared now for the provincial elections in northern Ontario ? I understand that the elections are to be on the 8th June and that the lists are not complete yet.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. The machinery was set in motion last March and they have been busy ever since preparing these lists. They have to go through these various stages in order to preserve the rights of the public. If the hon. gentleman wants to show that this measure is necessary he will have to show that this all could be done in the five weeks which would elapse between the issuing of the writs and the holding of the election. Five weeks have already elapsed in regard to the lists in the unorganized portions of Ontario.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Have they got the registration completed yet ?

Mr. W. WRIGHT. What does the hon. gentleman mean when he says ' completed.'

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is the enumeration completed yet ?

Mr. W. WRIGHT. I believe the enumeration is about completed but there will be an appeal to the judge.

Mr. GRAHAM. I agree with my hon. friend as to the thirty days that ought to be allowed after the enumeration for revision, but in the unorganized district where the enumeration is not completed it will be impossible to have thirty days for revision before the elections on the 8th June. That is the point that my hon. friend (Mr. Crawford) is making.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. The thirty days have elapsed. More than thirty days have passed since they commenced to compile these lists.

Mr. GRAHAM. But that is not the provision. The provision is that thirty days must elapse between the completion of the lists and the court of revision and that is a physical impossibility because the enumeration is not finished yet.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. No, there are not thirty days between the completion of the lists and the court of revision if the Minister of Railways and Canals means the court that the judge will preside at. That is not the provision in the Act, but it is that there shall be thirty days between the giving of the notice and the meeting of the enumerators that has reference to the sitting of the enumerators, and then there are ten days between that court and the judge's court, the idea being that people shall have that additional opportunity of getting on the list. These two periods, one of thirty days and one of ten days, make forty days that must intervene and there must be the time when the enumerators are getting out their notices and distributing them to the various districts.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am a little rusty on the Ontario election law now. I understood the time was longer. Would my hon. friend say that as a matter of fact in a large district like that, ten days, as he says the law provides—I thought it was longer—is sufficient time for the enumerators to prepare their preliminary list, to have that looked over and to allow people to put in their applications for names to be out, on or struck off.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. Do you mean the appeal to the judge ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. We have thirty days in the older districts but only ten days, the hon. gentleman says, in the newer districts.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. And ten days in the others. You have not thirty days in the others.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. I know whereof I speak. You have thirty days originally to appeal to the enumerators, but you have only ten days to appeal to the judge from the enumerators. The enumerators take the same place as the appeal to the judge would in the unorganized districts so that there are thirty days in addition to the ten days in which to appeal.

Mr. GRAHAM. Ten days is not long enough.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. It is open to debate, I will admit, as to whether ten days is a sufficient length of time. But, the point I am making now is that you have thirty days and ten days and if these periods are found necessary in order to safeguard the interests of the public, how are you going to get the whole thing done in the five weeks that this Act provides for? I think the Minister of Railways and Canals must admit that there would not be sufficient time to perform the whole operation inside of five weeks. I believe there has been a change in regard to the question which was raised by the Minister of Railways and Canals. I believe that there was a repeal of the provision respecting the thirty days' appeal from the enumerator, if I may so term that official. We did not call them enumerators in the Ontario Act. There was the right of appeal for a period of thirty days, but in order to hasten the preparation of the lists for the election that is pending in Ontario that time has been shortened and this has been subject to a good deal of criticism. I think there should be a reasonable time given, but under the provisions of the Bill which we are now discussing such an appeal would be absolutely impossible. No government could commence after the writs are issued and make up proper voters' lists and look after the interests of the people at the same time. Somebody is going to suffer.

That being the case and every interest of the public being safeguarded in the province of Ontario, I do not know any good reason why we should be brought under the scope of this Bill and put to the double expense of looking after two courts of revision inside of one year. Let me point out that any government that wishes to get the voters' lists in the province of Ontario as old and as obsolete as possible will hold an election in the month of October or November. By doing so they will have lists that are practically a year and a half old, and hundreds and thousands of people in that province will be disfranchised whenever elections are held late in the fall of the year. If they were held a little later the new lists would be available and if they were held earlier the lists would be nearer to the date of the previous final revision. But under the machinery in Ontario, as I described it a little while ago, the lists are finally completed by the judge and available for election purposes along in the latter part of November and December. If an election should be held in October or November next, we will be using lists that have been compiled a year and a half previously. That applies to the organized part of Ontario which this Bill does not deal with. Now, the fact is that under our law we could not have a list that would be as old as that in the unorganized portions of the province, so that the unorganized territory is, under the law, more up to date in its voters' lists than the organized part of the province. That being the case, I do not know of any good reason why this law should apply to the unorganized portions of Ontario. The lists there will be compiled annually from this time forward. I think there never has been any charge of unfairness; I think our courts in the northern part of the province have been fairly conducted both under the late government and the present government and there has been very little complaint so far as I know. I think the people have tried to act honestly and honourably, and that being the case, I do not see why we should use federal machinery; go over what has been already well done by the province. It is an utter waste of time and effort and of public money, and unjustifiable from any standpoint.

One of two words with regard to Manitoba. I do not purpose going into any general discussion of the question as it affects Manitoba, but I point out that it would be very hard indeed to satisfy our Liberal friends from that province. Their idea seems to be that the proper method of compiling voters' lists is to hand them over to some well known partisan of their own party who would take the lists down to the party headquarters and do what they like with them and never let a Conservative voter know what has been done so that he cannot tell whether he is on the list or not, and if he is lucky enough not to be disfranchised he is sent to vote 15 or 20 miles away. That seems to be their idea of what will be a fair and equitable and reasonable arrangement. How can they expect the Conservative opposition in this House to agree to that? As far as I know the courts of Manitoba are properly constituted and the judges will sit upon every appeal that is made from the revision court. I cannot believe that the judges of Manitoba will be so unjust in their decisions as to disqualify any man who has a right to be registered. I do not believe that, and consequently I am prepared to stand by the arrangement that allows an appeal to the court. As to whether or not sufficient time is allowed for registration I cannot discuss that question, because I do not know the character of the roads and the local conditions and other matters of detail, but I have no reason to believe that the government of Manitoba or the judges of Manitoba would deliberately set about to disfranchise certain of their citizens. At any rate if sufficient time is not given it would disqualify Conservatives as well as Reformers. We were told to-night that Mr. Leach was a very honest man, that one time he was an honest farmer and that he taught Sun-

day School. Well, that might have carried a great deal of weight at one time, but we have the memory of another gentleman who used to teach Sunday School and who went into West Elgin and sang There is Sunshine in My Soul to-day, when at the same time his cohorts were around disfranchising the people and stuffing the ballot boxes for all they were forth. That man was punished by this government giving him a very lucrative office, and I believe Mr. Leach has also been punished by getting a good government situation out in the west. I am afraid our Reform friends will hardly be able to satisfy the general public of this country that what they are asking in this respect is fair and reasonable and honest.

I want to say a word or two with regard to the province of Quebec. There is an attempt made in this Bill, whether it is a sham attempt or otherwise, to bring Quebec under the provisions of clause 9A. In the province of Quebec they have a property qualification; a man must have property worth so much money, or he must have an income of a certain amount, or he must have earned a certain sum during the preceding 12 months to qualify him to be on the voters' lists. It has been stated that in certain outlying portions of that province there is territory outside the municipal boundaries and the residents of which are not on the municipal lists. It is proposed in order to put these men on the lists to send out an enumerator. Is he going to be qualified as a valuator in order that he shall determine whether a certain farmer should be put on the list, whether his property is sufficient to entitle him to go on the list, whether if he has one or more sons the property is valuable enough to entitle them all to a vote. And after the enumerator has traversed the riding and made his lists, it would be utterly impossible to have an appeal to any judge because 30 days would have expired and then the decision of this enumerator would be final. It has always been deemed wise to have an appeal to a judge in such cases. Is an exception going to be made here? If the appeal is cut out, injustice and wrong may follow. Looked at from every standpoint, I fear that this clause 9A has been conceived in iniquity and born in sin, if it ever comes to birth. Now, the province of Quebec has been in the hands of friends of the Prime Minister for a good many years and if there is any crying grievance in that province, surely the remedy can easily be applied. Our friends on the opposite side cannot claim that they have an unfriendly government in the province of Quebec. We have sitting in this House as head of the government, a gentleman who is very intimate with the Quebec government, and who has, I believe, a great deal of influence in the province of Quebec. We know right well that all the right hon. gentleman has to do in the province of Quebec is to say to one: Go, and he goeth and to another: Come, and he cometh. If there is anything wrong in the compilation of the voters' lists in the province of Quebec, all he has to do is to raise his little finger to have it set right. I cannot conceive that the government of that province could have been so unmindful of the rights of their own citizens as deliberately to leave them off the voters' list, like scattered sheep. As was proved the other day by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, there is provision in the statutes of Quebec enabling the county officers to compile the list if the municipal officers are not able to do it. So that the machinery is here and can be put in motion at any time. It has been intimated that possibly the fact that never before has there been a transcontinental railway built throughout the back part of the province, and that never before have foreigners in that district been put on the voters' list, may furnish a key for unlocking the door which will let us into the reasons why it is proposed to put this law on the statute-book at the present time.

We have not had much information, I admit, from the province of British Columbia. The hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Duncan Ross) stated that they had very little complaint to make of the voters' list there. He said that they had not descended to the bickerings which people apparently did in other parts of the country, and that the voters' list was honestly compiled and everybody entitled to a vote was put on it. If that is the case, why meddle with it? If there is no grievance and everybody is satisfied, why should we lay violent hands upon a matter that pertains to the province only?

If this government were taking hold of this question from the broad standpoint of making a voters' list for the whole Dominion, I would give it my support. It does seem to be an anomaly that we should have all kinds of qualifications, people voting half a dozen times in one province and only once in another. There are many reasons why we should have a uniform Franchise Act covering the whole Dominion. But this Bill does not attempt to touch any grievance. Its effect will be to perpetuate any thing evil in the present situation, rather than to remedy it. Looking at the Bill from every standpoint, I cannot see any good reason for it. The only ostensible reason is the one little point in the province of Manitoba, of Dominion ridings overlapping provincial ridings. That ought to be provided for, and if it is provided for by the authorities in Manitoba, there is no excuse for this Act. If it is not provided for by them, this House would have a right to make some reasonable provision for it. But that work should be done by a proper court, by men vested with proper authority,

and after being properly advertised, so that everybody would have an opportunity of knowing that he was on the voters' list and that somebody was appealing to have his name knocked off, or of having his name put on if it is not there. Voters should not be subject to being bandied about by some party hack without knowing any thing about it. Any interference such as we have had by the thin red line cannot be tolerated in a free country like Canada. I cannot understand how it is that members from the province of Manitoba have got up one after another without condemning a condition of affairs like that. If that is their idea of what is fair and honest, I am sorry for the people of Manitoba who have sent such representatives to this House and I think they ought to send men here who are more reasonable.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What about the black line used by the Conservatives ?

Mr. WM. WRIGHT (Muskoka). I do not care whether the lines are red or black, or whether they are used by Conservatives or Liberals ; I do not think they should be used.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How could the work be done ?

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. If it were done legally, in open court, where both parties were present, there would be no grievance. Any judge who would disfranchise people whose names should be on the list should have his gown taken from him, no matter what political party may have appointed him. If there is any thing that ought to be done straight and clean and honest, it is the compilation of the voters' list, so that every man who is entitled to it should have the privilege of putting his ballot in the box and having it counted for the candidate for whom he wishes to vote. In this matter I would not countenance any crooked work for any party, and I do not believe the judges of this country would lend themselves to any thing of that kind. I have every confidence that they would do what is fair and right, and I think provision should be made that nobody but a judge should be the final arbitrator to decide what names should be put on or taken off the list of voters. We ought not to leave such a matter in the hands of any man that a government—whether the government of Manitoba or the government of Ontario or this government—may choose to pick out for this work men who are under obligations to the party who appoint them, and who know that they will get a fat office if they do the dirty work of the party, we shall never have a clean election. Let it be done in a way that will bear the light of day ; let it be left to the judges, and let us see that ample time is provided for every man who is entitled to vote to have his name put on the list, and then let us see that he is properly safeguarded in exercising his right to go to the poll and cast his ballot for the man of his choice. There are other matters that I would like to speak of, but as the House must be weary at this late hour of the night, I will reserve what further I have to say for the discussion of the Bill in committee.

Mr. DUGAS (Montcalm). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I do not intend at this late hour of the night to go very minutely in the Bill before this House. I will limit myself to a part only of the arguments advanced by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), in his speech last Friday.

The hon. member has quoted the electoral law of Quebec in a very inexact way. I was astounded when reading his speech in the 'Hansard' when I saw what gross errors he had made in expounding that law.

He said that the principle of the law was that every organized municipality, either parish or county, in our province had the power to prepare the electoral lists. This is absolutely against the practice up to this day. I will quote his own words, so that I will have a better chance of reputing them:

> Now, is there in the province of Quebec any territory not organized municipally? For, if there is not, then the statement contained in that enactment is not true, and a great semblance of reason it seems to me, is given to the statement made here by my hon. friend from Marquette. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has practised law for a long time in a part of the country where municipal cases were frequent. He knows perfectly well that there is not one inch of the province of Quebec that is not organized municipally—not one inch. He shakes the head; he has doubts on that point. I will, therefore, endeavour to convince him. You know that we have in the province of Quebec cities and towns and villages especially organized—that is, covered by special statutes of the local legislature. Will my right hon. friend say that these particular places are not municipally organized?

Thus, the contention of my hon. friend is that in the province of Quebec there are no unorganized territories as municipalities. I will show that this statement is absolutely contrary to the facts. The hon. member establishes his argument on section 17 of the Electoral Law of Quebec, which reads in this way:

> 17. The secretary treasurer of each municipality shall, between the first and fifteenth days of the month of September, in each year, make in duplicate, subdivided for each polling subdivision, a list, in alphabetical order, of all persons who, according to the valuation roll then in force in the municipality for municipal purposes appear to be electors by reason of the immovable property possessed or occupied by them in any manner

within the municipality, or by reason of being otherwise qualified as set forth in article 9. It is the duty of the council of the municipality to see that at the time named there is such a secretary treasurer appointed and competent to act.

Relying upon this section, the hon. member contends that the list of voters can be made by the secretary of every municipality. This contention has absolutely no foundation. Here is what my hon. friend answered to this argument. Here is what he said the other night:

Our electoral law prescribes that the secretary treasurer of the council, whatever council it may be, must make an electoral list and if he has under his control territory which belongs properly to the county council where there is no local municipal organization, he should make an electoral list for that part of his territory. There is no question about that whatever.

In order to give more weight to his statement the hon. member said that he had studied law under a very distinguished member of the Montreal bar, under a man with whom a certain number of members of this House were acquainted, and who has held also a prominent place in Canadian politics.

He added that the hon. First Minister had adso studied law under the same jurisconsult, and that he was astonished that the government presided by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had agreed to put into the Bill now before the House a clause to the effect that in the unorganized territories, the government may prepare the electoral lists.

Alluding to the great lawyer already mentioned, he said: Only good principles were thought by him, and we had the advantage of getting the best light to guide us in the study of law. All this was said, Mr. Speaker, to impress more fully the mind of the House.

The hon. gentleman has based his argument upon section 1 of the 'Municipal Code,' and upon section 32 of the same code. He contends that under section 1 there are no unorganized territories in the province of Quebec. I will quote the section:

1. The municipal code applies to all the territory of the province of Quebec, excepting the cities and towns incorporated by special statutes.

And from this he contends that there are no unorganized territories in the province of Quebec for the reason that the 'Municipal Code' applies to all the territory of the province. But, if the hon. gentleman had read further, if he had read section 2, I have no doubt he would have immediately modified his views. Here is what this section says:

2. The territory subject to the provisions of the municipal code is divided into county municipalities.

County municipalities include country, village or town municipalities.

Thus the territory subject to the 'Municipal Code' is the territory erected in village, parish and city municipalities, and all the rest is unorganized territory according to the 'Municipal Code.'

The hon. member has quoted section 32. I cannot understand what argument he wanted to draw from it, because this section adds another proof to the existence of unorganized territories. It provides for the erection of municipalities by the citizens. I will read it:

The council may, by a resolution, after public notice to that effect has been duly given, previous to the passing thereof, and approved and published in the manner prescribed by article 41, erect into a parish municipality, under the name which belongs to it, according to the rules prescribed, any territory included in one or more townships or part of township, whether or not erected into municipality, provided that such parish contains a population of three hundred souls and is wholly situated in the county.

Consequently this section instead of supporting the contention of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier contradicts it absolutely. It says that whenever there will in an unorganized territory a population of at least 300 souls, the parties may ask to the county council to erect in a municipality. If the hon. member had read section 28 he could have found there a stronger argument in favour of his contention.

I will read the section:

Every territory not erected into local municipality, or every territory of which the council is not organized, is, until it be annexed to an adjoining local municipality or until the council therefore be organized, administered and regulated by the county council and its officers, under their usual names and with the same privileges, rights and obligations, as if such council and officers were the local council and officers of such teritory.

As I have just already said, if the hon. member had read that section he could perhaps draw a satisfactory inference frcm it. But if it is true that the unorganized territories of the province of Quebec may be governed by the county councils, when they request it, I do not know of any one who ever did. In my own county there was at the time of my first election four groups of population which were subject to the county council. These various groups of settlers who come into our province prefer to wait till they are numerous enough before asking the county council to erect into a municipality.

Now the electoral law of 1903, of the province of Quebec, gives the necessary qualifications of a voter:

9. The following persons, and no other, being males, and who, at the time of the deposit of the list under articles 25 and 26 of

this Act, are of the full age of twenty years, subjects of His Majesty by birth or naturalization and not otherwise legally disqualified, shall be entered upon the list of electors:

1. Owners or occupants, in good faith, of immovable property estimated, according to the valuation roll in force, at a sum of at least three hundred dollars in real value, in any city municipality entitled to return one or more members to the legislative assembly, or two hundred dollars in real value or twenty dollars in annual value in any other municipality.

2. Tenants in good faith, paying an annual rent, for immovable property of at least thirty dollars in any city municipality entitled to return one or more members to the legislative assembly, or at least twenty dollars in any other municipality, provided such immovable property be estimated, according to such valuation roll, in real value, at, at least, three hundred dollars in any city municipality entitled to return one or more members to the legislative assembly, or two hundred dollars in any other municipality.

Thus no one but those whose names are on the assessment rolls can be a voter.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier said: But the assessment role does not say who is an owner or a farmer's son; it does not state who is a retired gentleman, a fisherman, &c., to whom the law gives the right to vote.

The hon. member is also mistaken. Section 718 of the Municipal Code says:

718. The valuation roll must include all taxable property in the municipality, and must specify in so many distinct columns and in the following order:

1. The consecutive names on the rolls;
2. The names, surnames and the quality of the owners of taxable property, if they are known;
3. The quality and age of the owners;
4. By whom it is occupied;
5. The qualities of the occupants, when they are not the owners;
6. The indication or designation of the taxable real estate, in the manner prescribed by a resolution of the council; but for any lot or part of any lot entered in the cadastre it is necessary to use the numbers of the cadastre;
7. The real value of such real estate giving separatively the value of any part of a lot occupied by any person not being the owner;
8. Their annual value or rent;
9. The nature of the property declared taxable by article 710;
10. The value of such property;
11. The total value of the taxable property of each person, including, if necessary, the real value of the real estate, and the value as mentioned in the foregoing paragraph;
12. The names, calling and qualification of the following persons, being males of the full age of twenty-one years and subjects of Her Majesty and subjects by naturalization:

(a) Teachers teaching in the municipality under the control of school commissioners or trustees;

(b) Retired farmers or proprietors (annuitants) receiving a rent of at least one hundred dollars;

(c) Fishermen, owners of boats, nets, fishing gear and tackle or shares in a registered ship, and the actual value thereof;

(d) Farmers' sons, working under father's or mother's farm;

(e) Sons of owners of real properity residing with their fathers and mothers;

(f) Priests, curés, vicaires, missionaries and ministers of any religious denomination, domiciled for upwards of six months in the municipality.

So that the militia council of the province of Quebec makes obligatory that the assessment roll of each municipality must contain all what I have read. But if we compare section 718 of the Code with section 9 of the electoral law of the province of Quebec, we see that both are identically the same. Numerous amendments have been made to our Code, but they were always directed to agree with the provisions of the electoral law.

But the capital sin of the hon. member is this. Basing his argument on section 17, which I have already quoted, he said, alluding to the preparation of the electoral list: The law does not make any distinction, and where the law does not make any distinction, nobody can distinguish, and he added that the word secretary-treasurer of the municipality means just as well secretary-treasurer of a county council as of a local municipality.

If the hon. member had read paragraph 10 of section 3, which the interpretation of the electoral law, he would have seen what was meant by the word 'municipality.' Here it is:

10. The word 'municipality' means every municipality of a parish or part of a parish, if a township or part of a township, of united townships, of a village, of a town existing under the operation of the municipal code, and every town or city municipality incorporated by charter or special Act.

Thus according to the election law, the clerk of these municipalities is the only party who can make the list, and by the construction which the law puts on the word 'municipality,' it cannot be applied to a county municipality.

The Municipal Code gives about the same definition to the word municipality, in section 19, paragraph 1

1. The word 'municipality' means solely the territory erected for the purpose of municipal administration. In every municipality bounded by a navigable or floatable river the limits of the municipality extend to the middle of such river.

2. The term 'rural municipality' or 'country municipality' includes and means parish municipalities, municipalities or part of a parish, of a township or part of township, of united township and generally every local municipality other than town or village municipalities.

Thus the meaning that must be given to the word 'municipality' according to the

Municipal Code is about the same as the one given by the electoral law, and when section 17 of this law puts upon the secretary treasurer of every municipality the duty of making a voters' list each year, from the 1st to the 15th of September, this duty is imposed upon the secretary-treasurer of parish municipality and not upon the secretary-treasurer of a county municipality.

Lists are made from assessment roll and I would like very much that the hon. member would tell me where I could find any section of the Code giving the power to a municipality, other than local municipality to make an assessment roll. I see in section 365 and 366 the following provisions.

CHAPTER 8.

Officers of the local council.

365. In addition to the municipal officers which it is required to appoint of the other provisions of this code, every local council must appoint, in the month of March, of every second year:

1. Three valuators;
2. A road inspector for every road, division, in the municipality.
3. Rural inspector for every rural division in the municipality.

366. The valuators enter upon their duties so soon as they have made oath well and faithfully to discharge the duties of their office.

Section 716 puts upon the valuators of every local municipality the duty to prepare assessment roll every three years, in conformity with the section 716 already quoted.

716. In the months of June and July, triennally, the valuators of every local municipality must draw up, either personally or by any other person employed by them, a valuation roll based upon the real value of the property, and which are set forth with care and correctness all the particulars required by the provisions of this title.

It is plain, therefore, that the voters' lists must be made from assessment roll, and that this roll must be made by the valuators appointed by the local council. There is not in our municipal code of Quebec a single section giving to the county council the right to appoint valuators to make an assessment roll, and I cannot understand where the hon. member has found such a thing.

Mr. DUGAS.

Now in conclusion I am able to state that there is in the province of Quebec some unorganized territories.

As I stated in the beginning of my remarks, when I was elected for the first time in 1900, there were in my county four settlements whose inhabitants has no right to vote, because they were never elected in a municipality. I was anxious that the franchise should be given to these four settlements ; I had even made a promise to that effect during my last campaign.

I have at that time got the opinion of eminent jurisconsults ; I have myself carefully studied the question, and I came to the conclusion that there was no other means to give to these citizens their franchise, than by the interference of the federal government through a law corresponding to section 9 of the Bill before us. I must say that if I have not succeeded to convince the government of the opportunity to make a law such as would give the franchise to these four settlements in my county, two at least have already obtained that right by forming themselves into municipality, without the assistance of any federal law of this Parliament.

The good administration of the affairs of the country, and the prosperity that we have enjoyed, since Sir Wilfrid Laurier is the leader of the government, has been felt in that part of my county as elsewhere, and the population have so increased that two of the four settlements already mentioned have been able to form a municipality under the Municipal Code.

This is all that I intend to say on this question. I followed this debate with much interest. I am satisfied that grave injustices has been made in the province of Manitoba. I am equally satisfied that four settlements in my county have been unjustly deprived during many years of their franchise. In the Bill before us, I see a remedy to this, and I cannot do otherwise than to support it in principle.

I have no doubt that when the Bill will come in committee, that amendments will be made. In these circumstances I am proud to give to the Bill my hearty support.

On motion of Mr. Calvert the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12.55 a.m. Tuesday.

INDEX

FOURTH SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT, 1907-1908.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass., Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Conside ; Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments ; Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General ; Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved ; Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., North-west Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques- Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

ADAMSON, Mr. A. J., *Humboldt,*

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s (B. 82) 1°*, 1732 (i); in Com., 4996 (iii); on Senate Amts., 10511 (iv).

Northern Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 7) 1°*, 231 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8583 (v).

Timber Limits, Leasing, of, &c., Com. of Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2276 (ii).

ALCORN, Mr. G. O., *Prince Edward, Ont.*

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4401 (iii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv), 8552 (v).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5955; Section of House of Commons Act (read) 5955 (iii).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1843 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 80) 1° m., 1671 (i); 2° m., 5228 (iii).

—— B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7890 (iv), 11753 (vi); in Com., 11812, 11840, (amt.) 11846, 11927 (vi); in Com., 12939 (vii); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 13254 (vii).

Immigration Agent A. G. McDonald, Payments *re* Placing of Immigrants (M. for cor.*) 4773 (iii).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12402 (vii).

ALCORN, Mr. G. O.—*Con.*

McDonald, Albert G., Commission paid *re* Immigrants, &c. (Ques.) 8617 (v).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7231; on M. for 3°, 7222 (iv).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9498 (v).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11998 (vi).

Ry. Connections, &c. (remarks) 434 (i).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents, &c.) 9969; (relief to settlers) 9985 (v).

Indians, Ont and Que. (land sales) 12735 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (patrol boats) 4750 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (obstructions) 3213; (tidal services) 3215; (wrecks) 3202 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5528 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cumberland) 10865 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10899 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8530 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax, customs) 7163; (Halifax, military) 7144; (Shelburne) 7177 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph armoury) 7680; (Kincardine) 7699; (Kingston gun shed) 7701; (London military) 7708; (North Bay) 7713 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Museum) 1498 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8594 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bronte) 12092 (vii); (Point Edward) 5713; (Stanley island pier) 5722 (iii).

ALCORN, Mr. G. O.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—I.C.R. (St. Cyrille diversion) 12757 (vii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10544 (vi).

AMES, Mr. H. B., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

Accountants, Payments to by Dept. of Justice (Ques.) 3233 (ii).

Advertisements for Tenders of Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4716 (iii).

Albert Development Co., Control of Coal Lands (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

All-Red Line, Mr. White's Duties in England (Ques.) 694 (i).

Arsenault, Mr. Auguste, Emplymt. in Customs, Montreal, Charges against (Ques.) 1347 (i).

Boyle Concession, Memorials from Dawson Legislature (Ques.) 509, 562, 681 (i).

Census Map, Publishing of (Ques.) 4406 (iii).

Central Ry. of Canada, Charter Grant, Deposit *re* (Ques.) 4767 (iii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10744 (vi).

Cloutier, J. E., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 8380 (v).

Coal Areas, Agents for Applicants, &c. (Ques.) 5469 (iii).

—— Agency of M. McKenzie and J. H. Moss, Applications, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5476 (iii).

—— Held by F. E. Keniston, Cor., Papers, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5476 (iii).

—— Name and Address of Agents *re* Applications, &c. (Ques.) 5789 (iii).

Coal Lands, Applicants, Names, Price, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3434 (ii).

Coal Lands in Alberta and Sask., Total Area sold, &c. (Ques.) 9278 (v.)

—— Royalty Fees, &c., Sale or Lease of (Ques.) 11019 (vi).

Coal Lands, Disposed of by Govt., Original Applicants, &c. (Ques.) 3232, 3480 (ii).

—— Purchase Price, &c., on Section 16, 20 and 21, &c. (Ques.) 10512 (vi).

—— sold, or assigned, &c., since March, 1907 (M. for ret.*) 698 (i).

—— Sale of through J. W. Bettes, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6242 (iv).

—— sold by P. E. Lessard (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

—— Sale by McGivern & Hayden (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

—— in Sections 2, 4, 9, 15, 17 and 28, First Applicants, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3850 (ii).

—— in Section 13, First Applicants, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3851 (ii).

AMES, Mr. H. B. —*Con.*

Coal Mining Privileges in Sections 11, Applications, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 3850 (ii).

Coal Mining in Sask. and Alberta, Returns made to Govt., &c. (Ques.) 10257 (v).

Customs Frauds, in Montreal, Complaints *re* Compromises (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9558 (v).

Documents in Depts., Access to Original Papers (M. for ret.) 1132; (reply) 1196; Amt. neg. (Y. 51; N. 86) 1201 (i).

Documents, Original, Examination of by Public Accounts Com. (remarks) 3853 (ii).

—— Production to Members, on M. for Sup., 1775, 1806 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11817; (amt.) 11821 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11137; in Com., 11189, 11423 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4678 (iii); in Com., 10761 (vi).

Favoured Nation Treatment, Conventions *re* Commercial Relations, &c. (Ques.) 846 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1408 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Canadian Products enjoying benefit of Minimum Tariff, &c. (M. for ret.) 851 (i).

—— Correction of Question *re* Sir Charles Tupper's Expenses, 1424 (i).

—— Favoured Nation Clause; and Foreign Powers, &c. (Ques.) 845 (i).

—— German Surtax, Effect, &c. (Ques.) 844 (i).

—— Imports from U.S., Exclusion of, &c. (Ques.) 845 (i).

—— Preferential Tariff, Names of Countries, &c. (Ques.) 844 (i).

Fishing Privileges granted in Clearwater, &c., Lakes, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

—— on Lesser Slave Lake, Date of Lease, Protest, &c. (Ques.) 6398 (iv).

Gaetz Brothers, Payments to (Ques.) 10514 (vi).

G. T. P. Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10772 (vi).

G. T. P. Prohibition Zone, Reduction of, &c. (Ques.) 516 (i).

Grazing Leases, Application of Messrs. Woods, Fleck and Finnie (Ques.) 238 (i).

Homestead Application of Mr. John C. Haddock, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 181, 11197 (vi).

Homestead Entries in Man., &c., Total Acreage (Ques.) 6920 (iv).

Homesteading in Section 18, Extension *re* Allowance, &c. (Ques.) 8381 (v).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*

Hough, Campbell and Ferguson, Sales of Lands to, &c. (Ques.) 364, 568 (i).

Immigrant Bonuses, Increase to Agents, &c. (Ques.) 3429 (ii).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4673 (iii).

Lake Megantic Public Works, Total Cost to date, &c. (Ques.) 11299 (vi).

Land Grants to Rys., Selection, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 4766 (iii).

See 'Rys.', &c.

Lands leased by Govt. in Section 11, Twp. 8, Original Grantee, &c. (Ques.) 3234 (ii).

Land Patents, Section 8, Twp. 53, &c., Occupation of Present Owner, &c. (Ques.) 3430 (ii).

McGuire, ex-chief Justice, Superannuation of, &c. (Ques.) 10514 (vi).

Mining, Surface or Timber Rights, on Section 8, Applications, &c. (M. for copies*) 3850 (ii).

Montreal Examining Warehouse, Valuations, Reps., Cor., Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 698 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 3319 (ii).

Patent and Proprietary Medicines B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 2°, 10553 (vi).

Peace River Colonization and Land Development Co., Surveys, Reps., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).

Quarantine Lands, Sask., Sale of, &c. (Ques.) 3481 (ii).

Ry. Charters and Land Grants, Renewals of (Ques.) 9271 (v).

—— Amounts and Names of Cos. (Ques.) 9271 (v).

Railway Land Grants in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Total Acreage, &c. (Ques.) 6920 (iv).

See 'Lands.'

Ry. Subsidies in Land, Areas for 1892-6 (Ques.) 8613 (v).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4662 (iii).

See 'Documents.'

Robbins Irrigation Co., Amount expended to Date (Ques.) 4763 (iii).

—— (M.) for Papers, 5210 (iii).

St. Andrews Rapids Improvements, Land Grant to Great Falls Power Co. (Ques.) 238 (i).

Sessional Paper No. 167b, brought down April 26 (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

Sessional Paper No. 207 *re* Fishing Leases (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9538 (v).
Dom. Lands (surveys) 9996 (v).
Marine (ice breakers) 1895 (i).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dominion arsenal) 7434; (Montreal, barracks) 7408; (Montreal examining warehouse) 7424; (Montreal, post office) 7410; (Montreal, station B) 7419; (Montreal, station C) 7420; (Nicolet) 7428; (Pointe St. Charles) 7419; (St. Rochs) 7439 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs, &c.) 11693 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Caraquet wharf) 11686; (Madawaska) 11696 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. Lake Ainslie) 11228; (McPherson's Cove) 11229; (Margaree) 11229; (Middle River) 11229; (New Glasgow) 11257; (Oyster Pond) 11258; (Parker's Cove) 11258; (Parrsborough) 11259; (Porter's lake) 11260; (Port Hilford) 11267; (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hood) 11268; (Pugwash) 11280; (Round Hill) 11281; (Tancook island) 11230 (vi).

Taché, J. C., Emplmt. in Public Works Dept. (Ques.) 8180 (iv).

Timber Berths, Leasing, &c., Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2269 (ii).

Timber Berths, 1046, &c., Original Applications (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).

—— No. 1100, Area, &c. (Ques.) 364 (i).

—— No. 1168, Area, &c. (Ques.) 363 (i).

—— No. 1279, Applications, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

Timber Lands, Sale or Lease subsequent to Ret. of April, 1907 (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 3580 (ii).

Timber Leases, *re* Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., on M. (Mr. Turriff) 8711 (v).

Timber Licenses in Man. and N. W. Ters., Renewals, &c., Total Areas, &c. (Ques.) 691 (i).

Timber Licenses issued in Man. and N. W. T. during 1896-7 (Ques.) 2396 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of Ques. of Priv., *re* Mr. Turriff's Charges, 2309 (ii).

Timber Permits to Settlers *re* cutting, in Twp. 39, Range 11 (Ques.) 11495 (vi).

Water-power Privileges in Alberta, &c., Sale or Leases (Ques.) 8378 (v).

Yukon Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10535 (vi).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E., *Lambton, East.*

Absinthe and Brandy Importations, Total Amount, &c. (Ques.) 689 (i).

Address, The, 335, 366; (amt.) 380; Neg. (Y. 54; N. 103) 505 (i).

Advertisement for Tenders, for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4735 (iii).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3878 (ii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

'Arctic' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4030 (ii).

Atlantic Steamers Mail Service, Cost per Annum (Ques.) 5656 (iii).

Barlow, Dr. A. E., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ques.) 5205 (iii).

——— Payments *re* Temagami District, 5787 (iii).

——— Survey *re* Temagami District (Ques.) 5473 (iii).

Bayfield, &c., Ret., Inquiry for, 6223 (iv).
See 'Docks,' &c.

Brewster and Park Hill Mail Route, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 6404 (iv).

Brock, Mr., Emplymt. *re* Geological Survey (Ques.) 5204 (iii).

Budget, The, 6046; (M.) to adjn. deb., 6054; rsmd., 6062 (iii).

Campaign Literature, sent by Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10343 (vi).

Canada and France Ocean SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6164, 6196 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., Action of Govt., Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 2795 (ii).

——— Removal of, Action by Govt. since 1896 (Ques.) 2167 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 6223 (iv).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).

——— Par. in Montreal 'Gazette,' 13081 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5124 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11371 (vi).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9168 (v).

Cold Storage Shipments, Number for year ending March 1, 1908 (Ques.) 6403 (iv).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 11314 (vi).

Customs Officers at Niagara, Fort Erie, &c., Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 6980 (iv).

Daley, Mr. R., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ques.) 5204, 5473 (iii).

Digby to Westport Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 7203 (iv).

Docks, Piers, &c., constructed at Bayfield, Grand Bend, &c., Cor., &c., *re* (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).
See 'Bayfield,' 'Grand Bend.'

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, 1878 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8645 (v); in Com., 12971 (vii).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5023 (iii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Dowling, Mr. D. B., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ques.) 5206 (iii).

——— Emplymt. by German Development Co. (Ques.) 5564 (iii).
See 'German.

Exhibitions outside of Canada, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4584 (iii).

Experimental Farms, Total Receipts from Sales, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4585 (iii).

Farnell, Gordon, Contractor for Halifax Mails, &c. (Ques.) 7731 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3605, 3637 (ii).

Fruit and Dairy Divisions, Separation of, &c., (Ques.) 2166 (ii).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10554 (vi).

German Development Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10580 (vi).
See 'Dowling.'

German Goods imported under Preferential Tariff, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 689 (i).

Geological Survey Department, Total Expenditure from 1896-1908 (Ques.) 6402 (iv).

Geological Survey Yacht, Use of (Ques.) 11231 (vi).

Grain Inspection in 1906, Total Expenditure, Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 4586 (iii).

Grand Bend Pier, Final Estimate of Chief Engineer Lafleur (Ques.) 8892 (v).

Grand Bend Wharf, Contract *re* (Ques.) 5085 (iii).

——— Ret., Delays, &c. (remarks) 4408 (iii).

G. T. R. Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12062 (vii).

G. T. P., Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10772 (vi).

——— Supplies to Prince Rupert via American Routes (remarks) 9025 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10375 (vi).

'Graphite,' Cost of Publication, Total Value, &c. (Ques.) 5081 (iii).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6651 (iv).

Hay and Straw Embargo by G. B., &c. (Ques.) 4765 (iii).

Immigrant Passages to Canada, Number rejected by SS. Companies (Ques.) 5468 (iii).

Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. for Sup., 11022 (vi).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13127 (vii).

Indian Lands and Islands owned by Indians, Sale of, &c. (Ques.) 5078 (iii).

——— Number of Acres sold since 1896, Total Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 4586 (iii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

I. C. R., Concrete Pipe, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 6640 (iv).

—— on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4428 (iii).

Jamestown Exhibition, Canadian Exhibits, Permission *re* (Ques.) 5079 (iii).

'Lady Evelyn' Str., Date and Place of Wintering, &c. (Ques.) 7936 (iv).
See 'Rimouski.'

Literature, &c., distributed through Mails (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9095 (v).

Mail Matters, Fradulent Weighing, Inspection of (Ques.) 4827 (iii).

Mail Matter mutilated in Transmission, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 2214 (ii).

Mail Service in B. C., Improvements *re* (remarks) 3754 (ii).

Mail Steamer, Purchase of (Ques.) 4827 (iii).
See 'Lady Evelyn.'

Mail Subsidies to Steamships, Total Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 689 (i).

Meat Inspection Act and Packing Houses, Cor., Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 4589 (iii).

Montreal Postal Service, Irregularities of, &c. (Ques.) 9274 (v).

Montreal Post Office, Extra Clerks, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9113 (v).

Newspapers, Postal Arrangements, &c. (Ques.) 6460 (iv).

North East Harobur Wharf, Total Length (Ques.) 11019 (vi).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10850 (vi).

Patent Medicines Inspection B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 6216 (iii).

Postal Arrangements between U.S. and Canada, Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 3885 (ii).

—— on Stmnt. (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).

—— (remarks) 3040 (ii).

Postal Note Business, Commission, Expenditure *re* Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 9279 (v).

Postal Rates on N. S. Weekly Newspapers, Tel. *re* (Ques.) 3484 (ii).

Postal Regulations *re* Weekly Newspapers, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 5201 (iii).

Postal Service, Complaints *re* Inadequacy (Ques.) 352 (i).

—— (M. for ret.*) 559 (i).

—— (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 7257 (iv).

—— Improvements in, &c. (Ques.) 8891 (v).

—— Irregularities in Western Canada (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8873 (v).
See 'Rimouski.'

Postal Service Printing, Tenders *re*, &c. (Ques.) 5472 (iii).

Postal Service Return, Inquiry for, 4832 (iii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10705 (vi).

Post Office Returns, Number, &c. (Ques.) 6405 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Change of Plans *re* Height of Span (Ques.) 5202 (iii).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4969 (iii).

—— (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10640 (vi).

Red Head Wharf, N.S., Total Expenditure (Ques.) 11019 (vi).

Returns, Inquiry for, 2024 (ii).

—— Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4664 (iii).
See 'Documents.'

Rimouski, Dredging, &c., *re* Landing of Str. 'Lady Evelyn,' &c. (Ques.) 7727 (iv).
See 'Lady Evelyn.'

Rimouski Mail Contracts, Payments to Str. 'Rhoda' (Ques.) 8176 (iv).

Round Bay, N.S., Removal of Post Office (Ques.) 11297 (vi).

Royal Mint, Amount of Silver and Gold Coins, &c. (Ques.) 8612 (v).

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. Blain) in Com., 4580 (iii).

St. Joseph's Wharf, Ont., Tenders, &c., *re* Construction (Ques.) 8890 (v).
See 'Bayfield,' &c.

Sandy Cove, N.S., Mail Service, Tender *re* (Ques.) 8891 (v).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3786 (ii); in Com., 12622 (vii).

South Huron, By-Election, Amounts paid Returning Officer, &c. (Ques.) 9270 (v), 11935 (vi).

Spry Bay Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 2391 (ii).

Steamship Subsidies and Subventions, Total Amount paid for five years, &c. (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 671 (i); (dairying, &c.) 10399 (vi); (census, &c.) 674 (i); (exhibitions) 10577 (vi); (fumigating stations) 12879; (Meat and Canned Foods Act) 12894 (vii); (seed branch) 5560 (iii); (Year Book) 678 (i).

Canals (Port Colborne) 10312 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 623; Mines (salaries) 646 (i); Post Office (clerical assistance) 8873 (v); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 651 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9227 (v).

Geological Survey (oil borings) 13163 (vii).

House of Commons (Library of Parlt.) 10504 (vi).

Indians—Generally (destitute, &c.) 5762 (iii); Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12748

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, rents, &c.) 5039; (aids to navigation) 5040, 5774; (Thunder Bay Ice-breaker) 5041 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson bay patrol) 4030, 4133 (ii).

Marine, &c.—Public Works (ship channel) 5035 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5749 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Japanese riots, B.C.) 5783 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5764 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2942; (wrecks) 3149, 3209 (ii).

Post Office (inspectors) 9094; (stamps, &c.) 9111 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10872; (Victoria immigration) 10875 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886, 10887 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg hospital) 10966 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7135 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Markham) 7711; (North Bay) 7712, 7812; (Renfrew) 7825; (St. Mary's) 7826; (Sarnia) 7829 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 11009; (lighting) 11011 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Cookshire) 7282; (Knowlton) 7290; (Lévis) 7295 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8586; (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8601 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (St. John) 12020 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Gore's Landing) 12101 (vii).

Railways (extra clerks) 10343 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (inspection) 10392 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5552 (iii), (supplies) 10193 (v).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10375 (vi).

AVERY, Mr. M., *Frontenac.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5123 (iii).

Hawkeye, Mr., Emplymnt. as Returning Officer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7251 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5529 (iii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2489, 2662 (ii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10696 (vi).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B. (Minister of Justice) *North York, Ont.*

Accountants, Emplymt. and Payment by Dept. of Justice (Ans.) 3233 (ii).

Admiralty Jurisdiction Act Amt. (B. 122) prop. Res., 2881 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4835; 1°* of Bill, 4867 (iii).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Anti-Cigarette Bill: *See* '*Tobacco.*'

B. C., Appeal Court (B. 165) prop. Res. 8185 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8465; 1° m., 8466 (v); 2°*, in Com., 10863 (vi).

——— M. to withdraw Res., 7992 (iv).

Badgley Island, Trespass of T. H. Jackman, Claims *re* (Ans.) 2218 (ii).

Belgian Syndicate, Commission *re* Investigation (Ans.) 842 (i).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. (B. 142) 1° m., 6054 (iii); in Com., 6520 (iv).

Binder Twine, Purchasers' Names and P.O. Addresses (Ans) 9715 (v).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3467 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 12909 (vii).

Brantford Stove Works Strike, Interpretation of Criminal Code (remarks) 9027 (v).

——— Cor. with Justice Dept. (Ans.) 10016

C. P. R. Taxation Cases, on Inquiry for Ret., 5049 (iii).

Cigarette and Tobacco Restraint Bill: *See* '*Tobacco.*'

Cimon, Mr. Justice, Apptmt. to Quebec District (Ans.) 2978 (ii).

——— Jurisdiction of Justice Dept. *re* Residence (Ans.) 2545 (ii).

——— Payments to *re* Travelling Expenses &c. (Ans.) 2978 (ii).

——— Residence *re* District (Ans.) 2218 (ii).

Civil Service Commission, Instructions to Judge Cassels, on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 7505 (iv).

See '*Marine.*'

Criminal Code (Ry. mortgage) Amt. (B. 212) 1° m., 12919; on Senate Amts., 13316 (vii).

See '*Ry. Act.*'

Dominion Elections Act Amt. (B. 115) 1° m., 4566 (iii); 2° m., 7835 (iv), 11755; in Com., 11796, 11827 (vi), 12919; 3° m., 13229; on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13238; on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) 13255; on Senate Amts., 13579 (vii).

——— (B. 115) Adjnd. debate, 11707 (vi).

Doukhobors, Tels. *re* Pardon by Justice Dept. (Ans.) 6983 (iv).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Violation of Laws, &c. (remarks) 7624 (iv).

Drysdale, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Accepting Appmt. (Ans.) 4768, 5084 (iii).

Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5486 (iii).

Essex County Junior Judgeship, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 1940 (i).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. (B. 116) 1° m., 4576 (iii); in Com., 8401 (v).

Forbes, Mr. Justice, Personal Status, Apptmt., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., &c., 899 (i).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Forbes, Mr. Justice, Professional Status, &c. (Ans.) 3840 (ii).

—— Qualifications *re* Apptmt. (Ans) 2390 (ii).

—— on Inquiry for Ret., 1861 (i).

Fraser, A. W., Emplymt. as Counsel for Purchase of Sussex St. Property (Ans.) 3478 (ii).

—— Payments *re* Legal Services, &c., (Ans.) 2979 (ii).

Gillis, Release from Penitentiary, (Ans.) 510 (i).

Govt. Officials as Political Partisans at Elections (remarks) in Com. on B. 115, 11903 (vi).

See 'St. Vincent de Paul.'

G. T. P., Commissions issued to Inspectors (remarks) 9716 (v).

—— Liquor, Prohibition of Sale, on Inquiry for Ret., 2024 (ii).

—— Madawaska Right of Way (remarks) 12661 (vii).

—— Policy *re* Police Patrol (remarks) 7997 (iv).

Hogg, Mr. W. D., Payments to since 1896, &c. (Ans.) 2981 (ii).

Japanese Immigration Acts, Disallowance of (Ans.) 6642 (iv).

Judges Salaries in Man. and Ont. (B. 206) prop. Res., 12392; in Com. on Res., 12551; 1° m., 12554; in Com., 13048 (vii).

Judges in Quebec Prov., Insufficient Number, Pets. from Bar (Ans.) 842 (i).

Juvenile Delinquents (B. 190) 1°*, 10915 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12399 (vii).

Kun, Agnes B., Release of (remarks) 9580 (v).

—— Letter laid on Table, 9710 (v).

Lacoste, Sir Alexander, Amount of Pension, &c. (Ans.) 1935 (i).

Legal Agents in Mar. Provs., Names, &c. (Ans.) 4768 (iii).

—— for Govt. in P.E.I., Names, &c. (Ans.) 4764 (iii).

Lord's Day Act Violations at Ottawa, *re* Horse Racing on Sunday (remarks) 3753 (ii).

MacIlreith, Mr. R. T., Payments to for Legal Services (Ans.) 696 (i).

McGuire, ex-Chief Justice, Superannuation of (Ans.) 10514 (vi).

Magee, Hon. Mr. Justice, Delay in giving Judgments (Ans.) 2594 (ii).

Man. Appeal Act: *See* 'Winding-up Act.'

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt of Counsel, for Commission, on M. (Mr Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7360 (iv).

—— Counsel Fees (Ans.) 8838 (v).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Letter of Instruction to Mr. Watson laid on Table, 7621 (iv).

See 'Civil Service.'

Metlakatla and Songhees Indian Reserves, Opinions of Dept. of Justice, on M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).

Montreal Circuit Court Judges, Increase in Salary (remarks) in Com. on B. 206, 12553 (vii).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11990 (vi).

Northwest Territories Act Amt. (B. 210) 1° m., 12650; 2° m., in Com., 13051 (vii).

Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Retirement of (Ans.) 516 (i).

Pardoning Power *re* Criminals released since 1896, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2825 (ii).

—— Ret. (remarks) 9579 (v), 13081 (vii).

See 'Blunden.'

Prisons and Reformatories Act (Halifax) Amt. (B. 166) 1°*, 8604 (v); 2° m., 10690; in Com., 10691 (vi).

Prisoners released, &c.: *See* 'Pardoning Power.'

Queebc Superior Court, Apptmt. of additional Judge (Ans.) 1288 (i).

—— (remarks) in Com. on B. 206, 13048 (vii).

Ry. Act Amt. (B. 28) M. to wthdrw., 3579 (ii).

Railway Act (Commission, Ass't Chief) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4966 (iii).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10637; on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3°, 11590; Amt. (Mr. Macdonell) moved in Com., 11632 (vi).

Ry. Act (mortgages) Amt. (B. 204) 1° m., 12549; 2°*, in Com., 13046 (vii).

See 'Criminal Code.'

Revised Statutes, Completion of French Edition, &c. (Ans.) 6983 (iv).

St. Louis, Mr. H., Emplymt. in Justice Dept. (Ans.) 1347 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Officers and Municipal Elections (Ans.) 2791 (ii).

—— Holidays for Officials (Ans.) 2792 (ii).

Saskatchewan Legislature Acts, Reports *re* (Ans.) 6401 (iv).

—— Disallowance of (Ans.) 6644 (iv).

School Statutes, *re* Saskatchewan Prov., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to adjn., 6858 (iv).

Shepley, Mr. G. F., Payments to (remarks) 1112 (i).

Sudbury Court Judges, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 12413 (vii).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Supreme Court Act Amt. (B. 121) 1° m., 4826; 2°*, in Com., 5497 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Justice (Dominion Police) 5509; (Exchequer Court) 5505; (printing, &c.) 5508 (iii); Supreme Court (contingencies) 12917 (vii); (registrar's uniform) 5507 (iii). Penitentiaries—B.C. (land purchase) 12918 (vii); Generally (maintenance) 5515 (iii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 12918 (vii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint (B. 173) 1° m., 9021 (v); 2°*, and in Com., 10693; 3°*, 11235 (vi); on Sen. Amts., 13044 (vii).

Winding-up Act (Man. Appeals) Amt. (B. 102) 1° m., 3477; 2°* in Com., and 3°*, 3933 (ii).

——— (B. 144) 1° m., 6142 (iii); 2°* in Com., 6523 (iv).

Yukon Concession Cases, Appeal from Supreme Court (Ans.) 10301 (vi).

Yukon Sunday Observance Law and Instructions to N.W.M.P. (Ans.) 565 (i).

——— Papers laid on Table, 841 (i).

BARKER, Mr. S. *East Hamilton.*

Address, The, 519, (amt.) 530, Neg. (Y. 50; N. 96) 552 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4712 (iii).

Atlantic Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

Bank of Hamilton incorp. (B. 56) 1°*, 1207 (i).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4387 (iii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7671 (iv).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6521 (iv).

British Columbia Bank incorp. B. 49 (Mr. Sloan) on M. for 2°, 1470 (i).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5888 (iii).

Civil Service Employees, 1905-6-7, Dates of Apptmts., &c. (M. for ret.*) 558 (i).

Coal Lands, O.C., Regulations, &c., *re* Disposal (M. for copies*) 4246 (iii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1162 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1655 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1793 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com.., 11837, 11851; (amt.) 11865 (vi).

Dom. Elections, Forms, Writs, Instructions, &c., issued in 1907 (M. for copies*) 555 (i).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Fire Extinguishers File, Cor. quoted by Min., Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7775 (iv).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8133 (iv).

G. T. P., Eastern Limit Mountain Section, Establishment of (Ques.) 9265 (v).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12361 (vii).

——— and National Trans. Ry., Disputed Questions (Ques.) 6235 (iv).

——— Protests *re* Land Acquisitions (Ques.) 6640 (iv).

——— Ry. Sections B and F, Contracts, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5211 (iii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3706, 3743 (ii).

Hillsborough Bridge Contract, Claims of M. J. Haney, O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1690 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3042, 3690 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 768 (i).

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6519 (iv).

Moncton Car Shops, Lease, &c., O.C., &c. (M. for copies*) 1690 (i).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11995 (vi).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) 5656 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Burning of Papers, Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4072 (ii).

Petit Rocher Breakwater, Incomplete Return (remarks) 5726 (iii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3138 (ii).

——— Meetings, &c. (remarks) 1441 (i).

Public Works, Estimated Cost, &c., Extravagant Expenditure, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7148 (iv).

Quebec Bridge Disaster, ref. to in debate on Address, 519 (i).

——— Commission's Report (remarks) 3901 (ii).

Quebec and N.B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13293 (vii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3780 (ii).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5833 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Welland (Port Maitland piers) 5682 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4072 (ii).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 7716 (iv); Ottawa (Mint) 1477; (Museum) 1492 (i); Harbours and Rivers —N.B. (St. John) 12019 (vi).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. (amt.) 921 (i).

BARR, Mr. J. *Dufferin.*

Address, The, 276 (i).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4525 (iii).

See 'National.'

Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10350 (vi).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6208 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5100 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11361 (vi).

Debates of the House, Time occupied by Members (remarks) 13539 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11831 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute, Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5012 (iii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co's. B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13209 (vii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3611, 3647 (ii).

Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction (remarks) in Com., 13568 (vii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6272 (iv).

Home Guards, N.W.T., Issue of Scrip for Services (Ques.) 2161 (ii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10501 (vi).

Inland Revenue Seizures, 1906-7 in Cornwall, Toronto, Ottawa, &c. (Ques.) 3846 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 3851 (ii), 4247 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7236 (iv).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9491 (v).

National Battlefields (lands) Amt. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13501; in Com., 13502 (vii).

Office Specialty Co., Fittings, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4696 (iii); in Com., 10858 (vi).

BARR, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Patent and Proprietary Medicines B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 2°, 10553 (vi); in Com., 12624 (vii).

Posters, Prohibition of Indecent Bills, Enforcement of Tariff Regulations (Ques.) 6161 (iv).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4978 (iii); in Com. on Res., 3907 (ii).

——— (wires, &c.) Amt. (B. 43) 1° m., 840 (i); 2° m., 5212 (iii).

Ry. Tracks, Crossing by Water Mains, Application to Board (Ques.) 1109 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 1294 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3768 (ii); in Com., 12608 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (seeds) 12893 (vii); (seed branch) 5504 (iii); (Year Book) 677 (i).

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 978 (i); Post Office (clerical assistance) 8876 (v).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9227, 9450 (v).

House of Commons (Library of Parlt.) 10504 (vi).

Immigration (agents) 9869 (v).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4082, 4151 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 10297 (v).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5511 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Vernon) 10872; (Victoria immigration) 10881 (vi); Man. (Dauphin) 8520; (Emerson) 8534 (v); (Winnipeg hospital) 10958 (vi); Ont. (Dom. renewals) 7483; (Glencoe) 7488; (Guelph armoury) 7682 (iv); Ottawa (Mint) 1452, 1481 (i); Sask. (Battleford) 8577 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 12097 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11088 (vi).

Telephone Wires, Applications to cross Ry. Tracks (Ques.) 690 (i).

See 'Railways,' &c.

Wheat Transportation from N. W., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2198 (ii).

BEATTIE, Mr. T., *London.*

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13296 (vii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6489 (iv).

Moir, Private, Shooting at Wolseley Barracks (remarks) 7322 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12600 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Militia (provisions) 12151 (vii); Public Works—Generally (armouries) 10895; Man. (Winnipeg hospital) 10966 (vi).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6124

BEAUPARLANT, Mr. A. M., *St. Hyacinthe.*

Criminal Code (libel) Amt. (B. 161) 1° m., 7307 (iv).

Exhibitions, Amount of Subsidies paid to (Ques.) 4406 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3°, 4356, 4372 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4171 (ii).

BELAND, Mr. H. S., *Beauce.*

Anthracite Coal, Quantity imported from U.S., and other Countries (Ques.) 1510 (i).

Cotton, Raw, Imported from U.S. in 1905-7, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 1511 (i).

Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution (ques. of priv.) 3486 (ii).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2579 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Distribution to Members (remarks) 605 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3552 (ii).

Pulp Wood, Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4808 (iii).

Pulp Wood, Exported to U.S., Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 1511 (i).

Rehm, Fred. and Frank Patent Relief (B. 110) 1°*, 3896 (ii).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*

Adams, Lake, Construction of Dam, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 5798 (iii).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).

Architects on Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).

'Arctic,' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4014 (ii).

—— Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4143 (ii).

Badgley Island, Trespass by T. H. Jackman, &c. (Ques.) 1937 (i), 2217 (ii).

Binder Twine Seizures, Payments to A. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).

Birnie and Noble, Advances to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12739 (vii).

Boone, C. S., Co., Amounts paid for Dredging (Ques.) 4214, 5083 (iii).

—— (M. for ret.*) 5476 (iii).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry. Service (remarks) on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 190 (i).

Canadian Timber used in Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11208 (vi).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Canadian Towing and Wrecking Co., Payments *re* Contracts, &c. (M. for copies*) 3241 (ii).

'Castle,' Tug, Removal of Wreck, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 6641 (iv).

Chicoutimi Dredging, Tenders *re*, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 7203 (iv).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11397 (vi).

Civil Service Commission Report (remarks) 5623 (iii).

—— Investigations, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Power, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7599 (iv).

See 'Marine,' &c.

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1048

See 'Travelling.'

Committee Meeting, Rep. in Toronto 'Globe,' Ques. of Priv., 2382 (ii).

Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1151 (i).

—— Production of Originals, Announcement *re* (remarks) 1425 (i).

——Production in Committees, 1427 (i).

—— taken from Pub. Accounts Com. (remarks) 2305, 2308 (ii).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Surrender of Title (remarks) 3850 (ii).

—— Commission to Mr. Ryan (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12732 (vii).

—— Protests *re* Sale (remarks) 10918 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11830, 11859 (vi), 12995; on M. for 3°, 13247 (vii).

Draper, P. M., Candidate for Municipal Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).

Dredging Contracts, O.C. *re*, Inquiry for, 6853, 6927 (iv), 8696 (v).

—— Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com., 5924 (ii).

—— Renewal without Tenders (remarks) 6633 (iv).

Dredging at Fort William, Amounts paid to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c. (Ques.) 8839 (v).

See 'Boone,' &c.

Dredging at Midland, &c., Tenders *re*, Advertisements for (remarks) 7195 (iv).

—— O.C. *re* Renewal, &c., 6741 (iv).

See 'Midland.'

Dredging in Quebec Harbours, 1907, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3240 (ii).

Dredges registered in Canada, &c. (Ques.) 11497 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4677 (iii); in Com., 10767 (vi).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Eclipse Co. of Ottawa, Payments to (Ques.) 6461 (iv).

—— Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7469 (iv).

Fisheries Regulations, Violations of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5782 (iii).

See 'Birnie,' &c.

Foresters Order, Charges in 'Le Canada,' Ques. of Priv., 6005 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3614 (ii).

Gelinas, Mr., Repayment of Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 654 (i).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 980

—— Report from Mr. Birnie (remarks) 5729 (iii).

See 'Birnie.'

'Golspie' Str., Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1084 (i).

G.T.Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res 2254 (ii); in Com., 12062 (vii).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12676 (vii).

Griffith Island, Georgian Bay, Sale of, &c (Ques.) 1508 (i).

Hay Shipments to S. Africa, Claims against Dept. of Agriculture (Ques.) 5791 (iii).

Holland River Dredging, Contract with Lake Simcoe Dredging Co. (Ques.) 2980 (ii).

—— Divisional Engineer, &c. (Ques.) 4767 (iii).

—— Name of Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 3037 (ii).

Hunter, Mr. J. B., Apptmt. as Dep. Min. of Pub. Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1459 (i).

Inspector of Public Works, Apptmts. of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5678 (iii).

I. C. R., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4423 (iii).

Johnston, Mr. W. J., Extra Remuneration, Leave of Absence, &c. (Ques.) 5201 (iii).

Lacas, Mr., Payments to, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 640, 1037 (i).

Marine and Fisheries, Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4003 (ii).

—— Investigation, Defalcations of Mr. Roy, &c. (remarks) 10741 (vi).

—— Investigations, Evidence (remarks) *re* Printing, 10916 (vi).

See 'Sorel.'

Matchedash Bay, Dredging at Fesserton Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 566 (i).

Midland Dredging Co., Statement *re* Mr. McMullen (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5714 (iii).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Midland Harbour Dredging, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3239 (ii), 8893 (v).

Midland, Tiffin and Victoria Harbours, Expenditure *re* Dredging, 1907 (Ques.) 8181 (iv).

—— Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3428 (ii).

Midland Towing and Wrecking Co., Contract *re*, Cor. (M. for copies*) 3241 (ii).

Noble, Mr. James, Conviction *re* Fishery Regulations (Ques.) 5650 (iii).

See 'Georgian Bay,' &c.

Office Specialty Co. and Eclipse Mfg. Co., Amounts paid to (Ques.) 3039 (ii), 4244 (iii).

—— (M. for ret.*) 3242 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 3581 (ii), 5785 (iii).

See 'Eclipse.'

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10335 (vi).

Oromocto Shoals, Contract *re* Dredging (Ques.) 11496 (vi).

Otonabee Power Co., Amount of Payment *re* Horse-power (Ques.) 5471, 5656 (iii).

—— Incorrect Answer (remarks) 5566 (iii).

Owen Sound Dredging Co., Payments to (Ques.) 2792 (ii).

—— Inspector Telford, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 3038 (ii).

Owen Sound Public Building, Contract *re* Extension (Ques.) 3039 (ii).

—— Inspector, Apptmt. of Mr. Foster (Ques.) 3039 (ii).

—— Sub-letting of Contract by Leslie (Ques.) 3039 (ii).

Port Arthur and Fort William Dredging, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 8617 (v).

See 'Dredging,' &c.

Port Colborne Elevator and Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12211 (vii).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).

Postal Service, Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 7259 (iv).

Pound-net Licenses, Granted in 1905, Cor. with A. E. Dyment, &c. (M. for copies*) 2795 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration re M. J. Haney's Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2747 (ii).

Prohibition Vote in Quebec (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Production of Original Documents (remarks) 1383 (i).

—— on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., 2160 (ii).

—— Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3082 (ii).

Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7189 (iv).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Public Works Estimates, Preparation of, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5924 (iii).

Public Works in Harbours and Rivers, Ont., Tenders, Amounts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 559 (i).

Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., Notice of Amt., 3751 (ii).

Registrar of Grey County, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Telford) 11303 (vi).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4667 (iii).

See 'Documents.'

St. John, N.B., Contracts with Dom. Dredging Co., &c. (Ques.) 11700 (vi).

——— Dredging Contracts, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 11496 (vi).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8562 (v).

Sorel Public Works, Investigation *re* Pay Rolls, &c. (Ques.) 4767 (iii).

———Allegations against Mr. Roy (remarks) 8295 (v).

——— Final Rep. (remarks) 10794 (vi).

——— Irregularities *re* (remarks) 5408 (iii).

——— Ref. to Judge Cassels (remarks) 7938 (iv).

See 'Marine,' &c.

'Speedy' Str., Purchase, Services, &c. (Ques.) 565 (i), 3844 (ii).

Stoney Lake, Damage Claims (Ques.) 5565 (iii).

Stoney Lake Dock, Construction by Govt. (Ques.) 5564, 5649, 5786 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10584, 10615 (vi).

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 12224; Trent (Buckhorn dam) 12227 (vii); (surveys) 10338 (vi); Welland (Port Colborne) 12211 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5678 (iii); (surveys) 12210 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 980; Printing and Stationery (salaries) 612; (Ass't. Dep. Min.) 1459 (i), 5699 (iii); Public Works (salaries) 639 (i), 5699 (iii); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Fisheries (protection steamers) 13326 (vii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5759 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lime Kiln crossing 13323; (pensions) 13324 (vii); (salaries) 4756 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (dredging plant, &c.) 4754 (iii); (Hudson Bay patrol) 3989 (ii); (patrol boats) 4750; (Lake St. Peter piers) 4752 (iii).

Marine (hospitals) 5782 (iii).

Militia (salaries and wages) 12147 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1079 (i), 5766 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2947, 2952; (obstructions) 3211; (removal of obstructions) 3156; (wrecking plant subsidies) 3221; (wrecks) 3151, 3205 (ii).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5512 (iii).

Post Office (boots for letter carriers) 8878 (v); (North Bay inspectors) 13152 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings, B.C. (Chilliwack) 13338; (Cranbrook) 13338 (vii); (Cumberland) 10865; (Fernie) 10866 (vi); (Grand Forks) 13338; (Greenwood) 13338 (vii); (Ladysmith) 10867; (Quesnel) 10868 (vi); (Revelstoke) 13339 (vii); (Vernon) 10872 (vi), 10339 (vii); (Victoria immigration) 10874 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings, Man. (Dauphin) 8519 (v); (Elmwood) 13335 (vii); (Emerson) 8534 (v); (Neepawa) 13336; (Portage la Prairie) 13336 (vii); (Selkirk) 8550 (v); (Souris) 13336 (vii); (Winnipeg hospital) 10959 (vi); (Winnipeg warehouse) 8571 (v).

Public Works—Buildings, N.B. (Grand Falls) 13328 (vii); (St. John, military) 7186 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Antigonish) 7122; (Bridgewater) 7135; (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax) 7140; (Halifax customs) 7162; (Inverness) 7172 (iv); (Parrsboro') 13327 (vii); (Shelburne) 7173; (Westville) 7179 (iv); (Wolfeville) 13327 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Dom., renewals) 7467; (Glencoe) 7489 (iv); (Mitchell) 13332; (North Bay) 13332; (Park Hill) 13332; (Peterborough) 13332; (Port Arthur) 13332; (Sarnia) 13333; (Seaforth) 13332; (Simcoe) 13333; (Sudbury) 13333; (Tilsonburg) 13333; (Uxbridge) 13333; (Walkerville) 13333; (Waterloo) 13333 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (improvements, &c.) 5707 (iii); (Mint) 1458; (Museum) 1489 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Georgetown) 7183 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaskaville) 13329; (Grand Mère) 13329 (vii); (Grosse Isle) 7290 (iv); (Joliette) 13329 (vii); (Knowlton) 7290 (iv), 13329; (Lachute) 13329 (vii); (Lévis) 7296 (iv), 13329; (Magog) 13329; (Megantic) 13330; (Plessisville) 13330; (Point St. Charles) 13330; (Roberval) 13330; (St. Thérèse) 13330; (Shawenegan) 13330 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta. (Battleford) 8577; (Edmonton) 8579 (v); (Estevan) 13336 (vii); (Humboldt) 8585 (v); (Lethbridge) 13336 (vii); (Maple Creek) 8600 (v), 13337 (vii); (Medicine Hat) 8601 (v); (Moosejaw) 13336 (vii); (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8601; (Saskatoon) 8603 (v), 13337; (Strathcona) 13338 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).

Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (North Thompson River) 13352; Que. and Ont. (generally) 13351 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Lower Newcastle) 11695; (St. John) 12013 (vi); (St. John improvements) 5708 (iii).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11207 ; (Baddeck) 11219 ; (Barachois) 11224; (Bay St. Lawrence) 11224; (Big Lorraine) 11224; (Breton Cove) 11224; (Charlos Cove) 11225; Church Point) 11225 ; (Cow Bay) 11225; (vi) ; (dredging) 13341 (vii) ; (McPherson's Cove) 11229; (Parrsborough) 11259; (Port Hood) 11277; (Port Joli West) 11279; (Pugwash wharf) 11280; (Round Hill wharf) 11282 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Georgian Bay survey) 13326; (Lakefield) 13350; (Meaford) 12103; (Michipicoten) 13350; (Midland and Tiffin) 12103 (vii); (Point Edward) 5714 (iii); (Port Arthur, &c.) 12144; (Port Colborne) 12146; (Rainy River) 12136; (Roche's Point) 12136 (vii); (Tiffin dredging) 5709 (iii), 13351 (vii); (Tobermory) 13351 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse à la Barbe) 12028; (Batiscan) 12029; (Bic) 12030; (Bonaventure) 12036; (Cap St. Ignace) 12030; (Chateauguay) 12030; (Clarke City) 12031; (Lake Aylmer) 12032 ; (Lake Megantic) 12033 ; (Lake St. Francis) 12033; (Lake St. John) 12033; (Lavaltrie) 12033; (Lotbinière) 12033; (Malbaie) 12034; (Matane) 12034; (Nicolet) 12034; (Notre Dame de Portage) 12034; (Ouelle Rivière) 12037; (Piché Point) 12035; (Richelieu) 12038; (Rivière du Lièvre) 12037; (Rivière du Loup) 12036; (Rivière Maskinonge) 12037; (St. Alphonse) 12041; (Ste. Anne de Monts) 12041; (St. Francis) 12041; (St. Louis) 12040; (St. Maurice) 12041; (Saguenay) 12040; (Yamaska dredging) 12043 (vi); (Yamaska river) 5708 (iii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13321 (vii).

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay surveys) 12145 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5552 (iii).

Sussex Street Property Purchase, Payment to Jos. Riopelle (Ques.) 3844 (ii).

Tenders, Advertisements, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7478 (iv).

Thessalon Post Office, Charges *re* Postmaster (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).

Tiffin Dredging, Tenders *re* Owen Sound Dredging Co. (Ques.) 8892 (v).
See 'Dredging.'

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2730 (ii).
See 'Documents.'

Travelling Expenses of Minister at Colonial Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3989 (ii)
See 'Colonial.'

Trent Valley Canal, Holland River Dredging, Advertisements, &c. (M. for copies*) 3241 (ii).
See 'Holland.'

Vautelet, Mr., Payments to, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Victoria Harbour, Tenders *re* Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 8893 (v).
See 'Dredging, &c.'

Wiarton Dredging, 1907, Tenders, &c., (Ques.) 6236 (iv).

——— Payments to Mr. Bowman, &c. (Ques.) 6407 (iv).

Winfield Basin Dredging, Tender, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 6461 (iv).

Woodstock, N.B., Postmaster L. C. Smith, Interference in Elections, on M. for Sup., 2888 (ii).

Yarmouth, N.S., Dredging Contracts, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 11500 (vi).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4722 (iii).

Architects on Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7125 (iv).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 10921 (vi).

Beauharnois Canal, Investigation by M. Dupuis, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 3038 (ii).

——— Lease to McIntyre and Robert Syndicate (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).

——— (remarks) 13475 (vii).

——— Water-power, Copy of New Lease (remarks) 946 (i).

——— (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

——— Inquiry for Copy, 1740 (i).

Becancour Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ques) 2392 (ii).

——— Commencement of, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 7212 (iv).

Budget, The, 5357 (iii).

Campaign Literature (French) distributed in Prov. of Que. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10352 (vi).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6162, 6173, 6203 (iii); in Com., 6426 (iv).

Canada and Germany Treaty (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10601 (vi).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12867 (vii).

Canadian Newspapers, Drawback *re* American Surtax (Ques.) 5203 (iii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12842, 12848 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6870 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12882 (vii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11251 (vi).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
Charlemagne and Terrebonne Dredging, Expenditure *re*, &c. (Ques.) 685 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10744 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10717, 10727; in Com. on Res., 11360 (vi); in Com., 12177 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Translation into French (remarks) 6222, 6925 (iv), 11312 (vi), 13477 (vii).
Civil Servants, Increases, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vii).
Clerks of Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).
Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1044 (i).
See 'Intercolonial.'
Côté, Boivin & Co., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ques.) 12650 (vii).
Cotton Strikers, Disputes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3492 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. *re* Salaries (remarks) *re* Conc., 12504 (vii).
——— (translators) 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10245 (v).
——— Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8897 (v).
See 'Hansard.'
Denis, Mr. Gaspard, Postmaster at St. Michel des Saints, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 9474 (v).
Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1180 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. debate, 1849 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 80 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 1682 (i).
——— B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 4573 (iii); on M. for 2°, 8681 (v); in Com., 11824, 11831, 11857 (vi), 13010 (vii).
Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5013 (iii).
Dredging in Ont. and Quebec, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 9276, 10008 (v).
Dredging in St. Lawrence, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 2896 (ii).
See 'Riviere la Graisse.'
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13278 (vii).
Farnham Post Office, Vote *re* Improvement of (Ques.) 6399 (iv).
Fort William Terminals Co.'s B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6223 (iv).
BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
French Canadian Ministers, Attack *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4200 (ii).
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com. on Res., 1223 (i); in Com., 3582, 3636 (ii).
——— Ratification by French Senate (remarks) 13083 (vii).
See 'Can. and France.'
French Translation of Govt. Statutes, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3179 (ii).
Gaudette, Victor, Employmt. by Govt., Payments to (Ques.) 515 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3634 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10312 (vi).
——— Rep. of (remarks) 12836 (vii).
G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2238 (ii).
Halifax Garrison, Discontent *re* Pay, &c. (remarks) 5660 (iii).
'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9128 (v).
See 'Debates.'
Immigration from France and Belgium, Premiums paid to Clerical and Lay Agents, &c. (Ques.) 6922 (iv).
Ingonish Island Lightkeeper, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 8618 (v).
Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6901 (iv).
Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 835 (i).
Intercolonial Conference in London, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 13225, 13511 (vii).
See 'Colonial.'
I.C.R., Employees Provident Fund Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 4577; in Com., 4995 (iii).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Change of Name to Govt. Rys., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6246 (iv).
——— Ste. Monique Gates, Number to be made (Ques.) 11936 (vi).
——— Sunday Cars, Instructions *re* (Ques.) 10734 (vi).
——— Talbot, Mr. Evariste, Employmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6400 (iv).
Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 968 (i).
Judges of Man. and Ont., Salaries (B. 206) (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13048 (vii).
Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12401 (vii).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).
'Labour Gazette,' Cost of Printing, &c. (Ques.) 6407 (iv).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

Lacas, Mr., Payments to, by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1037 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11248 (vi).

'Le Soleil, Par. *re* Voting by French Members, Ques. of Priv., 7992 (iv).

Letter Carriers, Contract for Boots, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8873 (v).

MacIlreith, Payment to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7178 (iv).

Manchester, Dr., Misappropriation of Moneys of Mr. Walter Dick (Ques.) 11936 (vi).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Appmt. of Counsel for Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7327 (iv).

——— Investigation by Minister, &c. (remarks) 6636 (iv).

——— Mr. Perron's Duties (Ques.) 10743 (vi).

——— Officers under Suspension (remarks) 6847 (iv).

——— Proceedings, &c. (remarks) 7321 (iv).

——— Translation of Evidence (remarks) 11204 (vi).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3026 (ii).

Matane River Fishing, Complaints (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5775 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7252 (iv).

Montreal Post Office, Addition, Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 6922 (iv).

——— Defalcations, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 7197 (iv).

Monuments to McGee and Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13352 (vii).

New York Central Ry., Complaints *re* Discrimination (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10328 (vi).

Nicolet Post Office, Completion of, Postmaster's Name, &c. (Ques.) 11498 (vi).

——— Emplymt. of Mr. S. Rivard (Ques.) 11702 (vi).

Nicolet River Dredging, Emplymt. of Narcisse Jutras (Ques.) 11936 (vi).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13289 (vii).

Notre Dame du Portage, Expenditure *re* Wharf (Ques.) 6400 (iv).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4701 (iii).

Order Papers, French and English Editions (remarks) 6853 (iv).

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ques.) 11498 (vi).

——— Emplymt. *re* Nicolet Post Office (Ques.) 11702 (vi).

——— Issue of Pass to travel on I.C.R. Express (Ques.) 11936 (vi).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 138 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 8610 (v).

Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, &c., released since 1896, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2854 (ii).

Patent Medicines Inspection B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 6216 (iii).

Patent Medicines Bill, Govtl. Intention *re* (Ques.) 356 (i).

——— (remarks) 608 (i), 2594 (ii).

——— Committee of Inquiry (Ques.) 3899 (ii).

——— (remarks) *re* Apptmt. to Com., 10689 (vi).

Post Office Act (drop letter) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 7933 (iv).

Priv., Ques. of, Par. in 'Citizen' *re* Pamphlet by Jesuit Priest, 10427 (vi).

Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid before and after Adjustment (Ques.) 8616 (v).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3142 (ii).

Quebec Judges, Additional, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 206, 13048 (vii).

——— Apptmt. of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 12190 (vii).

——— Apptmt. to Superior Court (remarks) 11825 (vi).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6225 (iv).

Ques. of Priv., Anti-Catholic Article in 'Leader,' 8604 (v).

Railway Act (commission, ass't chief) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4965 (iii).

——— (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10638; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. for 3°, 11608 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13286 (vii).

Restaurant of H. of C. and Senate, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Joint Com., 13224 (vii).

——— on 1st Rep., 13510 (vii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 3319 (ii), 13081 (vii).

Ricard, Mr., Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ques.) 11498 (vi).

Rivière à la Graisse, Dredging, &c., Expenditure (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).

——— inquiry for ret., 2896, 3689 (ii).

——— Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 686 (i).

Rivière du Loup Post Office, Improvement to Grounds, &c. (Ques.) 6399 (iv).

——— Postmaster, Resignation and Salary (Ques.) 6399 (iv).

Ross Rifle, Correction of Mr. S. Hughes Speech, Ques. of Priv., 9126 (v).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9332 (v).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

St. Anicet Wharf, Apptmt. of Mr. Dupuis, Revenues, &c. (Ques.) 3230 (ii).

—— Expenditure and Collections, &c. (Ques.) 1935 (i).

—— Expenditure by Public Works (Ques.) 3479 (ii).

Ste. Anne de Sorel Lighthouse, Destruction of Trees, &c. (Ques.) 7731 (iv).

St. Fulgence Pier, Paymaster's List, Signatures, &c. (Ques.) 1115 (i).

—— Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1130 (i).

St. Helen's Island Sale (remarks) in Com. on B. 218, 13417 (vii).

St. Laurent Wharf, Expenditure *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 895, 1121 (i).

St. Paschal and Kamouraska Mail Contracts, Tenders, Bondsmen, &c. (Ques.) 3236 (ii).

Sabourin, Maj., Cor. between Lt.-Col. Malette and Dept. (M. for copy*) 3434 (ii).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4580 (iii).

School Statutes, Saskatchewan Province, on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to adjn., 6862 (iv).

Sorel Irregularities, Allegations against Mr. Roy (remarks) 8296 (v).

—— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet (remarks) 6988, 7099, 7938 (iv).

Soulanges Canal, Floods at Valleyfield (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).

—— Investigation *re* Charges against Overseer (Ques.) 6407 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants Bill, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3756 (ii).

Sudbury County Court Judge, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 12413 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Archives) 671; (census and statistics) 673 (i), 12879 (vii); (exhibitions) 10601 (vi), 12889; (live stock) 12896 (vii); (Year-Book) 678 (i).

Canals—Generally—(additional remuneration) 13174 (vii); (salaries) 10325; (statistical branch) 10318 (vi).

Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5672; (slope walls) 5663 (iii).

Canals—Soulanges (floods, &c.) 10339 (vi).

Canals—Welland (electric lighting) 12195; (Port Colborne) 12212 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5674, 5678 (iii); (surveys) 12208; (widening) 12211 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries, &c.) 637; Inland Revenue (salaries) 646 (i); Marine and Fisheries (Ass't Dep. Min.) 12915 (vii); (salaries) 977, 1014 (i); Militia (salaries) 8872 (v); Mines, 646 (i); Post Office (clerical assistance) 8873 (v); (salaries) 8872 (v); Public Works (salaries) 643 (i), 12917 (vii); Sec. of State (salaries, &c.) 611; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9227, 9262 (v).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Geological Surveys (oil borings) 13163 (vii).

Hydrographic Surveys (Gulf of St. Lawrence) 13169 (vii).

Immigration (U. S. labourers) 13169 (vii).

Justice—Administration of. Supreme Court (contingencies) 12917 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5775 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 13152 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4200 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1907 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 10287 (v).

Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13155; (Cotton strikers) 13156; (Marine investigation) 13169 (vii).

N.W.M. Police (pay of force) 8863; (salaries) 8863 (v).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1086 (i).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5514 (iii); (wrecks) 3187, 3201 (ii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 12918 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vancouver) 13339 (vii); (Vernon) 10876; (Victoria immigration) 10876 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10892; (repairs) 10886 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8528 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7111; (Bridgewater) 7136; (Halifax customs) 7155; (Halifax quarantine) 7171; (Inverness) 7172; (Shelburne) 7173; (Westville) 7179 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 7811 (iv); (Park Hill) 13332 (vii);

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (deptl. buildings) 13478; (heating) 13340 (vii); (skylights) 7816 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Cookshire) 7286; (Dundee) 7286; (Farnham) 7288; (Grosse Isle) 7289; (Knowlton) 7290; (Lachute) 7293; (Lévis) 7294; (Longueuil) 7305 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta. (Edmonton) 13336; (Moosejaw) 13337; (Saskatoon) 13337; (Strathcona) 13338 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 13339 (vii).

Public Works Harbours and Rivers N.S. (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hood) 11268

Public Works—Marine (ship channel) 5035 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (gratuities) 5731 (iii).

Public Works—Telegraphs (Yukon) 13178 (vii).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—B.C. (Cape Beale) 5732 (iii).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10383 (vi); I.C.R. (Halifax accommodation) 5549 (iii); (supplies) 10336; Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10330; (extra clerks) 10345; (statistical branch) 10328; Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10362 (vi).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry. on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., 917 (i).

Toronto Ordnance Lands Sale B. 218 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 13417 (vii).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5386 (iii).

Travelling Expenses of Officials, Passes, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).

Valleyfield, Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv).

——— Floods on Lake St. Francis, Damage, &c. (rearks) on M. for Sup., 7808 (iv).

——— (remarks) 7996 (iv).

——— Post Office Clock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7115 (iv).

——— Regiment Organization, Cor., &c., *re* (M. for copy*) 3434 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of (remarks) on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2519, 2679 (ii).

T. Lindsay Co., Amount of Goods purchased, &c. (Ques.) 8615 (v).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4581 (iii).

Ventilation of H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vii).

Votes and Proceedings, Correction in Names of Clerks, 13066 (vii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6120 (iii).

BICKERDIKE, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5127 (iii)

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6915 (iv).

Independent Bank Audit, Establishment of (Ques.) 11232 (vi).

Presbyterian Church Widows' and Orphans' Fund (B. 23) 1°*, 430 (i); in Com. 2788 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12598 (vii).

BLACK, Mr. J. B., *Hants.*

Canada Temperance Act. Amt. (B. 187) 1°*, 10717 (vi).

Cigarettes, Sale and Prohibition of, on prop. res. (Mr. Blain) 5251 (iii).

Coasting Privileges, Prop. Res., on Order being called, 2795 (ii).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, Establishment of (prop. res.) 2562 (ii).

French Translation of Govt. Documents (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3184 (ii).

Shad Hatchery, Windsor, N.S. (Ques.) 8894 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Round Hill wharf) 11282 (vi).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10697 (vi).

BLACK, Mr. J. B.—*Con.*

Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c. (remarks) 10277 (v).

BLAIN, Mr. R., *Peel.*

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup. 4717 (iii).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3855 (ii)

Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5382, 5408 (iii).

Aud. General, Salary B. 208 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12645 (vii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10944 (vi).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4502 (iii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5945 (iii).

Bole Drug Co., Supplies furnished to Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5941 (iii).

Brampton Post Office, Repairs, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7480 (iv).

Braund, Samuel, Apptmt. as Inspector on Welland Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5674 (iii).

British Pensioners, Notice of Deductions, &c. (Ques.) 7501 (iv).

Bronze Coat-of-arms, Duty *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).

Campaign Literature franked by Depts. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10356 (vi).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) on M. for 2°, 13507 (vii).

Cattle exported to U.S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2768 (ii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11254 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10752 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of (prop. res.) 5087; on M. to resume debate, 5251 (iii).

——— Resolution of W.C.T.U. of Brampton (read) 7278 (iv).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 11347; in Com., 11368, 11655 (vi), 12166, 12183 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Number distributed (remarks) 6060 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5638 (iii).

Co-operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 4556 (iii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 11314 (vi).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members on M. for Sup., 1871 (i).

——— Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7761 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Documents, Instructions to Minister of Marine (remarks) 7810 (iv).
See 'Pub. Accts,' &c.

Dog-Fish Scrap, Shipments from Canso to U.S. (Ques.) 1126 (i).

Dom. Elections Act. Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11834; (amt.) 11835 (vi); 12943 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act. Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11523, 11181 (vi).

Dredging Contracts, O. Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6777 (iv).

Eclipse Manufacturing Co., Payments to (Ques.) 3239 (ii).

——— Amounts paid to (M. for ret.*) 3435 (ii).

——— Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7468 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13272 (vii).

Falconer, Kenneth, Arrangement *re* Balance of Pay (Ques.) 10516 (vi).

Fire Extinguishers, &c., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7666 (iv).

——— Cor. on File, Custody of Documents (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7761 (iv).

Fraser, Mr. A. W., Payments to, for Legal Services (Ques.) 2979 (ii).

Fruit (apples) Inspection, Complaints *re* (remarks) 2754 (ii).

Gatineau Point Bridge, Sums contributed by Govt. (Ques.) 355 (i).

Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction (remarks) on Conc., 13568 (vii).

Govt. Employees and Provincial Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10989 (vi).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6256 (iv).

G.T.P., Accidents to Employees (remarks) 7447 (iv).

——— Accidents on Construction, Reports *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6655 (iv).

——— Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8748 (v).

Halifax Customs House, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 7211 (iv).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) on M. for 3°, 4544 (iii).

Hogs slaughtered, Compensation, paid, &c. (remarks) 13085 (vii).

House of Commons Accountants, &c., Increase *re* Salaries under C. S. Bill (remarks) 13528 (vii).

Immigrants, Number entering Canada, Bonuses paid, &c. (Ques.) 5256 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6475 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

I.C.R. Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2454 (ii).

Inverness Harbour, Purchase of McIsaac's Pond (Ques.) 5792 (iii).

Inverness Public Building, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 5997 (iii).

'King Edward,' Dredge, Emplymt. in Lunenburg Harbour (Ques.) 13063 (vii).

Lacas, Mr., Payments to by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1037 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11247 (vi).

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4008 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) 7389 (iv).

——— Leave of Absence for Mr. Watson (remarks) 10918 (vi).

——— Rep. of Judge Cassels (remarks) 10915 (vi).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6892, 7228; (M.) to ref. to Com., 7226 (iv).

Midland Dredging Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5718 (iii).

Milford Haven Wharf, N.S., Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 13060 (vii).

National Battlefields (lands) Amt. B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 13503 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 5003; on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) in Com., 5059 (iii).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4697 (iii); in Com., 10849 (vi).

Opium Prohibition B. 205 (Mr. Lemieux) on Senate Amts., 13523 (vii).

Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re*, in Com. of Sup., 4106 (ii).

'Petrel,' Str., Supplies purchased, &c. (M for ret.) 7937 (iv).

Petroleum Bounty B. 192 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12644 (vii).

Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 10513 (vi).

Port Dufferin Dredging, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4828 (iii).

Postal Rates on Letters at Confederation, &c. (Ques.) 8175 (iv).

Postmasters, Rural, Salary Increases, &c. (Ques.) 183 (i).

Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid under present agreement and previously (Ques.) 315 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation (prop. res.) 3070; Neg. (Y. 49; N. 103) 3145 (ii).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Public Works, Estimated Cost, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).
—— Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4952 (iii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Rural Corps, Letter (read) 8694 (v).
Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4981 (iii).
Registrar of Grey County, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Telford) 11303 (vi).
Rolla L. Crain Co., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 3239 (ii).
—— (M. for ret.*) 3435 (ii).
Ross, Mr. D., Resignation as Member (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11106 (vi).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s (B. 98) 1° m., 3315 (ii); in Com., 4580 (iii).
St. Francis River, Melbourne Pier, Rock Removal, &c. (Ques.) 6918 (iv).
—— Piers at Richmond, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 6641, 6918 (iv).
St. Mary's Post Office, Construction (remarks in Com. of Sup., 12735 (vii).
—— Item *re* Expenditure of $658.03 (Ques.) 11937 (vi).
—— Total Cost (Ques.) 11019 (vi).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5547 (iii).
Seed Oats purchased in P.E.I., Incomplete Answer (remarks) 12551, 12661 (vii).
Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5445 (ii).
S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3785, 3818 (ii); in Com., 12611 (vii).
Speakers Expenses in House of Commons, Comparison, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).
Supplies for Govt., Apptmt. of Purchasing Commission, on Amt. (Mr. Fielding) to prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5826; (amt.) to Amt., 5847, Neg. (Y., 46; N., 90) 5877 (iii).
Superannuation and Retirement Act, Payments under (Ques.) 7989 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (seed branch) 5504 (iii).
Canals—Carillon (dams) 12768 (vii); (statistical branch) 10323 (vi); Lachine (repairs) 5673; (slope walls) 5668; Welland (Port Maitland piers) 5674 (iii).
Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 624, 634; Public Works (salaries) 640 (i).
Excise (provisional allowances) 819; (travelling expenses) 816 (i).
Geological Survey (oil borings) 13166 (vii).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12739 (vii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5041, 5774 (iii); (Lime Kiln crossing) 13323 (vii).
BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (subsidies) 12263 (vii).
Marine (hospitals) 5783 (iii); (ice-breakers) 1901 (i); (Hudson Bay patrol) 3997 (ii); (Lake St. Peter piers) 4753; (patrol boats) 4749; (Sorel property) 4752 (iii).
Militia (annual drill) 5746 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Prince Fushimi's visit) 5784 (iii); (seed grain) 2780 (ii).
N.W.M. Police (pensions) 8871 (v).
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5522; (maintenance) 5510 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cranbrook) 10864; (Cumberland) 10865; (Vernon) 10870 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10887; (rents, &c.) 10981 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 10954; (Winnipeg military) 10973 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7112, 7118; (Bridgewater) 7137; (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax) 7140; (Halifax customs) 7144; (Halifax Military) 7143 (iv); (Lunenburg) 13326 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10977 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brantford) 7457; (Dom., renewals) 7468; (Glencoe) 7486 (iv); (Kingston) 10909 (vi); (Leamington) 7816 (iv); (Markham) 13331 (vii); (North Bay) 7813; (Owen Sound) 7817; (Renfrew) 7825; (St. Mary's) 7827; (Simcoe) 7830 (iv); (Walkerville) 13334 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives fittings) 5700 (iii); (rents, &c.) 10985; (repairs, &c.) 10981 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Chicoutimi) 7280; (Cookshire) 7281; (Grosse Isle) 7289 (iv); (Knowlton) 13329 (vii); (Magog) 7306; (Montreal examining warehouse) 7425 (iv); (Montreal pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii); (Montreal Post Office) 7411; (Montreal station C) 7422; (Nicolet) 7429; (Quebec citadel) 7430; (Que. arsenal) 7435; (Quebec drill hall) 7431; (St. John's) 7444 (iv); (Sherbrooke) 13330 (vii); (Sherbrooke drill hall) 7439 (iv); (Three Rivers) 13330 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Baddeck) 11220; (Digby) 11226 (vi); (dredging) 13341 (vii); (Parker's cove) 11258; (Parrsboro) 11259; (Port Hastings) 11267; (Port Hood) 11269; (Portuguese cove) 11279; (Round Hill) 11285; (Tancook island) 11231 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Belle River) 12090; (Blanche River) 12091; (Brighton) 12133; (Port Credit) 12101; (Tobermory) 13351 (vii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11079; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11105 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines (Marconi) 12143; (Yukon) 13179 (vii).
Railways—I.C.R. (advertising) 10191 (v); (rolling stock) 5553 (iii), 12257 (vii).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Act) 12264 (vii).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Tenders, Advertisements *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7475 (iv).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10699 (vi).

See 'Cigarette.'

Travelling Expenses of Min. to Col. Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3997 (ii).

U. S. Warships on Great Lakes, Inquiry *re* Armaments, &c. (Ques.) 7502 (iv).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4582 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6124 (iii).

Wharfs, Piers, Amount of Revenue collected, &c. (Ques.) 2391 (ii).

——— Expenditure *re* (M. for ret.*) 5800, 5802 (iii).

——— (M. for ret.) 5476 (iii).

——— Total Expenditure since 1895 (Ques.) 5078 (iii).

Wheat, Frozen, Shipping from Man. and N.W. (remarks) on M. to adjn., 825 (i).

Woollen Industry, Legislation *re* Relief (remarks) 12772 (vii).

BOLE, Mr. D. W., *Winnipeg.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of, Inquiry *re* (prop. res.) 3853 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7939 (iv).

Drug Contracts with Govt., Ques. of Priv., 5562 (iii).

Manitoba Voters' Lists, Affidavits *re* Frauds (read) on Debate on Dom. Elections B. 115, 7942 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 3993 (ii).

Winnipeg Bank incorp. (B. 19) 1°*, 430 (i); in Com., 2787 (ii).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W., K.C.M.G. (Minister of Militia and Defence), *Kings N.S.*

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4399, 4498 (iii).

British Pensioners, Notice of Deductions from Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 7502 (iv).

Canadian Patriotic Funds (B. 216) in Com., 13320 (vii).

Cavalry Brigade, Eastern Townships, Camp at Quebec (Ans.) 9273 (v).

Cold Storage Co., Connection with: *See* 'N.B.,' &c.

Dom. Arsenal, Cor. with Ross Rifle Co. *re* (Ans.) 7991 (iv).

Dominion Camp Equipment Co., Incorporation of (Ans.) 3238 (ii).

Drill Shed, Lindsay, Date of Construction (Ans.) 1111 (i).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

Eastman Rifle Match, Investigation *re* Accident (Ans.) 1125 (i).

Esquimalt and Halifax Garrison, Equipment, &c. (Ans.) 1293 (i).

——— Transfer to Canada (Ans.) 1288, 1293 (i).

Fortifications, Construction of, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6646 (iv).

Garrison Artillery, B.C., 5th Regiment. Complaints *re* (Ans.) 5792 (iii).

Garrison Commons, Date of Sale, &c (Ans.) 354 (i).

See 'Ordnance,' &c.

Goderich Military Camp, Target Practices, &c. (Ans.) 9713 (v).

Govt. Business (remarks) 12504 (vii).

Halifax Garrison, Coal Supply, &c. (Ans.) 10015 (v).

——— Replacement of, by Imp. Troops (Ans.) 1288 (i).

Home Guards, N.W.T., Issue of Scrip to (Ans.) 2161 (ii).

Insurance Commission's Rept., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 9337, 9461 (v).

Kentville Rifle Range, ref. to in Budget debate, 5290 (iii).

Lancaster Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1022 (i).

Lee-Enfield Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe (Ans.) 10014 (v).

——— Number purchased, Dates, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 6645 (iv).

Military Camp in Eastern Townships, proposed Arrangements, &c. (Ans.) 3842 (ii).

Militia Allowances, Arrears of (Ans.) 9274 (v).

Militia—Board of Officers, Pay and Allowance, &c. (Ans.) 2165 (ii).

Militia Camps, Holding of (remarks) 9779 (v).

——— (stmnt.) 9835 (v).

Militia Dept., Attack *re* Boots furnished, Ques. of Priv., 10739 (vi).

——— and Civil Service Commissioner's Report, Statement in Com. of Sup., 12505 (vii).

——— at Quebec, Working Hours for Masons (Ans.) 10791 (vi).

——— Report (presented) 4494 (iii).

——— Threats *re*, &c. (remarks) 13584 (vii).

Militia, Apptmts. as Generals, Number and Qualifications (Ans.) 5086 (iii).

Militia Food Supplies, on Inquiry for Ret., 3042 (ii).

Militia, Memorandum of General Lake (M.) *re* placing on Table, 12770 (vii).

Militia Pay, Arrears, Reasons for, &c. (Ans.) 8443 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

Militia Permanent Corps, Apptmt. of Commission *re* Pay (Ans.) 1293 (i).

Militia Promotions, Names and Records, &c. (remarks) 352 (i).

Militia Stores, Inspection of (Ans.) 8181 (iv).

——Rural Battalions, Care of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5738 (iii).

Militia Supplies at Halifax, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 6406 (iv).

Minnedosa Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10890 (vi).

N.B. Cold Storage Co., and Ministerial Connection *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9306 (v).
See 'St. John.'

Niagara Camp, Transportation of Troops, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 2163 (ii).

Niagara Lands, Sale for Military Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13540 (vii).

Ordnance Lands—Toronto—Sale (B. 218) in Com. on Res., 13417 (vii).

Petawawa Camp, Training of Troops, &c. (Ans.) 5792 (iii).

Plains of Abraham, Lease to Ross Rifle Co. (Ans.) 1348 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3072 (ii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4894 (iii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Rural Corps (remarks) 8695 (v).

—— City Corps, &c. (remarks) 8386 (v).

—— Food supplied (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).

—— Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8855 (v).

—— Protests from Regiments *re* Attendance (Ans.) 7992 (iv).

—— Representation of Veterans (remarks) 7998 (iv).

—— Transportation of Troops (remarks) 8384 (v).

Rankin, Col., Resignation of (remarks) 11406 (vi).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 2025 (ii).

Rifles purchased from other Companies than Ross Co. (Ans.) 1123 (i).

Rifle Range at Charlottetown, Purchase Price (Ans.) 6233 (iv).

R.M.C., Investigation into conduct of Cadet Lancaster, on M. for Sup., 1022 (i).

Ross Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Range, Report *re* (Ans.) 11495 (vi).

—— Bayonets, Adoption of by Govt. (Ans.) 5786 (iii).

—— Bayonets, Date of Contract, O.C., &c. (Ans.) 6235 (iv), 8176, 8442 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

Ross Rifle, Consignment to N.W.M. Police, Where manufactured (Ans.) 5259 (iii).

—— Contract *re* Bayonets (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vii).

—— memorandum *re* agreement (read) 13553 (vii).

—— Contract Price, Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 8174 (iv).

—— Cor. with Imp. Govt., Rep. in British War Office, Disappearance from Library of House, Ques. of Priv., 4961 (iii).

—— Disposition of Manufactured Rifles (Ans.) 3237 (ii).

—— Extension of Cove Fields Lands, &c. (Ans.) 4405 (iii).

—— Extravagance of Militia Dept., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 8953 (v).

—— Interchangeable parts with Lee-Enfield Rifles, Cor. with Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 3899 (ii).

—— Negotiations with Vickers Maxim Co., &c. (Ans.) 178 (i).

—— Number delivered as per Contract, Cost per Rifle (Ans.) 8180 (iv).

—— Number ordered, Payments, Total Number delivered, &c. (Ans.) 168 (i).

—— Number reported Unfit for Use (Ans.) 3841 (ii).

—— Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' *re* Accident at Rockliffe Range (Ans.) 10515 (vi).

—— Payments to since Jan. 1, 1908 (Ans.) 7210 (iv).

—— Provisions for Bayonets, &c. (Ans.) 3483 (ii).

—— Sealed Pattern, Discovery of (Ans.) 3237 (ii).

—— Services of Govt. Officials, Names, Rank, &c. (Ans.) 365 (i).

—— Tests in England, Reps., &c., Ques. of Priv., 8167 (iv).

—— Tests, Rep. of Col. Gaudet (Ans.) 9714 (v).

—— Total Number in Use in Canada (Ans.) 5786 (iii).
See 'Dom. Arsenal.'

Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. Johns, Tenders *re* Supplies (Ans.) 5788 (iii).

St. Helen's Island, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B 218, 13418 (vii)

St. John Fusiliers, 62nd, Annual Drill, Delay in Payments to (Ans.) 847 (i).

St. John Cold Storage, Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 3580 (ii).
See 'N.B.'

Sherbrooke Militia Corps, Establishment of (Ans.) 9273 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

S. A. War, Land Scrip for Volunteers, &c. (Ans.) 1111 (i).

——— Medals for 3rd Contingent (Ans.) 1110 (i).

——— Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3769, 3819 (ii).

Sub-target Machines ordered, Dates, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 171 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Militia (salaries) 8871 (v).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4136 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 5732 (iii), 10286 (v), 13540; (customs dues) 12156; (Dom. arsenal) 12154; (gratuities) 13177; (pay and allowances) 12147; (properties) 12148; (provisions, &c.) 12150; (Quebec reviews) 13176; (rifle and artillery grants) 12152; (Ross rifle contract) 13543; (R. M. College) 12152, 13177; (salaries and wages) 12147; (Stoney Creek monument) 13177; (warlike stores) 12148 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886; Man. (Winnipeg hospital) 10955; (Winnipeg, military) 10970; (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10975 (vi); (Guelph armoury) 7678; (Hamilton drill hall) 7693; (Kingston) 7814; (Kingston, artillery park) 7701; (Kingston, gun shed) 7700 (iv); (Kingston, militia stores) 10908 (vi); (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7703; (London, military) 7706 (iv); (Quebec cliffs) 12148 (vii).

Sutherland Rifle Sights, Contract *re* (Ans.) 5207, 5258 (iii).

——— Number ordered, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 569 (i).

Thirteenth Hussars, Service Medal *re* Fenian Raids (remarks) 13533 (vii).

Toronto Barracks, Approval of Plans, &c. (Ans.) 7204 (iv).

Valleyfield Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv).

Vickers Maxim Co., Purchases from, by Govt. (Ans.) 356 (i).

Western Rifle Association, Pet. *re* Govt. Grant (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L., *Carleton, Ont.*

Address, The, 23 (i).

——— on M. to consider (remarks) *re* Questions, 8 (i).

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth, in Com. on Res., 4846 (iii).

Advertisements for Tenders of Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4717 (iii).

Algoma Steel Co., Orders from Govt. for Steel, &c. (remarks) 8606 (v).

All-Red Line, Omission of (remarks) on the Address, 23 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12432, (amt.) 12439; neg. (Y. 48; N. 108) 12499 (vii).

Anglo-American Treaty with G.B., Information *re* (remarks) 6985 (iv).

——— Cor. *re* (remarks) 9715 (v).

——— Further Information (remarks) 7447 (iv).

——— Information *re* Presenting, 8516 (v).

——— Tel. *re* (remarks) 6926 (iv).

Appeal Court of B.C., B. 165 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 8466 (v); in Com., 10863 (vi).

Architectural Institute of Canada on M. (Mr. Ethier) to refund Fees, 11234 (vi).

Asiatic Labour in B.C.: Ques. of Privilege, 6526 (iv).

Audit and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12658 (vii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10934 (vi).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4389; in Com., 4400 (iii).

See 'Que. Tercentenary,' &c.

Behring Sea Commission, Expenses of Sir Charles Tupper (remarks) 2883 (ii).

——— Correction *re*, 4669 (iii).

Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey (remarks) on Conc., 13571 (vii).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3470 (ii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5949 (iii).

Boundary Delimitations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9743 (v).

Bounties paid by Govt. for 1908-9 (Ques.) 13226 (vii).

Bridge Subsidies to Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Leonard) in Com., 13313 (vii).

B.C. Fisheries Commission, Report *re* (remarks) 5728 (iii).

Buildings, Cost of Construction (remarks) 12661 (vii).

Business of the House, Precedence *re* Questions (remarks) 431 (i).

——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 5135 (iii).

See 'Govt. Business.'

Cabinet Changes (remarks) on the Address, 24 (i).

Campaign Funds, Charges by Min. of Pub. Works (remarks) on the Address, 26 (i).

Campaign Literature franked by Depts. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10353 (vi).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Res., 6201 (iii); in Com., 6414 (iv).

Canada Shipping Act Amt B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12855 (vii).

——— B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 13058 (vii).

Canada and U.S. Treaty Negotiations, Completion of, &c. (remarks) 937 (i).

——— Boundaries Treaty (remarks) 7834 (iv).

See 'Fisheries,' &c.

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187, on M. (Mr. Fielding) to place on Order Paper, 13494; on M. for 2°, 13506 (vii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 202 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12847 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6871 (iv).

Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept (remarks) 6059 (iii).

See 'Marine,' &c.

Cattle Embargo in G. B., Cable *re* Removal by G. B. (remarks) 13228 (vii).

'Champlain,' Str., Use of by Political Agents (remarks) 9126, 9280, 9342, 9460 (v).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10546, 10747, 11021 (vi).

Chinese Immigration into B.C., O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 554 (i).

See 'Asiatic,' 'Japanese,' &c.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10719, 10724; on M. for 2°, 11338; in Com. on Res., 11355; in Com., 11364, 11561, 11640 (vi), 12164; on Senate Amts., 13520 (vii).

Civil Service Bill, Correction in Hansard *re* Increases, 11494 (vi).

——— Inquiry for, 8516 (v).

——— Resolutions *re* (remarks) 11016 (vi).

Civil Service Commission Rep., Inquiry for, 3317 (ii), 4963, 5408, 5567 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5623 (iii).

——— Policy of the Govt. *re*, on M. to Adjn. House, 5882 (iii).

——— Delay in Printing, &c., Investigations *re*, on M. to Adjn., 6143 (iii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers (Amt.) on M. for Sup., 7506; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 99) 7618 (iv).

See 'Marine and Fisheries,' &c.

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com of Sup., 9193 (v).

Colchester Election (remarks) on the Address, 39 (i).

Cold Storage Co.: *See* 'N.B.,' &c.

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1046 (i).

Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds, Cor, &c. *re* Govtl. Action (Ques.) 174 (i).

Committees, Sel. Standing (remarks) on M (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6 (i).

——— Organization &c. (remarks) 507, 569 (i).

——— Sitting concurrently with House, on M. (Mr. Finlayson) 9579 (v).

Companies Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5493 (iii).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12203 (vii).

——— Information *re* Break, 11121, 11406 (vi).

Criminal Code Amendts., on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 9282 (v).

Criminal Code (Ry. mortgages) Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Aylesworth) on Senate Amts., 13317 (vii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 11314 (vi).

Customs Defalcations at Huntingdon, B.C., Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9442 (v).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Kennedy) 9460 (v).

Customs Duties on Militia Uniforms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Supply (remarks) 10134 (v).

See 'Supply.'

Customs Inspectors, Suggestion of Civil Service Report (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v).

Customs Statistics, Duplicating with Trade and Commerce (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 9549 (v).

Cyr, Mr., Letter from, Ques. of Order *re* Reading, &c., 8462 (v).

Debates of the House, Time occupied by Members (remarks) 13539 (vii).

Debates, Official Reps., Conc. in without Notice (remarks) 8896 (v).

Debt of Canada, Portions falling due, &c. (Ques.) 315 (i).

——— Portions maturing in 1908 (Ques.) 315 (i).

Detroit Tunnel, Customs Collection *re* Construction Materials, (M. for O. Cs., &c.*) 5477 (iii).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Surrender of Title, Negotiations *re* (Ques.) 3849 (ii).

——— Name of Govt. Agent (Ques.) 5084 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Dokis Indian Reserve, Surrender of Timber, O.Cs. Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 5087 (iii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1140 (i), 1617, (amt.); Production of, 1622; agreed to, 1667 (i).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1801 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. deb. 1844 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7859 (iv), 8423 (v); in Com., 11798, 11828; (amt.) 11922 (vi), 12956; on M. for 3°, 13232 (vii), on M. for 3° (amt.) 13251; on Senate Amts., 13579 (vii).

Dom. Elections Bill and Obstruction Tactics (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9225 (v).

Dom. Lands Survey B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 231; in Com., 754, 949 (i); Sen. Amts., 3755 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11127, 11153 (vi); in Com., 11158, 11165, 11408, 11510, 11948; Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 11977 (vi); on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, 12395 (vii).

See 'Lands,' &c.

Doukhobors, Homestead Lands, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9957 (v).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Tel. from Sec. Board of Trade (read) 7620 (iv).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7628 (iv).

Dredging Contracts, O. C., on Inquiry for, 6854 (iv).

——— O.C., *re* Rule *re* Producing (remarks) 6927 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 9773, 10259 (v).

Drill Halls Ret., Inquiry for, 5659 (iii).

Drury, R. L., Apptmt. as Japanese Agent (remarks) 4769 (iii).

——— O.C. *re* Apptmt. Inquiry for, 4963 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4687 (iii); in Com., 10763 (vi).

Dunsmuir, Hon. Mr., Lt. Gov. of B.C., Cor. with Govt. *re* Legislation (remarks) 1861 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13261; in Com. on Res., 13279; in Com., 13419 (vii).

Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5485 (iii).

Esquimalt Naval Station, Maintenance of by Govt. (Ques.) 1117 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Esquimault Naval Station, Cor., &c., *re* Maintenance (M. for copies) 1128 (i).

Estimates, Suppl., Inquiry *re* Further, 12503 (vii).

Estimates, Preparation of, Insufficient Votes, &c. (remarks) in Conc., 5920 (iii).

Exchequer Court Act Amt.B. 116 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 8503 (v).

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13459 (vii).

Financial Stringency, &c. (remarks) on the Address, 35 (i).

See 'Wheat,' &c.

Fisheries Act (trials) Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 5249 (iii).

Fisheries Boundaries Treaty between U.S. and Can., Information *re* (remarks) 2023 (ii), 6844 (iv).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1712 (i).

Fishing Bounties paid to Cape Breton Fishermen, &c., (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

Fishing Licenses: *See* 'Whale,' &c.

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1393 (i), 3514 (ii); in Com., 3582, 3642 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty Bill (remarks) *re* Discussion, 3754 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Delay *re* Canadian Tariff &c. (remarks) 13534 (vii).

——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 1206 (i).

——— on Preparation of Statement *re* Duty Units (remarks) 943 (i).

——— (remarks) on the Address, 28 (i).

French SS. Subsidy: *See* 'Can. and France,' &c.

French Translation of Govt. Documents &c (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3181 (ii).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10556 (vi).

Gelinas, Mr., Repayments of Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 668 (i).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5496 (iii).

——— B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12555 (vii).

Govt. Business, Introduction of Govt. Bills (remarks) 10258 (v), 11826 (vi).

Govt. Business (remarks) 10403, 10511 (vi), 12163 (vii).

——— Ry. Subsidies (remarks) 12504 (vii).

——— Suppl. Estimates, &c. (remarks) 11016 (vi).

Govt. Legislation &c. (remarks) 7721 (iv), 10303, 11123 (vi).

Govt. Officials and Interference in Elections (remarks) in Com. on B. 115, 11903 (vi).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Govt. Officials and Municipal Elections in N.B., on M. (Mr. Sproule) to Com. of Sup., 2894 (ii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, on prop Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6280 (iv).

Grain Bill: *See* 'Man. Grain,' &c.

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2226 (ii); in Com., 12070 (vii).

G.T. Ry. Co.: *See* 'Major's Hill Park.'

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr Crawford) in Com., 9463 (v).

G.T.P. Ry., Cost of Construction (Statement) in Com. of Sup., 12238 (vii).

——— on M. (Mr. Graham) to lay on Table, 12049 (vii).

——— Reply to Min. of Rys., 12682 (vii).

——— Cost inclusive of Terminals, &c., (Ques.) 9265 (v).

——— (remarks) on the Address, 37 (i).

——— Total Cost, &c. (remarks) 5728 (iii).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 10393, 10916, 11407, 11939 (vi).

G.T.P. Eastern Division, Estimated Length, &c. (Ques.) 5563 (iii).

G.T.P., Engineering Staff, Resignation of Mr. Hodgins (Ques.) 366, 516 (i).

——— (M. for cor.*) 558 (i).

——— Charges *re* Classifications, &c. (remarks) 6844, 6925 (iv).

——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. to Com., 7213 (iv).

G.T.P., La Tuque Branch, Flooding by Water (remarks) 8607 (v).

——— Mountain Division, Incomplete Rel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).

——— Ret., Inquiry for, 6288 (iv).

——— Supplies via American Routes (remarks) 9027 (v).

See 'Indian,' &c.

Gunn, Mr. B. B., Decease of (remarks) 431

Halifax Garrison, Disbandment of &c. (remarks) 1208 (i).

——— Discontent *re* Pay, Par. in Press, 5659 (iii).

See 'Esquimalt.'

Halifax Immigration Frauds, Dismissal of Mr. J. Bernstein (remarks) 8605 (v).

——— Charges *re* (remarks) 9334 (v).

See 'Immigration,' &c.

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3710 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Lennox) to ref. back to Ry. Com., 3229 (ii).

Hindus in B.C., Protests *re* Treatment (remarks) 5490 (iii).

See "Chinese," &c.

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Hindus in B.C., Deportation from B.C., &c. (remarks) 5338 (iii).

House of Commons Act (members) Amt. (B. 66) 1° m., 1346 (i); 2° m., 5226 (iii).

House of Commons, Allotment of Rooms in New Wing (remarks) 5728 (iii).

——— Rules and Hours for Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wright) 590 (i).

See 'Rules.'

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6395 (iv).

Immigrants, Fraudulent Circular issued &c. (remarks) 606 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 769 (i).

——— B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5657 (iii); in Com., 6431 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 7066 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolishing of to Agents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1328 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 1298 (i).

Immigration Irregularities at Halifax, Investigation *re* (remarks) 5567 (iii), 6465 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Robertson (remarks) 9127 (v).

——— Restitution *re* (remarks) 5659 (iii).

——— Statement *re* (remarks) 4963 (iii).

See 'Halifax,' &c.

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13129 (vii).

Indian Reserves, Land Grant to G.T.P. Ry. Co. in B.C., O.Cs. Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6471 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 833; on M. to ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1743 (i).

I.C.R., Cars sent to U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10222 (v).

——— Civic Elections at Halifax, Interference of Employees (remarks) 6845 (iv).

——— Employes in Prov. of Quebec, Interference in Provincial Elections (remarks) 9777 (v).

——— Employees and Municipal Elections (remarks) 2885 (ii).

——— Employees Provident Fund Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4995 (iii).

——— Truro Sewerage Frontage, (M. for cor.*) 5800 (iii).

See 'Govt. Rys., &c.

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Irrigation Act, Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 955 (i); on M. to withdraw, 2974 (ii).
—— B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4671 (iii).
Japanese in B.C., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lemieux) 12659 (vii).
Japanese Immigration (remarks) on the Address, 32 (i).
—— Announcement of Mr. Lemieux's Mission (remarks) 1208 (i).
—— Cor. *re* Limitation, &c., Inquiry for, 94 (i).
—— Debate in Japanese Diet, Rep. *re* (remarks) 4737 (iii).
—— Information *re* (remarks) 947 (i).
—— Parliamentary Control of, 2025, (amt.) 2043 (ii). Neg. (Y. 45; N. 100) 2158 (ii).
—— Statement by Postmaster General (remarks) 1424 (i).
—— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1602, 1614 (i).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration, O.Cs. Cor. Papers, &c. (M. for copies) 854 (i).
Japanese Treaty, Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 1928 (i.)
Joly, Sir Henry, Lt. Gov. of B.C., Cor. &c. sent to by Govt. (M. for copies*) 554 (i).
Judges in Man. and Ont., Salaries B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 12551; in Com., 13050 (vii).
Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12399 (vii).
Keewatin Timber and Pulp Woods, Disposal of, &c. (remarks) 13587 (vii).
Kun, Agnes Ballum, Exercise of Clemency by Justice Dept. and Res. of Town Council of Sydney (read) 9334 (v).
—— Release of (remarks) 9580 (v).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1026 (i).
Lands Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 10526 (vi).
See 'Dom. Lands,' &c.
Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 10952 (vi).
Life Saving Stations, Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3186 (ii).
Literature distributed through Mails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9103 (v).
Loans to Govt., Temporary, &c., Outstanding, Rates of Interest, (Ques.) 235 (i).
—— since Oct., 1906, Rates of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 314 (i).
Lobster Fishing at Pictou, Inquiry for Ret., 12772 (vii).
Lovell, Mr. H., Decease of (remarks) 230 (i).
Major's Hill Park, and G.T.R. Hotel (remarks) 1425, 1585 (i).
See 'G.T.R.'

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Consent of Legislature, &c. (remarks) 936 (i).
—— Bill *re* Extension (remarks) 1741 (i), 2882 (ii), 11706 (vi).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), 12790 (vii).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12569 (vii).
Man. Voters Lists, Affidavits quoted by member (remarks) 7949 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Ass't. Judge in Exchequer Court (remarks) 11311 (vi).
—— Apptmt. of Counsel (remarks) 6845 (iv).
—— Apptmt. of Counsel for Civil Service Commissioners, on M. for Sup., 7322 (iv).
—— Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn. Hse., 8458 (v).
—— Delays, &c., on M. for Sup., 9725 (v).
—— Deputy Minister, Resignation, Acceptance of (remarks) 7621, 7938, 7995, 8088 (iv).
—— Evidence *re* (remarks) 8516 (v).
—— Evidence presented day by day to Hse. (remarks) 8293 (v).
—— Investigation by Minister (remarks) 6526 (iv).
—— Method of Procedure (remarks) 10742 (vi).
—— Officials, Suspension *re* C. S. Report (remarks) 6004 (iii), 6846 (iv).
—— Postponement of by Judge Cassels (remarks) 8385 (v).
—— Proceedings, Public, &c. (remarks) 7321 (iv).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3029 (ii); in Com., 3034 (ii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) on M. (Mr. Blain) to ref. back to Com., 7227; in Com., 7242 (iv).
Metlakatla and Songhees Indian Reserves, Legal Opinion of Justice Dept. (M. for copies*) 5477 (iii).
—— Inquiry for, 2381 (ii).
Militia Camps, Holding of, &c. (remarks) 9779, 9835 (v).
'Montcalm' Str., Collision, Investigation *re* (remarks) 8172 (iv).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9478 (v).
See 'Govt. Business,' &c.
Motions, Unopposed, and Business of the House (remarks) 8896 (v).
National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13498 (vii).
See 'Que.,' &c.
N.T. Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.'

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connections *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9420 (v).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3054 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3670 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co's. B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) on Senate Amts., 10511 (vi).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts paid *re* Immigration (remarks) on M. for Sup., 770 (i).

Northwest Territories Act Amt. B. 210 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13052 (vii).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co's. B. 131 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 7725 (iv).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4697 (iii); in Com., 10856 (vi).

Opium Prohibition B. 205 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 12550; on Senate Amts., 13523 (vii).

Owen Sound Strike, Settlement of (remarks) 8606 (v).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co's. B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6229 (iv).

Pakenham Mail Bags, Destruction of, &c. (remarks) 1425 (i).

Patent Medicines B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 12625 (vii).

Peace Union, Interparliamentary Union, Meeting at Ottawa (remarks) 13582 (vii).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3168 (ii).

Post Office Act (drop letter) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 7932 (iv).

P.E.I. Public Works Expenditure, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Ret., 2172 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 12628 (vii).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4654 (iii).

Prisons and Reformatories Act (Halifax) Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10692 (vi).

Private Bills, Discrepancy in Fees between Senate and House of Commons (remarks) 10122 (v).

Provincial Subsidies, Increased Payments, &c.(Ques.) 173 (i).

Public Acounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3080 (ii).

——— Meetings and Adjournments (remarks) 1442 (i).

——— Sittings concurrently with House (remarks) 9504 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Public Bills and Orders, Precedence of (remarks) 2941, 3405 (ii).

Public Buildings constructed since 1897, Amounts expended, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

Public Works Estimates, Discussions *re* (remarks) 5661, 5730 (iii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4945 (iii).

Quebec Bridge, Cor., Plans, Specifications, O.Cs., &c. (M. for ret.*) 605 (i).

Quebec Bridge Disaster (remarks) on the Address, 30 (i).

——— Report, Distribution of Printed Copies (remarks) 5914 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Rep., 946, 1739 (i), 3043 (ii).

——— Printing of (remarks) 6924, 7099, 8171 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Moneys contributed *re* Finances, Estimated Cost of Completion (Ques.) 5566 (iii).

——— Par. in Toronto Globe *re* Change of Site (remarks) 7931 (iv).

Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s B. 217 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13417; in Com., 13491 (vii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co's. B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6226 (iv).

Quebec Tercentenary, Number of Troops, &., (remarks) 10259 (v).

Questions, Precedence of &c. (remarks) 350 (i).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) on Par. in 'Globe,' 2383 (ii).

Railway Act (Commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4965 (iii).

——— (compensation) Amt. B. 27 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 5246 (iii).

——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3397 (ii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 583 (i).

——— on ques. of Order, ref. to debate in Senate, 577 (i).

Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 4659 (iii); in Com., 8511 (v), 10636; on Amt. (Mr Monk) to M. for 3°, 11606; on M. for 3°,11614; (amt.) 11619; Amt. neg. (Y. 40, N. 74) 11631 (vi).

Ry. Mortgages: *See* 'Criminal Code,' &c.

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com., Applications and Constructions, 13478 (vii).

——— Inquiry for, 12771 (vii).

——— Applications for, Memorandum *re* (remarks) in Com., 13304, 13315 (vii).

Returns delayed, &c. (remarks) 13082 (vii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Returns delayed, on Inquiry for, 2384 (ii), 6847 (iv).

—— Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in Toronto Globe, 4660 (ii).

See 'Documents,' &c.

Ross Rifle Co., Defects, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) on M. for Sup., 9073 (v).

—— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9331 (v).

—— Report from Public Accounts Com., Delay, &c. (remarks) 5728 (iii).

Rules of the House, Proposed Amendments to, on prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2985 (ii).

See 'House of Commons.'

St. Lawrence Power Co. and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., &c., 3011 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) 5548 (iii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. MCraney) in Com., 8564, 9069, 9167 (v).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Agreement with Govt. *re* Sale of Homestead Lands, Letter (read) 9127 (v).

—— Information *re* (remaks) 9280 (v).

—— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10102 (vi).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1382 (i).

—— Extension of Time of Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).

—— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10121 (v).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5417; (amt.) 5460 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3762 (ii), 12595; in Com., 13048; (amt.) 12612; on Senate Amts., 13524 (vii).

Stanstead By-election, Disappearance of Papers (remarks) 8087 (iv).

—— on M. for Sup., 8839 (v).

—— on M. for Com., 8888 (v).

Sub-target Machines, on M. to ref. papers to Pub. Accts. Com. (remarks) 946 (i).

Supplies for Govt., Apptmt. of Purchasing Commission, on prop Res. (Mr. Foster) 5820 (iii).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 5831 (iii).

Supply B. 220 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 13579 (vii).

Supply—Conc., 5499 (iii).

—— Estimates, Basis of Appropriations (remarks) 5919 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Supply—Obstructions to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9909 (v).

—— on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10034 (v).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Ross) 10025

See 'Dom. Elections B. 115,' &c.

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 672; (census, &c.) 674 (i); (dairying) 10397 (vi); (Patent Record) 672 (i).

Canals—Generally (salaries) 10325; (staff and repairs) 10304 (vi).

Interior (astronomical survey) 9737 (v); (salaries, &c.) 616 (i); Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 978 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9536 (v); Miscellaneous (cruisers) 9578 (v); Outside Service (salaries) 9226, 9441 (v).

Dom. Lands (forest reserves) 10062 (v); (salaries) 10040 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9878 (v); (deportations) 9882 (v); (literature, &c.) 9948 (v).

Militia (annual drill) 10286 (v); (rifle ranges) 12505 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (wrecks) 3147, 3185 (ii).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5510 (iii).

Post Office (inspectors) 9103 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg military)10973; (Winnipeg warehouse) 8568 (v); Miscellaneous (Deep Waterways Commission) 11112; Slides and Booms (surveys, &c.) 11071 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10378 (vi); (construction) 12238 (vii); (inspection) 10392 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5550 (iii); (Windsor Branch) 10145 (v).

Railways — Miscellaneous (extra clerks) 10342 (vi); (inspections, &c.) 10341 (vi); (legal expenses) 10363 (vi).

Supreme Court Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5497 (iii).

Technical Schools, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12660 (vii).

Telegraph and Telephones and Man. Boundaries, Legislation, Inquiry for, 3012 (ii).

Telephones and Telegraphs, Control by Ry. Commission (remarks) on the Address, 37 (i).

See 'Ry. Act Amt.'

Timber Berths, &c., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turriff) Ques. of Order *re* reading Evidence before Pub. Accounts, 11308 (vi).

Timber Licenses, Inquiry for Ret., 1739 (i).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2527 (ii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10701 (vi).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5386 (iii).

Transcontinental Ry. Commissioners' Rep. and Rv. Commission Reps., Printing of, &c. (remarks) 7 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Trust Funds: *See* 'Colonial Securities.'
Under-Secretaries of State (remarks) on the Address, 25 (i).
U.S. Warships passing through Canadian Canals (remarks) 5338 (iii).
Water Carriage of Goods B. 178,on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).
Whale Fishing Licenses granted in B.C., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10284 (v).
Wharfs, Piers, &c., and other Public Works, Expenditure since Jan. 1st, 1897, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 4867 (iii).
Wheat Transportation from N.W. and Financial Aid, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2182 (ii).
Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10532 (vi).
Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9636 (v).
Yukon Moral Reform, Inquiry for Dr. Shearer's letter, 10303, 11122 (vi).
Yukon Placer Mining Act. Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8188 (v),10519 (vi).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C., *Algoma West.*
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Subsidies, Reports, &c. (Ques.) 892 (i).
Alien Labour, Protection to Canadians, Pet. (read) in Com. of Sup., 12156 (vii).
Archives Dept., Index Cards, Quantity purchased, Names of Firms, &c. (Ques.) 6057 (iii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjourn House, 5906 (iii).
—— (remarks) on Presentation, 5644 (iii).
Coal Lands in N.W.T., Lease granted, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5087 (iii).
Copper Cliff Post Office, Charges against Postmaster Kilpatrick (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 658 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. on Election Bill, 11913 (vi).
Deputy Ministers, Payments for Special Services, &c. (Ques.) 1736 (i).
Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1655 (i).
Dredging Contracts, Payments to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c. (Ques.) 1736 (i).
—— Renewals without Tenders (remarks) 6634 (iv).
Dredging in Ontario Harbours, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1129 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7949 (iv); 11739; in Com., 11818, 11905; (amt.) 11931 (vi); in Com., 12926; on M. for 3° (amt.) 13230; neg. (Y. 60; N. 99) 13249 (vii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Farm and Garden Produce at Sault Ste. Marie, Customs Duties, &c. (Ques.) 13060 (vii).
Fort William or Mission Reserve, Conditions of Sale to G.T.P. Ry. Co. (Ques.) 5256 (iii).
G.T.R. Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale, B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12077 (vii).
G.T.P., Steel Rail Contracts, Importations, &c. (Ques) 12775 (vii).
—— Steel Rails, Purchases, Prices, Firms, &c. (Ques.) 10738, 10790 (vi).
—— Supply Transportation, Award of Contracts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2171 (ii).
—— Ties purchased in U.S., &c. (remarks) 1443 (i).
—— Transportation of Supplies, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1932 (i).
Heath Point Lighthouse, Contract *re* Rebuilding (Ques.) 7210 (iv).
Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, 13095; (amt.) 13122; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 101) 13138 (vii).
—— (remarks) *re* Telegram of Mr. Sifton, 13528 (vii).
—— Withdrawal from Sale, &c. (Ques.) 2396 (ii).
I.C.R. Officials, A. T. LeBlanc, &c., Accounts, Vouchers, &c. *re* Travelling Expenses, &c. (M. for copies*) 2982 (ii).
—— Steel Rails purchased from Algoma Steel Co., Contracts *re* (Ques.) 9269 (v).
Manitoulin & North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, Reps. *re* &c. (Ques.) 893 (i).
Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11992 (vi).
Niagara Falls, Rep. of Dr. Spencer, Cost of, &c. (Ques.) 6054 (iii).
Ontario, North, Division of Prov. (remarks) 8294 (v).
Port Arthur Dredging, Contracts, Securities, &c. (Ques) 697 (i).
Prefontaine, Hon. R., Date of Sailing for England, Acting Minister of Marine, &c. (Ques.) 7732 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3125 (ii).
—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3085 (ii).
Public Buildings and Works, Initiated since 1896, (M. for ret.*) 2170 (ii).
Ques. of Priv., Stmnt. of hon. member for Thunder Bay *re* Misleading House, 7995 (iv).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, 11610 (vi).
Ry. Act Amt., (remarks) 12194 (vii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Returns, Inquiry for, 2381 (ii).

St. Mary's River, Kaministiquia, Port Arthur, &c., Dredging Contracts, Expenditure *re*, &c. (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).

'Sault Express,' Amounts paid for Advertising, &c. (Ques.) 696 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 853, 1129 (i).

Sault St. Marie Port, Farm Produce entered, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 898 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie Steel Works, Closing of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13470 (vii).

See 'G.T.P.' &c.

Seed Grain Distribution, Extension to Unorganized Territories (remarks) 5408 (iii).

——— O.C. *re* Advances (remarks) 6635 (iv).

Spanish River Dredging, Amount of Expenditure (Ques.) 4764 (iii).

Steel Concrete Co., Payments to by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 3850 (ii).

See 'Walker.'

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5872 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 635 (i); Labour Dept. (salaries) 12156 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4015 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. Steamers) 1072 (i); (life-saving stations) 2972; (wrecks) 3152, 3195 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5524 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Mint) 1452, 1474; (Museum) 1498 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (legal costs) 5557; (Pictou) 5559 (iii).

Timber Berths, East Saskatchewan, Conditions of Sale to Owners, &c. (Ques.) 3839 (ii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 1050, &c., Bonuses, Rentals, &c. (M. for ret.*) 852 (i).

——— Nos. 1018, &c., on Order for Ret. (amt.) 850 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3318 (ii).

Timber Berths, Original Documents, &c. (M. for ret.) 2983 (ii).

See 'Indian Lands.'

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on M. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2466 (ii).

Wallberg, Mr. E. A., Contracts with Steel Concrete Co., Payments *re* (Ques.) 3842

——— Payment by Public Works Dept. (Ques.) 5085 (iii).

See 'Steel.'

Yukon Placer Mining Act, Grants *re*, Claims, Names, &c., for one year (M. for ret.*) 698 (i).

BOYER, Mr. G., *Vaudreuil.*

'Challenge' Dredge, Quantity of Material removed (Ques.) 12651 (vii).

Dorval, Dredging at Yacht Club Wharf (Ques.) 13060 (vii).

Dredging Work at Rigaud River, &c. (M. for cor.*) 6240 (iv).

Maple Syrup and Sugar Adulteration, Penalties *re* Violations, &c. (Ques.) 6639 (iv).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3461 (ii).

Soulanges Canal, Claims *re* Accidents, &c. (M. for reports*) 6239 (iv).

BRABAZON, Mr. G. H., *Pontiac.*

Georgian Bay Canal, Survey, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for copies, 1997 (i).

——— Final Report of Engineer, &c. (Ques.) 240 (i).

Immigrants, Total Number entering Canada for ten Months, Deportations, &c. (Ques.) 240 (i).

BRISTOL, Mr. E., *Toronto Centre.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3866

Canadians at Niagara, Indignity by U. S. Customs Officers (remarks) 11121 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11669 (vi).

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Minister (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1638 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1797 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11126; in Com., 11815, 11843; (amt.) 11820 (vi); in Com., 12920; on M. for 3°, 13234 (vii).

French Treaty, going into Effect (Ques.) 8614 (v).

Goderich Military Camp, Target Practices, &c. (Ques.) 9712 (v).

G.T.P., Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res, 13303 (vi).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3705, 3720 (ii).

Japanese Immigration, Parliamentary Control, &c., on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2056 (ii).

——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1605, 1663 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Appointment of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7354 (iv).

BRISTOL, Mr. E.—*Con.*

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9502 (v).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. (B. 82) in Com., 4997, 5052; (amt.) 5056 (iii).

Public Accounts Com., Meetings, &c. (remarks) 1442 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1454, 1470 (i).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).

Timber Sales to Saskatchewan Valley Co., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 8807 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. Turriff) 8700 (v).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turriff) 11309 (vi).

Unleavened Bread, Pet. *re* Customs Duties (Ques.) 8616 (v).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6120 (iii).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9679 (v).

BRODER, Mr. A., *Dundas.*

Brockville Cheese Curing Room, Lease, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 3897 (ii).

Budget, The, 5980 (iii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10753 (vi).

Civil Service Commission's Report, Investigations, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7574 (iv).

Deep Waterways Commission, St. Lawrence, Damming at Long Sault (remarks) 13142 (vii).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1825 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11140 (vi).

Gold and Silver Marking B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12554 (vii).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6905 (iv).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2098 (ii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2904 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Agriculture (dairying, &c.) 10398; (exhibitions) 10591 (vi); Canals, Welland (electric lighting) 12205 (vii); Public Works, Miscellaneous (telegraph branch) 11098 (vi).

Technical Students, Employment on Govt. Works, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3297 (ii).

BRODER, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Williamsburg Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12205 (vii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P., (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) *Rouville.*

'Arctic,' Str., Amounts expended for Repairs, Supplies, &c., from June 1904, to June, 1907 (Ans.) 185 (i).

———Trip in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup. 4012 (ii).

Bait Freezer at North Sydney, Govt. Assistance *re* Construction (Ans.) 3849 (ii).

Beauchemin, A., Employment at Sorel (Ans.) 5467 (iii).

See 'Sorel,' &c.

Becancour River Dredging, Commencement of, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 7213 (iv).

Behring Sea Commission, Expenses *re* (Ans.) 1733 (i).

——— Expenses of Sir C. H. Tupper (explanation) 4669 (iii).

Bellechasse Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 4830 (iii).

Belleville Harbour, Issue of Bonds, &c. (Ans.) 6238 (iv).

——— Ret., Delay, &c. (remarks) 4408 (iii).

Berins Fish Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn Supply (Ans.) 3241 (ii).

Bernier, Capt., Islands flagged *re* Arctic Expedition (Ans.) 5208, 5466 (iii).

Birnie and Noble, Advances to, &c. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 987 (i).

See 'Fishing,' &c.

Briar Island Marine Signalling, Change of System (Ans.) 9266 (v).

B.C. Fisheries Commission, Report *re*, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).

B.C. Fishing, Licenses issued to Packers Associations (Ans.) 8173 (iv).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P., Travelling Expenses from June 30th, 1906 (Ans.) 1347 (i).

See 'Marine,' 'Travelling,' &c.

Bronte Harbour Wharfage, Dues collected (Ans.) 13064 (vii).

Burlington Channel Lighthouse, Damages to (Ans.) 5467 (iii).

Campbellton Harbor, Gas Buoys, Tender *re* (Ans.) 8612 (v).

Can. Ensign: *See* 'Red Ensign.'

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6161, 6173, 6198; 1°*, 6215 (iii); 2°*, in Com., 5108 (iv).

See 'Franco,' &c.

Canada Shipping Act, Amt. B. 17 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) on M. for 2°, 3420 (ii).

——— (B. 183) 1°*, 10119 (v); in Com., 12851, 13052 (vii).

Canso Medical Officer, Successor to Dr. Brine (Ans.) 1736 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Captains of Govt. Vessels, Examinations *re* Efficiency (Ans.) 3236 (ii).

Cascumpec Harbour Buoys, Tenders for Placing (Ans.) 681 (i).

Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept. (remarks) 6060 (iii).

See 'Marine,' &c.

'Castle' Tug, Removal of Wreck, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 6641 (iv)

Champlain, Str., Emplymt. by Political Agents, (explanation) 9280 (v).

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).

——— Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5890 (iii).

——— Statement *re* Marine Dept., 5620 (iii).

——— Translation (remarks) 6926 (iv).

Clarke, Capt. Arthur, Compensation *re* Death (Ans.) 8180 (iv).

Clement, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 11300 (vi).

Coal Shipments from N.S. and Cape Breton, Res. from Board of Trade, P.E.I. (Ans.) 5471 (iii).

Cold Storage Plant, Canso, Total Cost of Construction (Ans.) 8379 (v).

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Minister (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 999, 1040 (i).

See 'Travelling.'

'Coquitlam,' Str., Compensation *re* Seizure (Ans.) 2289 (ii).

Cowie, F.W., Salary, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 5649 (iii).

Currie, W. D., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 7731 (iv).

Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8896 (v).

Deep Sea Fisheries on Pacific Coast, Cruiser, &c. (Ans.) 1934 (i).

Deputy Ministers, Payments for Special Services (Ans.) 1736 (i).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1149 (i).

'D. H. Thomas,' Tug, Dom. Subsidy Grant (Ans.) 8184 (iv).

Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Operation at Canso (Ans.) 5651,5779, 5790 (iii), 8179 (iv).

Dog-Fish Scrap, Shipments from Canso to U.S. (Ans.) 1126 (i).

Esquimalt Naval Station, Maintenance of by Govt. (Ans.) 1117 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies of Cor. 1128 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Falconer, K., Payments to for Services (Ans.) 8890 (v).

——— Payment of Balance of Account (Ans.) 10516 (vi).

——— Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4060 (ii).

Fire Extinguishers purchased by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7610 (iv).

——— (personal explanation) 7663 (iv).

——— Production of Original File (remarks) 9281 (v).

——— Quotations from, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7765 (iv).

——— on Inquiry for Original Papers, 8912 (v).

Fisheries, B.C., Negotiations with Mr. Bastedo (remarks) 6849 (iv).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1723 (i).

Fisheries Inspectors in Alberta, Names, &c.; (Ans.) 12390 (vii).

Fisheries between Dom. and Provs., Jurisdiction *re* (Ans.) 2395, 3429 (ii).

——— Conference *re* (Ans.) 8236 (ii).

——— Negotiations with Provs., Instructions to Mr. Bastedo (remarks) 4407 (iii).

——— Protection Service, Amounts expended since 1885 (Ans.) 1118 (i).

Fisheries in Lake Winnipeg, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 2390 (ii).

Fish Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn, &c. (Ans.) 1683 (i).

Fish Hatchery at Selkirk, Failure *re* Spawn Supply (Ans.) 3240 (ii).

Fishing Leases granted between Lake Superior and Rocky Mountains, Name &c. (Ans.) 1684 (i).

Fishing Licenses in B.C., Granted to Japanese (Ans.) 7446 (iv).

Fishing Rights in Matane River, &c. (Ans.) 7446 (iv).

——— Complaints, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5775 (iii).

Fishing Privileges, Lesser Slave Lake, Lease &c. (Ans.) 6398 (iv).

Fish Island, Name of Present Lightkeeper (Ans.) 6058 (iii).

Fog Signal Co., Payments to (Ans.) 11498 (vi).

Forchu Fish Hatchery, Duties of Supervisor, &c. (Ans.) 3427 (ii).

France and Canada SS Subsidy, (prop. res.) 3493 (ii).

See 'Can. and France.'

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 927 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1384 (i); in Com., 3609, 3636 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4335 (iii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, Ratification by French Senate (remarks) 13082 (vii).

Gananoque and Burnt Island Lights, &c., Apptmt. of Keeper (Ans.) 8383 (v).

Gaudette, Mr. Victor, Emplymt by Govt. (Ans.) 515, 1120 (i).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 981 (i).

——— on Rep. of Mr. Birnie (remarks) 5729 (iii).

See 'Birnie, &c.

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6282 (iv).

Govt. Steamers, Number purchased, &c. (Ans.) 10731 (vi).

——— Maintenance and Supplies, in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).

——— Pay of Officers, &c. (Ans.) 10736 (vi).

——— Trips of Mr. Cowie, &c. (Ans.) 5468 (iii).

See 'Cowie,' &c.

Hackett, Capt., Tug *re* Lime Kiln Crossing, Remuneration, &c., (Ans.) 7729 (iv).

Halliday Bros., Lighthouses, Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 6236 (iv).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) on M. for 3°, 4543 (iii).

Heath Point Lighthouse, Contract *re* Building (Ans.) 7210 (iv).

'Hurona-Mongolian' Collision, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 358 (i).

Hydrographic Surveys, Amounts expended, &c. (Ans.) 1128 (i).

Ice-Breaker for Northumberland Straits, Progress *re* Construction (Ans.) 1734 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2944 (ii).

Ingonish Light-keeper, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 8618 (v).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6477 (iv).

I.C.R. Employes and Provincial Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9778 (v).

Lacas, Mr., Payments to by Marine Dept. (statement) in Com. of Sup., 1035 (i).

'Lady of the Lake,' Str., Crew during Winter &c. (Ans.) 6403 (iv).

——— Purchase Price, Staff, &c. (Ans.) 3434 (ii).

Life-Saving Boats in B.C., Purchase of &c. (Ans.) 684 (i).

Life Saving Stations, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3186 (ii).

Lighthouse Keepers on Pacific Coast, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1934 (i).

Lighthouses in Nicolet River, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3837 (ii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Lighthouses in Quebec, Classification, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 172 (i).

Lighthouse Service on St. Lawrence, Charter of Steamers, &c. (Ans.) 11299 (vi).

Lighting Buoys on Rideau Canal, Contract *re* (Ans.) 9477 (v).

Lobster Fishery Overseers in Lunenburg, &c., Names, &c. (Ans.) 2794 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries, Issue of Licenses, *re* (Ans.) 2388 (ii).

Lobster Fishery Regulations, Pet. from Fishermen's Union N.S. (Ans.) 6644 (iv).

Lobster Fishing Fines, Names and Amounts (Ans.) 10256 (v).

Lobster Fishing Licenses, Refusals in Northumberland County (Ans.) 9473 (v).

——— Licenses in Savage Harbour, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 4404 (iii).

Lobster Fishing Licenses in P.E.I., on M. (Mr. Martin) for Cor., 5475 (iii).

Lobster Fishing at Pictou, on Inquiry for Ret., 12772 (vii).

Lobster Fishing in St. John, N.B., Legal Size, &c. (Ans.) 10257 (v).

Lobsters, Undersized, Caught at Lunenburg, &c., Complaints *re* (Ans.) 2793 (ii).

Lockery & McCombel, Amounts *re* Extra Harbour Dues (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

'Lord Kitchener,' Tug Boat, Payments *re* Services (Ans.) 7198 (iv).

Louisburg, Bait Freezer, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 4406 (iii).

——— Harbour Dues for 1906, &c. (Ans.) 7503 (iv).

——— Harbour Master, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 3428 (ii).

——— Marine Hospital, Condition of, &c. (Ans.) 4402 (iii).

Lyall & Sons, Storage of Refuse on Harbour Property (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

Marconi Co. and Commercial Press Business (Ans.) 513 (i).

Marconi Station, Glace Bay, Operation of, &c. (Ans.) 2161 (ii).

Marconi System, Regulation *re* Rates, &c. (Ans.) 174 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Dept., Acting Deputy (remarks) 11939 (vi).

——— Dep. Minister, Resignation and Acceptance (remarks) 7938 (iv).

——— Letter *re* (read) 8088 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries, Book-keeping, Ret. *re* Mr. Falconer's Accounts, laid on Table, 4223 (iii).

——— Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 510 (i).

——— Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3989 (ii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7325 (iv).

——— Apptmt. of Counsel (remarks) 6845 (i).

——— Apptmt. of Mr. Perron (remarks) 6926 (iv).

——— Defalcations of Mr. Roy (remarks) 10741 (vi).

——— Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn. House, 8452 (v).

——— Deputy Minister, Suspended Officers, Date of Apptmt, &c. (Ans.) 6982 (iv).

——— Investigation by Minister (remarks) 6636 (iv).

——— Investigation, Public &c. (remarks) 7321 (iv).

——— Method of Procedure (remarks) 10742 (vi).

——— Officers under Suspension (remarks) 6846 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries, Minister's Travelling Expenses, Refund, &c. (Ans.) 8889 (v).

Marine and Fisheries Warehouse, Sussex St. (Ans.) 13062 (viii).

Marine and Militia Stationery Supplies, Purchase *re* Book-keeping (Ans.) 6234 (iv).

Markey Fishing Leases, Copy laid on Table, 11404 (vi).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3022; in Com., 3034 (ii).

Meaford Harbour, (B. 158) 1° m., 7195 (iv); in Com., 8510 (v).

Merwin, Geo. T., Payments to by Marine Dept. (Ans.) 11701 (vi).

Montcalm, Str., Amount expended, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1886 (i).

——— Purchase Price, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 8441 (v).

'Montcalm,' Str., Amount expended, &c. (re-vestigation *re* (remarks) 8087, 8171 (iv).

——— Accident (remarks) 10121 (v).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Contract *re* Cement (Ans.) 7199, 7499 (iv).

——— Expenditure *re* Cleaning, &c. (Ans.) 8888 (v).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3456 (ii).

Motion, Unopposed, and Business of the House (remarks) 8896 (v).

Naval Instruction, Drilling of Canadian Seamen, &c. (Ans.) 1119 (i).

Naval Stations in Canada, Maintenance of, Arrangements with G. B. *re* (Ans.) 1118 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Noble, Mr. James, Conviction *re* Fishery Regulations (Ans.) 5651 (iii).

Partridge Island Stores, Emplymt. of Ferry, Rate, &c. (Ans.) 1120 (i).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3980 (ii).

'Petrel' Str., Amounts paid for Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 7937 (iv).

Playgreen Lake, Conditions *re* Lease, &c. (Ans.) 6403 (iv).

Port Hood Fishery Officer, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 10255 (v).

Prefontaine, Hon. Mr., Date of Sailing for England, &c. (Ans.) 7732 (iv).

Prescott Light Station, Presentation to Dr. W. C. Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 984 (i).

P.E.I. Cable Service, &c. (remarks) 8516 (v).

P.E.I. Fisheries Protection Service, Annual Cost, &c (Ans.) 360 (i).

——— Life-Saving Station, Establishment of (Ans.) 681 (i).

P.E.I. Lighthouse Supplies, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 358 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Contract *re* Construction of Steamer (Ans.) 2546 (ii).

——— Georgetown and Cape George Route, Test *re* (Ans.) 895 (i).

——— Contract *re* Construction (Ans.) 8444 (v).

——— Progress *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 365 (i), 5796 (iii).

——— Rep. *re* (Ans.) 4584 (iii).

——— Signing of Contract (Ans.) 10254 (v).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Removal of Steamers from Georgetown Route (remarks) *re* Discussion, 1109 (i).

——— 'Str. Stanley,' Route, &c. (Ans.) 172 (i), 6160 (iii).

——— Total Quantity of Freight, Delays, &c. (Ans.) 844 (i).

——— Withdrawl of Str., &c. (remarks) 1207 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Investigations, &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3084 (ii).

Quahaug and Clam Fishing, Changes *re* (Ans.) 1940 (i).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118, on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 10663 (vi).

Red Ensign, Flying on Merchant Vessels, Authority for (Ans) 12776 (vii).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 1018, 1740 (i), 2025, 2886, 3318 (ii).

——— Delayed (remarks) 13082 (vii).

Rideau Canal, Buoys, &c., Contract *re* Lighting (Ans.) 8613 (v).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Russian Govt., Compensation to B.C. Schooners (Ans.) 683 (i).

St. Anicet Wharf, Apptmt. of Mr. Dupuis (Ans.) 3230 (ii).

——— Expenditure and Collections (Ans.) 1935 (i).

Ste Anne de Sorel, Lighthouse, Destruction of Trees, &c. (Ans.) 7732 (iv).

St. Lawrence Route, Wrecks, Collisions, &c. (Ans.) 10739 (vi).

St. Louis, Mr., Payments to, by Marine Dept (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).

St. Peters Post Office, on Inquiry for Ret., 2787 (ii).

Salmon Fishing Licenses in B.C., Number, Condition, &c. (Ans.) 5652, 5998 (iii).

——— Gardner's Inlet, &c. (Ans.) 5652 (iii).

——— Payments *re* (Ans.) 5651 (iii).

Salmon Net Fishing, Priviliges in Restigouche River (Ans.) 13518 (vii).

Saskatchewan Fishing Licenses, Issue of, &c. (Ans.) 351 (i).

Shad Hatchery at Windsor, N.S. (Ans.) 8894 (v).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7756 (iv).

Shipping Master, Quebec, Apptmt of, &c. (Ans.) 11700 (vi).

Shipping, Statistics *re* Tons registered (Ans.) 2790 (ii).

See 'Canadian Shipping Act,' &c.

Signal Dues at Halifax (B. 152) 1°m., 6457 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8510 (v).

Sorel Pay Lists, Alleged Padding, Rep. *re* (remarks) 7938 (iv).

——— Allegations against Mr. Roy (remarks) 8295 (v).

——— Final Rep. (remarks) 10794 (vi).

——— Investigation *re* Pay Rolls, &c. (Ans.) 4768 (iii).

——— Papers laid on Table, 5477 (iii).

——— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet (remarks) 7099 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet laid on Table, 8170 (iv).

——— Rep. *re* Irregularities (remarks) 5408 (iii).

Sorel Shipyards, Mr. Desbarats, Connection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).

Soulanges County Wharfage Dues, Amount received, &c. (Ans.) 9277 (v).

Spain, Commander, Travelling Expenses, Cor. with Aud. Gen. (Ans.) 4405 (iii).

——— Cor. laid on Table, 4825 (iii).

——— on Inquiry for Papers, 4670 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).

——— (statement) in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

'Stanley,' Str., Passenger Accommodation (Ans.) 687 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).

Steamboat Inspection Report (presented) 3896 (ii).

Stevenson, Mr. A. W., Payments to *re* Auditing, Dept. of Marine (Ans.) 3233 (ii).

Submarine Signal at Negro Point, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 5202 (iii).

Summerside Harbour and Str. Stanley (remarks) 6160 (iii).

Supplies purchased for Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5829 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (ass't. dep. min.) 12915 (vii); (salaries) 977 (i).

Fisheries (dogfish works) 13325 (vii); (inspectors, &c.) 12261 (vii); (protection steamers) 13326 (vii).

Hydrographic Surveys (Gulf of St. Lawrence) 13169 (vii).

Immigration (agents) 9853 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, rents, &c.) 5039 (iii); (aids to navigation) 5040, 5773 (iii); (lighthouses) 12262 (vii); (lightkeepers) 13323 (vii); (Lime Kiln crossing) 13323 (vii); (maintenance, &c.) 5039 (iii); (pensions) 13324 (vii); (pilotage pensions, &c.) 5046 (iii); (Point Pelee lightship) 13325 (vii); (repairs) 5039 (iii); (salaries) 4755, 5039 (iii); (signal service) 5045 (iii); (Thunder Bay ice-breaker) 5041 (iii); (wireless stations) 5045 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (dockyard) 5039 (iii); (dredging plant, &c.) 4754 (iii); (hospitals) 5782 (iii); Hudson Bay Patrolling) 3985 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1885 (i); (Lake St. Peter piers) 4752 (iii); 12262 (vii); (Patrol Boats in Hudson Bay) 4747 (iii); (Sorel property) 4751 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Marine investigation) 13169 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 3220 (ii); (Govt. steamers) 1078 (i), 5763 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2942, 2952; (life-saving awards) 2972 (ii); (masters and mates) 2969 (ii); (naval schools) 3153 3222 (ii); (obstructions) 3211 (ii); (tidal service) 3215 (ii); (winter mail service) 3217 (ii); (wrecks) 3147, 3184, 3195, (wrecking plant subsidies) 3221 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Elmwood) 13335 (vii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13321 (vii); (St. Lawrence channel) 5035 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11082 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Bonaventure) 12036 (vi); (Peribonka) 12036 (vi); (Piche Point) 12035 (vi).

Technical Students, Emplymt. on Govt. Works, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3294

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. &c., 915 (i); on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 922 (i).

Toronto Harbour Life Saving Station, Establishment of (Ans) 4586 (iii).

Trap Bag Nets in Pokemouche River (Ans.) 9476 (v).

Trap Net Licenses issued to John A. Webster, &c. (Ans.) 7204 (iv).

Travelling Expenses of Minister, Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4122 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 986 (i), 3985 (ii).

'Victor,' Tug, Repairs to, &c., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Reid) 9775 (v).

'Vigilant,' Cruiser, Investigation *re* Collision (Ans.) 683 (i).

Wallberg, Mr. E. A., Contracts with Marine Dept. (Ans.) 3230, 3843 (ii).

——— Contracts with Steel Concrete Co., Payments *re* (Ans.) 3843 (ii).

Washington Fisheries Commissioners, Expenses *re* (Ans.) 1732 (i).

Washington Treaty and Behring Sea Commission, Duration of, &c. (Ans.) 2165 (ii).

Watson, Mr., Apptmt. as Counsel *re* West Elgin Fraud (remarks) 6848 (iv).

See 'Marine,' &c.

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6121 (iii).

Westport, N.S., Installation of Marine Signals (Ans.) 9274 (v).

Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Granting of Licenses, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A McLean) 10269 (v).

——— Moneys due, Penalties, &c. (Ans.) 5996 (iii).

Wharfs, Piers, &c., Amount of Revenue collected (Ans.) 2391 (ii).

——— Expenditure, on Inquiry for Ret., 4867 (iii).

Willson, T. L., Payments *re* Ottawa Carbide Co. (Ans.) 11498 (vi).

Wireless Tel. Stations on Pacific Coast, Erection of (Ans.) 683 (i).

BROWN, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*

Pontiac Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 155) 1°*, 6525 (iv).

Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 195) 1°*, 11589 (vi).

BUREAU, Hon. J. (Solicitor General) *Three Rivers and St. Maurice.*

Convict Labour, Control of, Sales of Articles, &c. (Ans.) 238 (i).

Hansard, Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9131 (v).

BUREAU, Hon. J.—*Con.*

Judges, Supreme Court, Quebec Apptmnt. on Commissions (Ans.) 358 (i).

Justice, Deptl. Report (presented) 185 (i).

'Le Soleil,' *re* Voting of French Members, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7994 (iv).

Revised Statutes, French Version, Date of Completion (Ans.) 357 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5539 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 10396 (v); Justice (Exchequer Court) 5506; (salaries) 5505 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (Arctic cruise) 4012 (ii); Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5522 (iii); (maintenance) 5509 (iii).

BURROWS, Mr. T. A., *Dauphin.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8357 (v).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11172, 11445, 11526; (amt.) 11943 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10822 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6358 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12812 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12568 (v).

Seed Grain for Settlers in Man., &c., in Com. of Sup., 2772 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2772 (ii); Public Works— Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8531 (v).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr Lake) 2378 (ii).

——— Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in Winnipeg 'Telegram,' 9023 (v).

——— Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., on M. (Mr. Turriff) 8734 (v).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 8751 (v).

CALDWELL, Mr. T. B., *Lanark, N.*

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5446 (iii).

CALVERT, Mr. W. S., *Middlesex, W.*

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82, on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) in Com., 5062 (iii).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 16) 3° m., 1929 (i).

CALVERT, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886 (vi).

West Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 24) 1°*, 430 (i).

CARNEY, Mr. M., *Halifax.*

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 764 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10595 (vi); Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4160 (ii).

CARON, Mr. J. B. T., *Ottawa.*

'Arctic,' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4026 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 11344 (vi).

Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for Copies, 2005 (i).

Northern Empire Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 86) 1°*, 2160 (ii).

Royal Mint of Canada, Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re* (M. for copy*) 5210 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4026 (ii).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B., *Carleton, (N.B.)*

Anse St. Jean Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).

Chicoutimi Public Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8401 (v); in Com., 13021 (vii).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6798 (iv).

Fraser Lumber Co.'s (B. 8) 1°*, 231 (i).

Govt. Employees and Provincial Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10990 (vi).

G.T.P., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep., 12293 (vii).

Hillsborough Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7188 (iv).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12405 (vii).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11992 (vi).

N.B. Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 53) 1°*, 1108 (ii).

Obstructions to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9929 (v).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5441 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12619 (vii).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B.— *Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10899 (vi); N. S. (Shelburne) 7177 (iv); Ont. (Kingston) 10913 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (St. John surveys) 13348 (vii); (St. John tidal waters) 12005 (vi); N.S. (Port Hood) 11276 (vi); Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12112 (vii).

CASH, Mr. E. L., *Mackenzie.*

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. (amt.) 11964 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5014 (iii).

—— Manner of Living, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5752 (iii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6334 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 3314 (ii).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 26) 1°*, 430 (i).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12580 (vii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1353 (i).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (general expenses) 5752 (iii).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T., *Huron, E.*

Address, The, 263 (i).

Bubonic Plague, Prevention of into Canada (Ques.) 686 (i).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6214 (iii).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2573 (ii).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1651 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11945, 11953 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5007 (iii).

Fishing Licenses issued in Saskatchewan Lakes, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 559, 697 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret. 2896 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1238 (i).

Fruit Marks Act Inspection Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10564 (vi).

Hudson Bay Co., Original Land Registers of Lord Selkirk's Estate, &c. (Ques.) 4403 (iii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6834 (iv).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T.—*Con.*

McGee, Hon. Thomas D'Arcy, Monument *re* (remarks) 6288 (iv).

Mint Building, Ventilation of, &c. (Ques.) 3036 (ii).

National Battlefields (lands) Amt. B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13501; in Com., 13502 (vii).

Obstructions to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9945 (v).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) on Senate Amts., 13316 (vii).

Patent Medicines Inspection B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 6216 (iii); in Com., 12623 (vii).

'Petrel,' Str., Supplies, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 7937 (iv).

Postmasters' Assessments, Amount collected, &c. (Ques.) 6458 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on M. (Mr. McLean) to conc., 13353 (vii).

Salmon Fishing Licenses, Number granted in B.C., Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 5998 (iii).

Saskatchewan Fishing Licenses, Issue of, &c. (Ques.) 351 (i).

S.A. SS. Subsidy, Amount to Elder-Dempster Co. (Ques.) 2792 (ii).

S.A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12607 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries, &c.) 622 (i); Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5759 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4184 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2687 (ii).

CHISHOLM, Mr. W., *Antigonish.*

Antigonish Armoury, Leasing, &c., Letters, Tels., &c. (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1702 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Georgetown and Cape George Route, Test *re* (Ques.) 895 (i).

——— Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4630 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs, &c.) 11695 (vi).

CHRISTIE, Mr. P., *Ontario, S.*

Cattle Embargo in G.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vii).

Cattle, Exports and Imports from Canada to G.B. (Ques.) 6460 (iv).

Cattle Registered, Importations from U.S., from 1904-7 (Ques.) 6238 (iv).

Postal Services, Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 7266 (iv).

CHRISTIE, Mr. P.—*Con.*

Railway Commission (ass't. chief) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3930 (ii).

Sheep Quarantine by U.S. (remarks) 13537 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock) 12895 (vii); (seeds) 12893 (vii).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H., *Essex, S.*

Address, The, 254 (i).

Battlefields of Canada, B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4385 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5120 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11825, 11859; (amt.) 11881 (vi).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s (B. 25) 1°*, 430 (i); in Com., 3194, 3226, 3621, 3692, 3737 (ii), 4224 (iii); 3° m., 4357, 4536 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6474 (iv).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11992 (vi).

Patent Medicines, B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 12627 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Meetings and Adjournments (remarks) 1440 (i).

——— 3rd Rep. (M. to conc.) 2159 (ii).

——— Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3131 (ii).

Tobacco, Protection *re* Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., 913 (i).

Walker, Andrew, Relief (B. 124) 1°*, 5336 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6126 (iii).

Windsor, Chatham and London Ry. Co.'s (B. 108) 1°*, 3834 (ii).

Windsor Pump and Foundry Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 72) 1°*, 1424 (i).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8494 (v).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S., *Kent, W.*

Address, The, 194 (i).

Binder Twine Seizures, Payments to A. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).

Blankets purchased by Militia and Indian Depts., Amount, Price, &c. (Ques.) 4584 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 6465 (iv).

See 'Militia.'

Bounties paid by Govt. since 1896 (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

——— (Ques.) 895 (i).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*

Brome County Employees, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

Budget, The, 6527 (iv).

Canned Foods, &c., Inspection Regulations, Names of Counties, &c. (Ques.) 514 (i).

——— Cor. *re* Regulations, &c. (M. for copies*) 557 (i).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy, B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6174 (iii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11254 (vi).

Charlan, Mr., Salary as Tobacco Expert (Ques.) 11495 (vi).

Chilvers, Messrs., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 8894 (v), 9266 (v).

Chilvers, Francis W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 10515 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12164 (vii).

Colchester Point, Essex Pier, Amount expended (Ques.) 12652 (vii).

Concrete Wharfs, Dissatisfaction in Ont. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11278 (vi).

Detroit River Tunnel, Duties on Construction Material, &c. (Ques.) 1116 (i).

——— Material imported, &c. (Ques.) 4583 (iii).

——— Material entered free of Customs Duties (Ques.) 10254 (v).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 10417 (vi).

Dillon, Michael, Emplymt. by Customs Dept. at Windsor (Ques.) 7201 (iv).

Documents, Original, Ques. of Priv., 6010 (iii).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5031 (iii).

Dredging Contracts, Renewals without Tenders (remarks) 6634 (iv).

Essex County Junior Judge, Apptmt. of &c. (Ques.) 1939 (i).

Falconer, Payments to *re* Auditing Accounts of Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4178 (ii).

Floods at Chatham, Damage &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4742 (iii).

Foster, Frederick, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 12652 (vii).

Glencoe Post Office Building, Contract *re* (Ques.) 3846 (ii).

Hackett Dock, Purchase of, at Amherstburg (Ques.) 7730 (iv).

Hog Cholera in Essex, Number of Animals slaughtered (Ques.) 9280 (v).

Hogs slaughtered, Compensations paid, &c. (remarks) 13092 (vii).

Immigrants deported from Chatham, Names and Cause, &c. (Ques.) 5796 (iii).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*

Immigrants at Chatham, Complaints *re* Deportation of (Ques.) 6922 (iv).

Immigrants distributed in West Kent, Certificates, &c. (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

Immigration Agents appointed in Ontario, Names, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1129 (i).

Immigration Agents, Special Prizes, &c. (Ques.) 3484 (ii).

Immigration Forms, Number returned by Farmers, &c. (Ques.) 3847 (ii).

Immigration Officers in Kent County, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 514 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 3172 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3041 (ii), 4223 (iii).

Indian Department, Extravagant Management (remarks) on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11066 (vi).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr Templeman) in Com., 6470 (iv).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11248 (vi).

Lime Kiln Crossing, Charter of Capt. Hackett's Tug, Remuneration *re* (Ques.) 7729 (iv).

Mail Tenders at Rimouski, Complaints *re* 'Lady Evelyn' (Ques.) 5799 (iii).

Marcoun, Mr. Frank, Commission *re* Settlement of Claims, &c. (Ques.) 1122 (i).

Meats and Canned Food Inspectors, Number appointed, Names, &c. (Ques.) 172 (i).

Meat Inspection Regulations, Meetings at Chatham (remarks) in debate on Address, 196 (i).

Meat Inspection Act Violations, Inquiry for Ret., 3042 (ii).

Militia, Purchase of Blankets, Return *re* (remarks) 5914 (iii).

See 'Blankets.'

North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 793 (i).

Pacaud, Benjamin, Apptmt. to Customs, Windsor (Ques.) 5200 (iii).

Patent Medicines Inspection B. 146 (Mr Templeman) in Com. on Res., 6216 (iii).

Pepin, J. A., Emplymt. at Windsor Customs (Ques.) 7201 (iv).

Perdue, Dr M. B., Apptmt. as Inspector, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 173 (i).

Piggeries at Experimental Farm (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4931 (iii).

Railway Commission (Ass't. Chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3928 (ii).

Rankin, Col., Resignation of (remarks) 11405 (vi).

Returns, Inquiry for, 1739 (i).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4665 (iii).

Ruscomb River Works, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1122 (i).

Sandwich Post Office Site, Price, &c. (Ques.) 7201 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 12894 (vii); (Meat and Canned Foods Act) 12893 (vii); (seeds) 12892 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Trade and Commerce (salaries) 652 (i).

Fisheries (protection steamers) 13326 (vii).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (administration) 12732 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lime Kiln crossing) 13323 (vii); (Thunder Bay ice-breaker) 5042 (iii).

Marine, &c.—Public Works (ship channel) 5038 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (naval schools) 3154 (ii); (obstructions) 3212 (ii); (wrecks) 3188 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8524 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Dom. renewals, &c.) 7479 (iv); (Glencoe) 7487 (iv); (Guelph armoury) 7678 (iv); (Kingston R. M. C.) 7704 (iv); (Leamington) 7705 (iv); (Markham) 7712 (iv); (North Bay) 7712 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal Station C.) 7420 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8599 (v); (Maple Creek) 8600 (v); (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8601 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Hood) 11273 (vi); (Port Royal) 11278 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Belle River) 12090 (vii); (McGregor's Creek) 12103 (vii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13322 (vii).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys, &c.) 11073 (vi).

Tecumseh Park Breakwater, Dangerous Condition (remarks) 12657 (vii).

Thames River Wharf, Damages to (remarks) 7506 (iv).

Tilbury, Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vii).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. &c., 908 (i).

Wallace, Michael J, Emplymt in Customs at Windsor (Ques.) 7500 (iv).

Waugh, James, Refund to Govt. *re* Immigration Agent (Ques.) 4765 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6138 (iii).

Wilson Cordage Co., Cor. Accounts, &c. (M. for copies*) 1129 (i).

Windsor, Detroit and Belle Isle Ferry Co., Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

—— Expiration of Franchise (Ques.) 1940 (i).

COCKSHUTT, Mr. W. F., *Brantford.*

Address, The, 123, (amt.) 147 (i); Amt. Neg. (Y. 95: N. 56) 274 (i).

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12448 (vii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10940 (vi).

Battlefields of Canada, B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4391; in Com., 4400 (iii).

Bell Memorial Association, Grant, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11206 (vi).

Brantford Srike, Cor. with Justice Dept. (Ques.) 10016 (v).

Budget, The, 5314 (iii).

Buffalo Herds for Parks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5756 (iii).

Butter Imports, Quantity, Countries of Origin, &c. (Ques.) 1116 (i).

Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6176 (iii).

Canadian Associated Press B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12407 (vii).

Cataract Power Co., Welland Canal, Amount diverted at DeCew Falls, &c. (Ques.) 897 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12183 (vii).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 9736 (v).

Customs Dept. and Civil Service Rep. *re* on M. for Sup., 10428 (vi).

Customs Seizure for 1905-7, Reasons, Fines, &c (M. for ret.*) 4588 (iii).

—— Customs Dept., Criticism, on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10428 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10825 (vi).

Dominion Power Co.'s Bill, Inquiry for, 10919 (vi).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4239 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1237 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3556 (ii); in Com., 3617 (ii), 3640 (ii).

Fraser, Donald, Customs Collector, Investigation *re* Defalcations (Ques.) 5200 (iii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12555 (vii).

G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2240 (ii).

G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6661 (iv).

—— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12725 (vii).

COCKSHUTT, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 4227 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6451 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolishing of, to Agents, &c. (prop. res.) 1295 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6998 (iv).

Indian Schools, Dr. Bryce's Report (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 625 (i).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6490 (iv).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2074 (ii).

Newspaper Rates, List of Publications (M. for copy*) 1295 (i).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10704 (vi).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8857 (v).

Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 4659 (iii) .

Saskatoon, Saskatchean, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4238 (ii)

SUPPLY—

Agriculture (seed branch) 5501 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 625 (i).

Indians—(destitute, relief) 5762 (iii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5756 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5741 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10891 (vi); Ont. (Brantford) 7455 (iv).

Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 2873 (ii).

CONMEE, Mr. J., *Thunder Bay and Rainy River.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12855 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5097 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10721 (vi); in Com., 11386 (vi); 12167 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7982 (iv), 7998 (iv), 11727 (vi); in Com., 11802 (vi), 11833 (vi), 12958 (vii); on M. for 3°, 13235 (vii).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5030 (iii).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6803 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3635 (ii).

CONMEE, Mr. J.—*Con.*

G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6659 (iv).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12678 (vii).

——— Ties purchased in U.S. (remarks) 1445 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3702 (ii), 3719 (ii).

Hudson Bay Ry. (remarks) on Amt. (Mr. Foster) *re* Financial Review, 13467 (vii).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12561 (vii).

Midland Dredging Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5716 (iii).

Niagara, St. Catherines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) in Com., 5064 (iii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4914 (iii).

Railway Act (Commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4971 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12611 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (slope walls) 5664 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4054, 4132 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt (Mr. Lake) 2315 (ii).

COPP, Mr. A. J. S., *Digby*

Dominion Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 50) 1°*, 1108 (i); in Com., 4231 (ii); on Senate Amts., 5785 (iii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 5412, 5519 (iii).

Townsend, Arthur James, Relief (B. 196) 1°*, 11589 (vi).

CRAWFORD, Mr. J., *Portage la Prairie.*

Address, The, 316 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11986 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8076, 8089 (iv); in Com., 13007 (vii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Ry Co.'s (B. 151) 1°*, 6287 (iv).

——— on Order for Com., 7141 (iv); in Com., 7667, 8125 (iv), 8552, 8609, 8741, 9377, 9461 (v).

Grazing Land leased to Brown, Bedingfield & Co., Number of Acres (Ques.) 13062 (vii).

'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 2132 (v).

CRAWFORD, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6382 (iv)

Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and N. W. Ters., Areas reserved on July 1, 1896 (Ques) 13512 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12571 (vii).

Railway Act (demurrage) Amt B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3381 (ii).

Returns, Questions, &c., ordered by House, Time to complete, &c. (Ques.) 4242 (ii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1364 (i).

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5523 (iii)

Public Works--Buildings--Man. (Dauphin) 8521 (iii); (Neepawa) 8537 (v).

Timber Berths, Awarded between June 1904 and July 15th, 1896, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3851 (ii).

——— Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2676 (ii).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S., *York (N.B.)*

Blackhall, Mrs., Claims *re* Caraquet Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6878 (iv).

Civil Service Act. Amt B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11558 (vi).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1655 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1861 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13028 (vii)

Elections in N.B., Federal Govt. Patronage, on M. for Sup., 3043 (ii)

Freight Rates, Discrimination *re* City of St John, Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr Crawford) in Com., 9464 (v).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12710 (vii).

——— Grand Falls and Moncton Section, Contract *re* (Ques.) 9266 (v).

Immigration in N.B., Co-operation with N.B. Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).

I.C.R., Claim Agent, E. H. Allen, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 3480 (ii).

——— Deterioration in Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10147 (v).

——— Freight Rate Discrimination against Fredericton, N.B., Cor., &c. (M. for copy) 2558 (ii).

——— Moncton Shops, Contractor, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 1509 (i).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Pictou Engine House, Contract *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1683 (i).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12403 (vii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).

MacIlreith, Mr., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).

Mail Service in N.B. and N.S., Number of Post Offices, Postal Revenue, &c. (M. for ret.*) 852 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12796 (vii).

Moncton Shops, Payments to E. A. Wallberg (Ques.) 8892 (v).

N.B. Coal and Ry. Co.'s Claim against Ry. Dept. (Ques.) 9714 (v).

Post Office Services Ret., Inquiry for, 6288 (iv).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4916 (iii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6227 (iv).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10639 (vi).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9830 (v).

St. Mary's Indian Reserve (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).

Seed Grain for N.W. Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2911 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12597 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 12889 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries, &c.) 621 (i); Mines (salaries) 647 (i); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 652 (i).

Immigration (deportations) 9886 (v).

Indians—N.B. (agents salaries) 13170 (vii); (salaries) 12736 (vii); (schools) 13170 (vii).

Militia (gratuities) 13178 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2942 (ii).

Post Office (inspectors) 13154 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Emerson) 8534 (v); (Neepawa) 8537 (v); (Winnipeg, warehouse) 8573 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fredericton) 13328 (vii); (Moncton) 13328 (vii); (Quarantine, water service) 7187; (St. John) 7186 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7119; (Bridgewater) 7136 (iv) (Halifax customs) 7156 (iv); (Inverness) 7172 (iv); (Shelburne) 7173 (iv); (Westville) 7179; (Yarmouth) 7182 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph armoury) 7679 (iv); (Kingston artillery park) 7701 (iv); (Kingston, hospital)

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

7702 (iv); (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7704 (iv); (North Bay) 7718 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dom. Arsenal) 7438 (iv); (Dundee) 7287 (iv); (Farnham) 7287 (iv); (Knowlton) 7291 (iv); (St. John's) 7444 (iv); (St. John's military) 7442 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta (Battleford) 8578 (v); (Edmonton) 8579 (v); (Estevan) 8581 (v); (Humboldt) 8584 (v); (Moosejaw) 13337 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Buctouche) 11684 (iv); (Campbellton wharf) 11685 (vi); (Campbellton 13344 (vii); (Caraquet wharf) 11685 (vi); (Dover wharf) 11692 (vi); (Madawaska) 11696 (vi); 13344 (vii); (Miscou) 13344 (vii); (Moncton) 11696 (vi); (New Mills) 13345 (vii); (Richibucto) 11698 (v); (St. John river) 11698 (vi); (St. John, surveys) 13346 (vii); (St. John, tidal waters) 12008 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11216 (vi); (Baddeck) 11220 (vi); (Cow Bay) 11225 (vi); (Portuguese cove) 11279 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10384 (vi); (inspection) 10392 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (Chatham diversion) 12758 (vii); (claims dept.) 10176 (v); (double tracking) 12250 (vii); (Fredericton improvements) 12758 (vii); Halifax accommodation) 12227 (vii); (Indiantown branch) 12258 (vii); (locomotives) 10156 (v); (machinery) 12257 (vii); (Moncton car shops) 12251 (vii), 12256 (vii); (Pictou accommodation) 12230 (vi); (Sackville) 12235 (vii); (salaries) 10147 (v); (supplies) 10191 (v).

Railways—P.E.I. (Haney, M. J., claim) 12762 (vii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance, &c.) 10389 (vi).

Venoit, Mr. P. G., Complaints *re* Interference in Politics (Ques.) 6406, 7730 (iv).

Woodstock, N.B., Mr. C. L. Smith's Salary, &c. (Ques.) 2794 (ii).

——— Interference in Elections, on M. for Sup., 2886 (ii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10534 (vi).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W., *St. John (City).*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3862 (ii).

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12469 (vii).

'Arctic,' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to, in Com. of Sup., 4026 (ii).

Aud. General, Salary B. 208 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12645 (vii).

Boards of Trade Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11990 (vi).

Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6173 (iii).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W. —*Con.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12852 (vii).

——— B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12647 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12183 (vii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11983 (vi).

Dom. Liabilities due N.B. from 1869 to 1884, &c. (Ques.) 2217 (ii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4686 (iii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1722 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1236 (i); on M. for 1°, 3494 (ii); in Com., 3593 (ii), 3637

Franco-Canadian Treaty, and Favoured Nation Clause (Ques.) 514 (i).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res, 2222 (ii); in Com., 12081 (vii).

Halifax Garrison, Coal Supply, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 10015 (v).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Instruction *re* Municipal Offices, &c. (Ques.) 3430 (ii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10493 (vi).

Imports from France, Value for five years, &c. (Ques.) 1124 (i).

I.C.R., Claims *re* Damages, Settled and Unsettled, &c. (Ques.) 5793 (iii), 7196 (iv).

——— Employees, Names and Number taken in Jan. and Feb. in N.B. (Ques). 5793 (iii).

——— Hard Pine Tenders, Number, &c. (Ques.) 3233 (ii).

——— Moncton Workshops, Tenders *re* Leasing, &c. (Ques.) 5800 (iii).

——— Number employed in N.B. for Jan. Feb., &c. (M. for ret.*) 6241.

International Ry., N.B., Directors, Amount of Stock, &c. (Ques.) 4246 (iii).

Lobster Fishing in St. John, N.B., Legal Size, &c (Ques.) 10257 (v).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), 12795 (vii), 12829 (vii).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9494 (v).

Negro Point Submarine Signal, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 5202 (iii).

New Brunswick Cold Storage Co., Lease of Land to, Cost and Terms, &c. (Ques.) 563 (i).

——— Ministerial Connections *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9313 (v).

See 'Trueman.'

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

N.B. Credit, Amount &c. (Ques.) 1937 (i).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. Patronage (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3050 (ii).

Obstruction to Supply, on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10032 (v).

Partridge Island Stores, Emplymt. of Ferry, Rate, &c. (Ques.) 1120 (i).

Patent Medicines B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 12624 (vii).

Prisons and Reformatories Act (Halifax) Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. 10692 (vi).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4958 (iii).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10648 (vi).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in House of Com., on M. for Sup., 9780 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv., 9891 (v).

Rifle Range, Charlottetown, Purchase Price, &c. (Ques.) 6233 (iv).

Ryan, Mr. G. M., Ry. Mail Supt., Apptmt. of Successor (Ques.) 7504 (iv).

St. John Fusiliers, 62nd, Payments *re* Annual Drill, Delays, &c. (Ques.) 846 (i).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8563 (v).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1561 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com on Res,, 3787 (ii); in Com., 12596 (vii).

Sussex Military Camp (remarks) 9836 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10569 (vi); (Year Book) 678 (i).

Canals—Lachine (Richard, Jos., compensation) 13175 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries, &c.) 639 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9541; Miscellaneous (printing, &c.) 9577 (v); Outside Service (salaries) 9229 (v).

Fisheries (dogfish reduction works) 13325; (protection steamers) 13326 (vii).

Geological Survey (maps, &c.) 12260; (specimens) 12261 (vii).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 9972 (v).

Indians—N.B. (schools) 13172 (vii).

Labour Dept.—(Gazette) 12261 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5040 (iii); (lifeboats) 13323; (lighthouses) 12262; (Point Pelee lightship) 13325 (vii); (salaries) 5039 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and Cumberland) 12263.

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4026 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1908 (i).

Marine—Public Works (ship channel) 5036 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5736 (iii); Dom. arsenal) 12155; (gratuities) 13177; (provisions, &c.) 12150; (R. M. College) 12152; (warlike stores) 12149 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13155; (Civil Service Commissioners) 13168; (Olympic Games) 13167 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 3221 (ii); (Govt. steamers) 1082 (i); (ice-breakers) 2961; (life-saving awards) 2973; (masters and mates) 2969; (Naval Schools) 3153, 3223; (tidal service) 3215; (wrecks) 3194, 3196 (ii).

Post Office (inspectors, N.B.) 13153 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fairville) 13328; (St. John) 13329 (vii); (St. John, quarantine station) 5703 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Bridgewater) 7136 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston militia stores) 10908 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (H. of C. (additions) 1487; (mint) 1451, 1483; (museum) 1497 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle) 7290 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John harbour) 12012 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11218; (Caribou Island) 11225; (Cow Bay) 11226; (Round Hill) 11282 (vi).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (architects' branch) 11096; (clerical assistance) 11100; Deep Waterways Commission) 11102; (telegraph branch) 11097 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (advertising) 10186 (v); (double tracking) 12236, 12250; (Halifax accommodation) 12229 (vii); (legal services) 10190 (v); St. John accommodation) 12257 (vii); (salaries) 10154 (v).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10696 (vi).

Trueman, Mr., and N. B. Cold Storage Co., &c., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 9344 (v).

See 'N.B. Cold Storage.'

Uniforms, Official, and Customs Duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9570 (v).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8484 (v).

DELISLE, Mr. M. S., *Portneuf.*

Captains of Govt. Vessels, Examinations *re* Efficiency, &c. (Ques.) 3236 (ii).

Lacoste, Sir Alexander, Amount of Pension, &c. (Ques.) 1934 (i).

Money Lenders, Operating in Public Buildings, &c. (Ques.) 1738 (i).

DEMERS, Mr. J., *St. John's and Iberville.*

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3576 (ii).

Sand, Cement or Clay Utensils, Quantity imported from G. B. for 1904-5-6-7 (Ques.) 1506 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. John's military) 7442 (iv).

DESJARDINS, Mr. S., *Terrebonne.*

Jesus River Dredging, Payments to Mr. Morgan (Ques) 6980 (iv).

Peat Industry, Employment of Mr. Erik Nystrom, &c. (Ques.) 1122 (i).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B., *Wright.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12487 (vii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1177 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8143 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for Copies, 2012 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).

Prohibition Vote in Quebec (remarks) in Com of Sup., 662 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4922 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4056 (ii); Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1098 (i).

DUBEAU, Mr. J. A., *Joliette.*

Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s (B. 77) 1°*, 1584 (i).

Cigar Stamps, Use of Black Ones (Ques.) 12390 (vii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3573 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6490 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Year Book) 679 (i).

Tobacco Industry, Amts. to Inland Revenue Act, &c. (Ques.) 178 (i).

——— (M. for copies) 899 (i).

DUGAS, Mr. F. O., *Montcalm.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8282 (iv); in Com., 11863 (vi).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt., B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6493 (iv).

Tobacco, Foreign, Refund, Total Amount, &c. (Ques.) 4402 (iii).

DYMENT, Mr. A. E., *Algoma East.*

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 137) 1°*, 5913 (iii).

Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 138) 1°*, 5913 (iii); in Com., 8610, 9070 (v).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2195 (ii).

ELSON, Mr. P., *Middlesex, E.*

Address, The, 304 (i).

Binder Twine, Purchasers Names and P. O. Addresses (Ques.) 9715 (v).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy, B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6209 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5098 (iii).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5011 (iii).

Lord's Day Act, Violations at Ottawa *re* Horse Racing on Sunday (remarks) 3753 (ii).

Opium, Amount received *re* Duties, Pet. from B.C. *re* Prohibition, &c. (Ques.) 8614 (v).

Ry. Semaphores, Standard Ladder and Posts, &c. (Ques.) 239 (i).

Salmon Fishing Licenses, B.C., Payments *re* (Ques.) 5651 (iii).

Semaphores at Interlocking Plant, London, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 9714 (v).

Sheep Quarantine by U. S., &c. (Ques.) 13064 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10575 (vi).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R., *Westmoreland.*

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7671, 8553 (iv).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12866 (vii).

——— B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12647 (vii).

C.P.R., Papineauville Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9178 (v).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 755 (i).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6750 (iv).

Easter Adjournment, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6464 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13273 (vii).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13297 (vii).

Govt. Officials and Municipal Elections, on M. (Mr. Sproule) to Com. of Sup., 2893 (ii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6267 (iv).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6653 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 833 (i).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, (prop res.) 2435 (ii).
——— Passes issued to P. S. Archibald, (Ques.) 2387 (ii).
N. B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3058 (ii).
P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13482 (vii).
P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch, B. 202 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 12629 (ii).
P.E.I., Hillsborough Bridge Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2743 (ii).
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6226 (iv).
Stewart, Mr. James, Inspecting Auditor, I. C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10154 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10595 (vi).
Militia (gratuities) 13178 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Tracadie) 13349 (vii).
Railways—I. C. R. (inspecting auditor) 10154 (v); (double tracking) 12237 (vii); (St. Cyrille diversion) 12757 (vii).
Tobacco, Violation of Act, Ques. of Order, in Com. of Sup., 9242 (v).
William, Thos., Emplymt. on I.C.R., &c. (Ques.) 2388 (ii).

ETHIER, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Architectural Institute of Can., Refund of Fees (M.) 11234 (vi), 11404 (vi).
Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3488 (ii).
Geological Survey, Technical Officers (remarks) on Conc., 13575 (vii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3459 (ii).
Ry. Act (land surveys) Amt. (B. 30) 1° m., 560 (i).
Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 13482 (vii).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. &c., 911 (i).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance) *Shelburne and Queen's (N.S.)*
Accounts and Claims against Govt., Total Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 352, 363 (i).
Address, The, 94; on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 531 (i).
Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4719 (iii).
All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12465 (vii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
American Bank Note Co., Agreement *re* Printing Stamps, &c. (Ans.) 2593 (ii).
Anglo-French Exhibition, Purchase of Goods, &c. (Ans.) 8443 (v).
——— Total Expenditure (Ans.) 8444 (v).
Anglo-French Treaty, Ratification by British Govt. (remarks) 11706 (vi).
See 'Franco,' &c.
Apples seized at Port of Montreal, Value, &c. (Ans.) 1508 (i).
Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5381 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Ethier) to refund Fees, 11234 (vi).
Aud. Gen.'s Deptl. Rep. (Vol. i)—(presented) 7 (i).
——— (Vol. ii)—(presented) 766 (i).
——— (Vol. iii)—(presented) 6 (i).
Aud. General, Salary (B. 208) Prop. Res., 12502; in Com. on Res., 12645, 1°*, 2°*, in Com., 12645 (vii).
Audit and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12658 (vii).
——— Independent Bank Audit, Establishment of (Ans.) 11232 (vi).
Bank Act Amt. (B. 160) 1° m., 7307 (iv); 2° m., 10919; in Com., 10933 (vi).
Bank Act Amt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4298 (ii).
Banks, Aid to: *See* 'Dom. Notes Bill,' 'Wheat,' &c.
Banque de St. Jean, Investigation *re* Failure (remarks) 9336 (v).
Belleville Harbour, Total Revenue, &c. (remarks) 2593 (ii).
Belleville—Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 8556, 8609 (v).
Binder Twine Seizures, Payments to A. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).
Blue Books, Distribution of (remarks) 432 (i).
Boards of Trade Act Amt. (B. 133) 1°*, 5337 (iii); 2° m. and in Com., 11987 (vi); in Com., 12393 (vii).
Bonusing System, on Notice of M. (Mr. Monk) 6289 (iv).
Boone Co., Payments to (remarks) 5083 (iii).
Bounties paid by Govt. for 1908-9 (Ans.) 13226 (vii).
Bridge Subsidies to Ry. Cos., on Amt. (Mr. Leonard) in Com., 13312 (vii).
British Columbia Bank incorp. B. 49 (Mr. Sloan) on M. for 2°, 1469 (i).
B.C., Revenue contributed to Dom. from 1872-3 to 1905, on M. (Mr. D. Ross) for Ret. 3436 (ii).
British Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3621 (ii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Bronze Coat-of-arms, Duty *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).

Budget, The, (M.) for Com. on Ways and Means (annual statement) 5137 (iii).

——— (remarks) 519, 560 (i), 4316, 4670 (iii).

See 'Financial Review.'

Business of the House, Precedence *re* Questions (remarks) 430 (i).

Campaign Literature franked by Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10352 (vi).

Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6174, 6194 (iii); in Com., 6412 (iv).

Canada and Germany Treaty (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10601 (vi).

——— Trade Relations (remarks) 13082 (vii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. (B. 209) prop. Res., 12392 (vii); in Com. on Res., 12646; 1°, 12649; in Com., 13053 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. (B. 187) on M. to place on Order Paper, 13493; 2° m, 13506 (vii).

Canadian Associated Press (B. 201) prop. Res., 12052 (vii); in Com. on Res., 12408 (vii); in Com., 12644 (vii); 2° m., 12837; in Com., 12848 (vii).

——— Memorial from Pres'dt. J. Ross Robertson (read), 12837 (vii).

Canadian Associated Press, Govt. Subvention, &c. (Ans.) 5080 (iii).

Canadian Building, Rental, Space, &c. (Ans.) 5208 (iii).

Canadian Loans, Rate of Interest (remarks) 12194 (vii).

See 'Loans,' &c.

Canadian Weather Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. M. S. Schell) in Com., 5174 (iii).

Canso Medical Officer, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 6647 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12881 (vii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11256 (vi).

Cigarette, Anti-Legislation *re* (remarks) 7279 (iv).

Civil Servants, Increases *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) prop. Res., 11300 (vi); in Com. on Res., 11359 (vi); in Com., 11402, 11641 (vi), 12185 (vii).

Civil Service Bill, on Inquiry for, 8516 (v).

——— Resolution *re* (remarks) 11017 (vi).

Civil Service Commission's Rep., on Inquiry for, 90, 938, 1740 (i), 3043, 3317 (ii), 4316, 4832, 4963, 5408, 5491, 5567 (iii).

——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4495 (iii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Civil Service Commission's Rep., presented, 5620 (iii).

——— Number distributed, &c. (remarks) 5723, 6060 (iii), 6222 (iv).

——— Translation, &c. (remarks) 6222, 6926 (iv), 13477 (vii).

See 'Marine,' &c.

Civil Service Commission's Report, Policy of Govt. (remarks) on M. to Adjn. House, 5883 (iii).

Civil Service System, Re-organization of, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9158 (v).

Coal Duties, Refunds *re* Coke, &c. (Ans.) 6924 (iv).

Cold Storage Cos., Grants to (Ans.) 1938 (i).

Colonial Conference, 1907, Total Expenditure by Govt. (Ans.) 512 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i).

See 'Intercolonial,' &c.

Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds, &c., Cor. *re* Govtl. Action (Ans.) 174 (i).

Companies Act Amt. (B. 104) 2°* and in Com., 5492 (iii).

Contractors' Securities, Amounts retained (Ans.) 1112 (i).

Co-operation B. 5 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 4565 (iii).

Copper Cliff Postmaster, Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 659 (i).

Crown Life Insurance Co.'s B. 180 (Mr. Tisdale) in Com., 9962 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Sup. (remarks) 10143 (v).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11984 (vi).

Customs, Outside Service (salaries) 9221 (v).

Debates, Official, Adoption of 2nd Rep. (remarks) 12505 (vii).

——— 4th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to Conc., 8835 (v).

——— Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8898 (v).

Debt of Canada, Portions falling Due (Ans.) 315 (i).

——— Portions maturing 1908 (Ans.) 315 (i).

See 'Loans,' &c.

Detroit River Tunnel, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10482 (vi).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on M. for Sup., 1805 (v).

Dominion Guarantee Co.'s B. 127 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 6231 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11202 (vi).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Dom. Lands Act Amt., on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to Amt. (Mr. Lake) on M. for 3°, 11977 (vi).

Dom. Liabilities due to N.B. from 1869 to 1884, &c. (Ans.) 2217 (ii).

Dom. Loans and Overdrafts, Disposition of, &c. (Ans.) 313 (i).

Dominion Notes Issue (grain advances) (B. 159), 1° m., 7307 (iv); 2°*, in Com., 10795 (vi).

See 'Seed Grain,' &c.

Dom. Notes Outstanding, Oct. 1907, Total Amount (Ans.) 692 (i).

See 'Loans.'

Dom. Power and Development Co.'s (B. 173) on Conc. by Senate, 12549 (vii).

Dominion Revenue from 1873 to 1907 (Ans.) 1734 (i).

Draper, Mr., and Mr. Pepper, Candidates for Municipal Office (Ans.) 687 (i).

——— (Remarks) in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).

Dry Docks Subsidy (B. 119) M. for Com. on Res., 4314 (iii); in Com. on Res., 4675 (iii); 1°*, 4689 (iii); in Com., 6911 (iv), 10761; on Senate Amts., 11633 (vi).

Easter Adjournment (M.) *re* 6843 (iv).

Employees of Parliament, Religions, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5480 (iii).

Estimates of 1908-9 (presented) 554 (i).

——— Suppl. (1908) presented, 2381 (ii), 5134 (iii).

——— Suppl. (1909) presented, 12503 (vii).

Estimates, Preparation of, Insufficient Votes, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5920 (iii).

Favoured Nation Treatment, Conventions *re* Commercial Relations, &c. (Ans.) 840 (i).

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13442 (vii).

See 'Budget.'

Financial Stringency : *See* 'Wheat,' &c.

Fisheries Regulations, Violation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5780 (iii).

Foresters Subsidiary High Court B. 62 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 5175 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty (B. 57), Res. prop., 941; (M.) for Com. on prop. Res., 1213 (i); on M. for 1°, 1421 (i); 2° m., 2220, 3502; in Com., 3582, 3636; 3°m., 4317, agreed to (Y. 103; N. 5) 4376 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 930 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Canadian Goods and Minimum Tariff, on M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret., 851 (i).

——— Delay in Approval, &c. (Ans.) 12655 (vii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Delays *re* Canadian Tariff (remarks) 13535 (vii).

——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 1206 (i), 3754 (ii).

——— Distribution to Members (remarks) 606 (i).

——— Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 12651 (vii).

——— Favoured Nation Clause and Foreign Countries (Ans.) 845 (i).

——— German Surtax, Effect, &c. (Ans.) 844 (i).

——— Going into Effect (Ans.) 8614 (v).

——— Imports from U.S., Exclusion, &c. (Ans.) 846 (i).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 570 (i).

——— Information in Detail (remarks) 1585 (i).

——— Maximum and Minimum Rate, &c. (Ans.) 178 (i).

——— Mess from His Ex. (presented) 6 (i).

——— and Most Favoured Nation Clause (Ans.) 514, 564 (i).

——— Preferential Tariff, Names of Countries, &c. (Ans.) 844 (i).

——— Preparation of Stmnt. (remarks) 8 (i).

——— Printing and Distribution, &c. (remarks) 94 (i).

——— Ratification by French Senate (remarks) 13083 (vii).

——— Shipments from Canada, &c. (Ans.) 4763 (iii).

——— Stmnt. *re* Papers to be distributed 848 (i).

——— U.S. Exports, &c. (Ans.) 896 (i).

See 'Mess. from His Ex.'

Fruit Inspection, in Closed Packages, &c. (Ans.) 2982 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3623 (ii).

Govt. Business (remarks) 13207 (vii).

——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 11123 (vi).

——— Suppl. Estimates, &c. (remarks) 11016 (vi).

Govt. Securities *re* Dom. Notes, &c. (Ans.) 6235 (iv).

Grain Shipments from the West, Financial Aid, &c. (remarks) 608 (i).

See 'Dom. Notes Bill.'

Grand Bend Wharf, Contract (Ans.) 5683 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry., Bond Issue, Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 8441 (v).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12694 (vii).

——— Guarantee Bonds (B. 171) 1° m., 8835 (v); 2°*, and in Com., 10771 (vi).

——— Medical Attendance, O.C. regulating

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Deductions (Ans.) 1937 (i).
—— Medical Fees, Deductions *re* (Ans.) 9473 (v).
—— Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13301 (vii).
—— Route, Change of, Financial Reasons, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' Ques. of Priv., 8089 (iv).
—— Securities *re* Construction Contracts (Ans.) 357 (i).
—— Ties purchased in U.S. (remarks) 1445 (i).
Gunn, B. B., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 431 (i).
Halifax Garrison, Discontent *re* Pay, &c. (remarks) 5660 (iii).
Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Instruction *re* accepting Municipal Offices (Ans.) 3430 (ii).
—— Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6648 (iv).
Hay and Straw Embargo, by G. B. (Ans.) 4765 (iii).
Hillsborough Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7189 (iv).
Immigrants stranded in Toronto (remarks) 429 (i).
Insurance Act Amt. (B. 42) 1° m., 827 (i); 2° m., 1741, (M.) to ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1743 (i).
Insurance Bill, Discussion *re*, 1107 (i).
—— Information *re* (remarks) 7099 (iv).
—— Introduction of (Ans.) 9272 (v).
—— (Remarks) 8386 (v).
Insurance Commission, Total Expenditure, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 232 (i).
—— Evidence, Sale of, for private Profit (Ans.) 6059 (iii).
Insurance Companies' Deposits, Total Amount, Securities, &c. (Ans.) 241 (i).
Insurance, Supt., Salary (B. 200) in Com. on Res., 12407 (vii).
Intercolonial Conference, Expenses of Canadian Ministers (Ans.) 13511 (vii).
—— Total Expenditure (Ans.) 13225 (vii).
See 'Colonial,' &c.
I.C.R., Circular *re* Payment of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10128 (v).
—— Employees Provident Fund Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4995 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Amounts paid from 1903 to 1907 (Ans.) 4245 (iii).
Judges Salaries, Application *re* Payments (remarks) 11018 (vi).
Keewatin Timber and Pulp Lands, Disposal of (remarks) 13587 (vii).
Labour unemployed, Protection to (Ans.) 10735 (vi).
Lead Bounties (B. 191) prop. Res., 9773 (v); in Com. on Res., 10952; 1°*, of B., 10953 (vi); 2° m., 11235; in Com., 11243 (vi); 3° m., 12054 (vii).
Lead Bounty Bill, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 11408, 11705 (vi).
Lithographing and Printing, Expenditure by Govt. Outside of Canada (Ans.) 1506 (i).
Live Stock, N.B., Information *re* Figures, &c. (Ans.) 1507 (i).
Loans, Temporary, since Oct. 1906, Rates of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 314 (i).
Loans, Temporary, Total Amounts, &c. (Ans.) 314 (i).
Loan of August, 1907, Names of Banks where discounted (Ans.) 564 (i).
Loan negotiated in London, Conditions *re* (Ans.) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 13584 (vii).
Loan of 1874, Commission for Renewal (Ans.) 11501 (vi).
Loan, Temporary or Advances, Rates of Interest (Ans.) 12654 (vii).
See 'Dom. Loans,' &c.
Lumber Combine Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 2977 (ii).
Lumber Duties from U.S., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 9509 (v).
McGee, Hon. Thos. D'Arcy, Monument to (remarks) 6288 (iv).
MacIlreith, Mr., Legal Agent for Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11220 (vi).
Mail Subsidies to Steamships, Total Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 689 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, Extension (remarks) 6222 (iv).
—— on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12794 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Aptmt. of Counsel, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7330 (iv).
—— Deptl. Investigation by Minister (remarks) 6526 (iv).
—— Distribution of Evidence (remarks) 10789 (vi).
—— Evidence, Printing, &c. (Ans.) remarks) 8517 (v), 11301 (vi).
—— on Inquiry for Evidence (Mr. Foster) 11203 (vi).
—— Leave of Absence for Mr. Watson (remarks) 10918 (vi).
—— Rep. of Judge Cassels (remarks) 10915 (vi).
See 'Civil Service,' &c.
Meat and Food Inspection Act, Number and Names of Establishments (Ans.) 1505 (i).
Military Camps, &c. (remarks) 9838 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Mint Building, Ventilation of (Ans.) 3036 (ii).

Mint, Date of Operation, Value of Coinage, &c. (Ans.) 11297 (vi).

—— Gold Coins, &c. (Ans.) 2593 (ii).

Mint, on Inquiry for Papers, 938 (i).

—— Papers laid on Table, 941 (i).

Mint, Royal, Sums expended, Apptmts., &c. (Ans.) 232 (i).

Money-Lenders operating in Public Departments (Ans.) 1738 (i).

Montreal Turnpike Trusts, Indebtedness, Payments, Audit, &c. (Ans.) 1932 (i).

—— Payment of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 2979 (ii).

Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co., Amount of Deposit in Govt. Hands (Ans.) 3485 (ii).

N.B. Credit, Amount of (Ans.) 1937 (i).

Obstruction to Supply, on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10020 (v).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 10025 (v).

Obstruction Tactics (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9221 (v).

Old Age Annuities (B. 120) in Com. on Res., 4690; 1°*, 4702 (iii); 2°*, in Com., 10848 (vi); 3° m., 12053 (vii); on Senate Amts., 13316 (vii).

Old Age Pensions Bill (M.) to withdraw, 3654 (ii).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2433 (ii).

Ordnance Property, Toronto, Sale Bill (prop. res.) 13226 (vii).

Ottawa Improvement Commission, Amount expended to Jan. 1st, 1908, &c. (Ans.) 11500 (vi).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6182, 6228 (iv).

Parliamentary Documents, Distribution of (remarks) 610 (i).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloane) to Com. of Sup., 3978 (ii).

Petroleum Bounty (B. 199) in Com. on Res., 12406 (vii); in Com., 12644 (vii).

Pianos rented, &c. for Speaker's Rooms (Ans.) 563 (i).

Post Office Savings Bank Deposits, Increase of Interest (Ans.) 691 (i).

P.E.I. Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2744 (ii).

—— Communication with C. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13353 (vii).

P.E.I. and G.B., SS. Subventions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12754 (vii).

P.E.I., Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 12636 (vii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

P.E.I., Subsidy, Deduction *re* Hillsborough Bridge (Ans.) 5079 (iii).

Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid under present agreement, &c. (Ans.) 315 (i).

—— Amounts paid before and after Adjustment (Ans.) 8616 (v).

—— Dates of Payments, Sums owing, &c. (Ans.) 564 (i).

—— Date of last Payments, &c. (Ans.) 237 (i).

—— Increased Payments, &c. (Ans.) 173 (i).

Public Accounts (presented) 6 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3110 (ii).

—— Meetings, &c. (remarks) 9504 (v).

—— on M. to Conc. in 3rd Rep., 2160 (ii).

Public Bills and Orders, Govt. Business (remarks) 13493 (vii).

—— Precedence of, &c. (remarks) 3404 (ii).

Public Works Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) 5730 (iii).

Public Works, Estimated Cost, Extravagance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7146 (iv).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4937 (iii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Deficit, &c. (Ans.) 6459 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Dom. Govt. Guarantee, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 2394 (ii).

—— Investigation *re*, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 2553 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Finances, Estimated Cost of Completion, &c. (Ans.) 5566 (iii).

—— Corrected answer, 6059 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Report, on Inquiry for, 6223 (iv).

Quebec Bridge and G.T.P., Agreement *re* Rentals, &c. (remarks) 13227 (vii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 583 (i).

—— B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 11605 (vi).

Railway Commissioners Board Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8511 (v).

Religious Fanatics in Man. (remark) 12161 (vii).

Representation of the Mar. Provs. in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9839 (v).

—— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Daniel) 9892 (v).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 6010 (iii).

Rifles purchased by Govt. since 1896, Number, Price, &c. (Ans.) 5654 (iii).

Royal Mint, Amount of Gold and Silver Coins (Ans.) 8613 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Royal Mint, Ques. of Order *re* Govt. Apptmts., 1461 (i).

St. John Cold Storage Co., Names of Stockholders, &c. (Ans.) 1938 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5547 (iii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8563, 8610, 9068, 9167 (v).

Seed Grain Bill, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2780 (ii).

Seed Grain for Settlers in Man., &c., in Com. of Sup., 2770 (ii).

See 'Grain,' &c.

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, Extension of time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2916 (ii).

Senate Sittings, Number of Days, Cost, &c., for 1895, 1906-7 (Ans.) 1114 (i).

Shipping Rings, Combinations, &c. (remarks) 5919 (iii).

——— Royal Commission *re* (remarks) 5916 (iii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5520 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers, Land Grants (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).

South Huron By-Election, Amount paid Returning Officer (Ans.) 9270 (v).

Standard Plate Glass Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 41 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 6183 (iii).

Stanstead Election Papers, Disappearance of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 8849 (v).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5822; (amt.) 5826, Agreed to (Y. 93; N. 43) 5879 (iiii).

Supply—(M.) for Com., 554 (i).

Supply (B. 96) *re* Seed Grain, 1° m., 2°*, and in Com., 2782 (ii).

——— (B. 136) 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5957 (iii).

——— (B. 186) 1°*, 2°*, and 3°*, 10510 (vi).

——— (B. 220) 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 13579 (vii).

Supply, Changes in Procedure (remarks) 1884 (i).

——— Charges of Obstruction by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9395 (v).

See 'Obstructions,' &c.

——— Conc. (M.) 5499, 5915, 5919 (iii).

——— Discussion *re* Estimates (remarks) 5661 (iii).

——— Estimates, Basis of Appropriations (remarks) 5920 (iii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10588 (vi).

Charges of Management (Dom. Notes) 5562 (iii); (Receiver General) 12160 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 635 (i); Finance (Artz, J. G.) Conc., 13578 (vii); (Ross, H. T.) 12914 (vii); (salaries) 637 (i); Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 610 (i); Interior (salaries, &c.) 617 (i), 9708 (v); Militia (salaries, &c.) 611 (i); Printing and Stationery (salaries) 612 (i); Privy Council (Bennetts, F. K.) 12902 (vii); Railways (Butler, M. J.) 12756 (vii); Sec. of State (C. S. examiners) 12917 (vii); Sec. of State (salaries, &c.) 611 (i); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9577 (v); Outside Service (salaries) 9253 (v).

Finance (Treasury Board) 5562 (iii).

House of Commons (Clerk of Crown in Chancery) 10508 (vi); (printing, &c.) 10507; (provincial voters' lists) 10508 (vi); (sessional clerks) on Conc., 13578 (vii).

Inspection of Staples (inspectors) 12264 (vii).

Insurance (Supt.'s office) 12160 (vii).

Justice (Exhequer Court) 5507 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Canada and Australia) 13152 (vii); (China and Canada, &c.) 13152 (vii); (G. B. and Canada) 12728 (vii); (P.E.I. and G.B.) 12264 (vii); (St. John and Cumberland) 12263; (subsidies) 12262 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4017 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 5662 (iii); (customs dues) 5662 (iii); (supplies, &c.) 5662 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Brantford monument, Telephone) Conc., 13567 (vii); (charwomen) 10509 (vi); (Civil Service Commission) 13168 (vii); (cotton strikers) 13162 (vii); (Jamaica Earthquake) 5784 (iii); (Japanese riots, B.C.) 5783 (iii); (Olympic Games) 13167 (vii); (Prince Fushimi's visit) 5783 (iii); (seed wheat) 2770 (ii); (Yukon, Bank of Commerce) 13167 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (wrecks) 3152 (ii).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5514 (iii).

Post Office (stamps, &c.) 9111 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Emerson) 8535 (v); (Winnipeg warehouse) 8571 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1453, 1472 (i); (rents, &c.) 11004 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax) 7140; (Shelburne) 7173; (Westville) 7179 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dom. Arsenal) 7437; (Knowlton) 7292 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Baddeck) 11220 (vi); (Lakevale channel) Conc., 13568 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11083 (vi).

Railways Generally (extra clerks) 10344 (vi); I.C.R. (collection of revenues) 5694 (iii); (Moncton—Truro, additional line) 12760 (vii); (salaries) 10128 (v); Ry. Commission (Quebec Bridge) 12770 (vii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Senate (salaries) 10489 (vi).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Act) 12264 (vii).
Temporary Govt. Loans, Rate of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 234, 235 (i).
Town Site, Section 32, Erection of Public Buildings (Ans.) 1348 (i).
Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep., (presented) 7 (i).
Travelling Expenses of Ministers from March, 1907 (Ans.) 562 (i).
See 'Colonial,' &c.
Uniforms and Customs Refunds (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9570 (v).
Wallberg, E. A., Payments by Public Works Dept. (Ans.) 5086 (iii).
Water Carriage of Goods (B. 178) on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).
——— (remarks) 13416 (vii).
Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 554 (i), 13579 (vii).
Ways and Means—The Budget, 5137 (iii).
Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6118 (iii).
Wednesday Evenings and Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9486 (v).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6185 (iii).
West India Trade, Reciprocity Negotiations (remarks) 1860 (i).
Wharfs, Piers and Harbours, Total Expenditure since 1895 (Ans.) 5078 (iii).
Wheat Transportation from West, Financial Aid, &c. (Ans.) 173 (i).
——— Bank Negotiations (Ans.) 171 (i).
——— Financial Aid, &c. (Ans.) 1938 (i).
——— Financial Aid by Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copies of Papers, &c., 899 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copies of Cor. &c., 2176 (ii).
——— Special Arrangements *re* Shipments of Feed Wheat with Ry. Cos. (Ans.) 893 (i).
Whisky, Illegal Distribution at Thetford Mines, Customs Frauds, &c. (remarks) 9894 (v).
Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9684 (v).
——— Dom. Revenue and Expenditures from March 31st to June 30th, 1907 (Ans.) 1346
——— Expenditures, Total Expenditure (remarks) *re* Question, 1128 (i).
——— Judges Salaries (remarks) 11123 (vi).
——— Money Transmission, Rates, *re* &c. (Ans.) 2979 (ii).
——— Revenue and Expenditure, Total Amount, &c. (Ans.) 1114 (i).

FINLAYSON, Mr. D., *Richmond, N.S.*
Behring Sea Commission, Expenses *re* (Ques.) 1733 (i).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12872 (vii).
Dodds, Mr. W., Information *re* (Ques.) 5655 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11865 (vi).
Public Accounts Com., Sittings concurrently with Hse. (M.) 9579 (v).
Washington Fisheries Commission at Washington, Expenses *re* (Ques.) 1732 (i).

FISHER, Hon. S. A. (Minister of Agriculture) *Brome.*
Accountants for Marine Dept., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4111 (ii).
Address, The, 213 (i).
Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (prsented) 7 (i).
Anglo-French Exhibition, Canadian Representative (Ans.) 8611 (v).
——— Goods purchased from T. Lindsay Co. (Ans.) 8615 (v).
Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5385 (iii).
Archives Dept., Index Cards purchased, Names of Firms, &c. (Ans.) 6057 (iii).
Blankets purchased, Ret., on Inquiry for, 6465 (iv).
Boneless Meat, Frozen, Imported into G.B., Par. in English Newspapers, &c. (Ans.) 3231 (ii).
Brockville, Cheese Curing Room, Lease, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 3897 (ii).
——— Cold Storage Plant, Disposal of (Ans.) 3234 (ii).
Bubonic Plague, Prevention of into Canada (Ans.) 686 (i).
Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6202 (iii).
Canned Goods Inspection Act Amt. (B. 147) 1° m., 6221; in Com., 6870 (iv).
Canned Goods Inspection Act, Enforcement of (Ans.) 3846 (ii).
Canned Goods Inspection Regulations, Names of Counties, &c. (Ans.) 514 (i).
Cattle Embargo by G. B., Removal of, Action of Govt. since 1896 (Ans.) 2168 (ii).
——— Par. in Montreal Gazette, 13081 (vii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12880 (vii).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 6223 (iv).
Cattle exported to U.S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2767 (ii).
Census (complete) of the N.W. Provinces Report (presented) 3422 (ii).
Census Map, Publication of (Ans.) 4406 (iii).
Central Experimental Farm, Sale of Cattle, &c. (Ans.) 2389 (ii).

FISHER, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

Charlan, Mr., Salary as Tobacco Expert (Ans.) 11495 (vi).

Chartered Banks of Canada, Report (presented) 8086 (iv).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5109 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 189) in Com. on Res., 11350; 1° m., 10717; 2° m., 11315; in Com., 11362, 11536, 11634 (vi), 12163; on Senate Amts., 13520 (vii).

Civil Service Bill, Physical Fitness (remarks) 11018 (vi).

Civil Service Commission's Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).
See 'Marine.'

Civil Service Act Amt. Bill, (remarks) 11124 (vi).

Civil Service Examiners' Report (presented) 8086 (iv).

Cold Storage Establishment in East Elgin, Assistance to (Ans.) 352 (i).

Cold Storage Plants, Construction in Alberta (Ans.) 1685 (i).

Cold Storage, Number constructed, Applications, &c. (Ans.) 236 (i).

Cold Storage Ret., Letter of Mr. McKeown, on Inquiry for, 4223, 4407 (iii).
See 'N.B.'

Cold Storage Shipments, Number for year ending March 1908 (Ans.) 6404 (v).

Co-operation B. 5 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 4565 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) to M. for 3°, 13256 (vii).

Exhibitions, Amount of Subsidies paid to (Ans.) 4406 (iii).

Exhibitions outside of Canada, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4584 (iii).

Experimental Farms, Establishment of, Names of Provs. (Ans.) 7990 (iv).

——— Pet. from Quebec Board of Trade (Ans.) 8182 (iv).

——— Establishment of (Ans.) 2593 (ii).

——— Number under control of Dom. Govt. (Ans.) 3897 (ii).

Experimental Farms, Rep. (presented) 1018 (i).

——— Total Receipts from Sales, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 4585 (iii).

Fruit and Dairy Divisions, Separation of, &c. (Ans.) 2166 (ii).

Fruit Inspection (apples) Complaints *re* (remarks) 2756 (ii).

Fruit and Vegetable Inspectors, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 516 (i).

FISHER, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

Fruit Marks Act Inspection Amt. (B. 148) 1° m., 6221 (iv); in Com., 10553 (vi).

Fruit Marks Act, Prosecutions *re* Apples, &c. (Ans.) 4831 (iii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. (B. 123) 1°*, 5337; in Com., 5495 (iii).

——— (B. 197) 1°*, 11990 (vi); 2°*, in Com., 12554 (vii).

Govt. Steamers, Built in Canada (stmnt.) 11124 (vi).

Grain Commissioners Report, on Inquiry for, 4224 (iii).

Hay Shipments to S. Africa, Claims against Dept. of Agriculture (Ans.) 5791 (iii).

High Commissioner's Office, Increase of Salaries (Ans.) 10737 (vi).

Hog Cholera in Essex, Number of Animals slaughtered (Ans.) 9280 (v).

——— Compensations paid, &c. (remarks) 13089 (vii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10498 (vi).

House of Commons Accountant, &c., Increase of Salary under C. S. Bill (remarks) 13528 (vii).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. (B. 148) in Com., 6900 (iv).

Inspectors of Food Products, Number of Apptmts. (Ans.) 353 (i).

Jamestown Exhibition, Canadian Exhibits, &c. (Ans.) 5079 (iii).

Japanese Immigration, &c., Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2123 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies of O.Cs., &c., 880 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Investigations, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7351 (iv).
See 'C. S. Commission.'

Meats and Canned Foods Inspection Act Amt. (B. 149) 1° m., 6221; in Com., 6890, 7244; 3° m., 7215 (iv).

Meats and Canned Foods Inspectors, Number appointed, &c. (Ans.) 172 (i).

Meat Inspection Regulations, &c., Meetings at Chatham (remarks) in Debate on Address, 213 (i).

Moberley, Mr. H. J., Payments to, by Govt. (Ans.) 3818 (ii).

N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connections *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9321 (v).

N.B. Cold Storage Plants, Bonuses by Govt. (Ans.) 9272 (v).

Order, Ques. of, *re* Montreal Liquor Licenses, Remarks of Hon. Mr. Scott, 4065 (ii).

FISHER, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

Perdue, Dr. M. B., Duties and Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 173 (i).

Presbyterian College, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7668 (iv).

Prohibition Vote in Quebec (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 661 (i).

Returns, on Inquiry for 1018, 1740 (i), 2385 (ii).

Rhindress, Dr. Horace, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 6000 (iii).

Seed Grain Purchases, Apptmt. of Agent in P.E.I. (remarks) 3690 (ii).

Sheep Quarantine by U.S., &c. (Ans.) 13064 (vii).

——— (remarks) 13537 (vii).

Smith, Mr. W. M., Dom. Fruit Inspector, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 2393 (ii), 5085 (iii).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Appmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5860 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture (Archives) 671; (census, &c.) 673 (i), 12879 (vii); (dairying) 10397; (exhibitions)10569 (vi), 12889; (fumigating stations) 12879 (vii); (Imperial Institute) 10623 (vi); (live stock) 12895 (vii); (Meats and Canned Foods Act) 12893 (vii); (Patent Record) 672 (i); (Seed Control Act) 5500 (iii); (seeds) 12891 (vii); (Year Book) 677 (i).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (Dep. Minister) 12878 (vii); (salaries) 645; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4044 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 13340 (vii); Que. (Cookshire) 7283; (Grosse Isle) 7290; (Knowlton) 7291 (iv).

Quarantine (public health) 5504 (iii).

Railways—G.T.P. (inspection) 10390 (vi).

Timber Marking Act Amt. (B. 193) 1° m., 11120 (vi); in Com., 12408 (vii).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5386 (iii).

Tuberculin Tests, Results of, &c. (Ans.) 9271 (v).

Wheat Frozen, Shipments from Man., &c., on M. (Mr. Blain) to adjn., 826 (i).

Woollen Industry, Number of Employees, Value of Output, &c. (Ans.) 7504 (iv).

FORGET, Mr. R., *Charlevoix.*

I.C.R. 'Ocean Limited,' Date of Beginning and ending of running (Ques.) 6054 (iii).

——— Trains and Official Cars, &c. (Ques.) 5474 (iii).

Post Office Savings Banks, Increase of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 691 (i).

St. Irenee des Bains, Apptmt. of Mr. Geo. Girard as Postmaster (Ques.) 5795 (iii).

FORGET, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont (Stanley Island pier) 5721 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E., *Toronto, North.*

Accountants for Marine Dept., Payment to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4110 (ii).

Address, The, 66 (i).

Advertisements in Newspapers, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 509 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4721 (iii).

Advertising in Mar. Prov. Newspapers, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 936 (i).

Agricultural Implements, Amounts of Rebates, &c. (Ques.) 1112 (i).

Allan, Mr., Interference in Dom. Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).

All-Red Route (remarks) in debate on Address, 87 (i).

——— on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12419, 12488 (vii).

——— Purposes of Mr. White's Duties in England (remarks) 608 (i).

——— Mr. Sifton's Address *re* Canada's Attitude (remarks) 947 (i).

——— Statement *re*, Negotiations (remarks) 366 (i).

American Bank Note Co., Agreement *re* Printing Stamps, &c. (Ques.) 2593 (ii).

American Cereal Co., Customs Refunds, &c. (Ques.) 3484 (ii).

Analytical Index to Debates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10504 (vi).

Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank incorp. B. 141 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Anglo-French Treaty, Ratification of by British Govt. (remarks) 11705 (vi).

See 'Franco, &c.

Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 600 (i).

'Arctic' Str., Amounts expended for Repairs, Supplies, &c., from June, 1904, to June, 1907 (Ques.) 184 (i).

——— Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4012 (ii).

Assay Office, Vancouver, Results, &c. (remarks) on Conc., 13573 (vii).

Bait Freezer and Cold Storage Plant in St. John, N.B., Cor., Agreements, &c., with Govt (M. for copies*) 558 (i).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 7307 (iv); on M. for 2°, 10924; in Com., 10933 (vi).

Bank Act Amendments, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4309 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Banque de St. Jean, Investigation *re* Failure (remarks) 9335 (v).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4380; in Com., 4393, 4408, 4497; on M. for 3°, 4530 (iii).

Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey (remarks) on Conc., 13569 (vii).

Belleville Hospital Site, Inquiry for Ret., 7506 (iv).

Bernier, Capt., Islands, Customs Ports Flagged by him (Ques.) 5208, 5466 (iii).

Blue Books, Distribution to Members, Changes *re* (remarks) 194 (i).

Boards of Trade Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11988 (vi).

Bonanza Post Office Theft, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 1291 (i).

Boundary Delimitations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9743 (v).

Brass Importations, &c. (remarks) 6233 (iv).

Briar Island, N.S., Marine Signalling, Change of System (Ques.) 9266 (v).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P., Advances *re* Travelling Expenses for Priv. Sec., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1690 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses since July, 1904 (M. for ret.*) 1689 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1347 (i).

Buchanan Town Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10086 (v).

Budget, The (reply) 5163; (M.) to adjn. debate, 5199; (rsmd.) 5260 (iii).

——— (remarks) 519, 559 (i); 4316, 4670 (iii).

Budget Speech sent out by Deptl. Clerks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10349 (vi).
See 'Financial,' &c.

Buffalo Herd, Location in Elk Park, &c. (Ques.) 5208 (iii).

——— Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10103 (v).

——— Purchased for Parks, Authority for Expenditure (Ques.) 896 (i).

Business of Hse. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 10688 (vi).

Cabinet Appointments (remarks) in debate on Address, 80 (i).

Canadian Building, Rental, Space, &c. (Ques.) 5207 (iii).

Canadian Loans, Rate of Interest (remarks) 12194 (vii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12841, 12850 (vii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11253 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10546, 10753 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11351; on M. for 1°, 10718, 10727; in Com., 11369, 11549, 11634 (vi), 12164 (vii).

——— (remarks) 11124 (vi).

Civil Service Commission, Instructions to Judge Cassels, Inquiry for, 7505 (iv).

——— Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7543 (iv).

Civil Service Commission, Rep., Inquiry for, 938, 1740 (i), 2787, 3043 (ii), 4315, 4495 (iii).

——— Number printed, &c. (remarks) 6222 (iv).

——— Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5884 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5631 (iii).

Civil Service System, prop. Res. (M.) to drop, 6242 (iv).

——— (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 9132 (v).

Clarke, Capt. Arthur, Compensation *re* Death, &c. (Ques.) 8179 (iv).

Clement, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 11300 (vi).

Cold Storage Plant, Canso, Total Cost of Construction (Ques.) 8379 (v).

Cold Storage Ret., Missing Letter (remarks) 4407 (iii).

Cold Storage Co., Ques. of Priv. *re* Minister's Stmnt. *re* Insurance Commission, 9337 (v).
See 'N. B. Cold Storage,' &c.

Colonial Conference (remarks) in debate on Address, 82 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses of Minister of Marine (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 998 (i).
See 'Imperial.'

Committee Meetings, Rep. in 'Globe,' on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) 2383 (ii).

Congdon, Mr. F. T., Stmnt. *re* Administration of Estates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10111 (v).

——— (remarks) 13420, 13518 (vii).

——— Instructions *re* Estates Trusts (Ques.) 12413 (vii).

Congdon vs. Mrs. Wiley, Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 565 (i).

Contractors' Securities, Amounts retained (Ques.) 1112 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11981 (vi).

Customs Defalcations, Punishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9455 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Sup. (remarks) 10133 (v).

Customs, Receipts and Expenditures, 1907-8 (Ques.) 12655 (vii).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9732 (v).

Cyr, Mr., Letter from, Ques. of Order, *re* Stmnts., 8460 (v).

Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8898 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10248 (v).

Deep Waterways Commission, Inquiry *re* Proceedings (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).

Detroit River Tunnel, Customs Tariff *re* Materials, on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10472 (vi).

——— (remarks) 13526 (vii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1135 (i).

——— Notice of Motion, on Order being called, 2794 (ii).

——— Production of, to Members, on M. for Sup., 1766 (i).

———Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1628 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. debate, 1851 (i).

Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Canso, Total Cost of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 8179 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8321 (v); in Com., 11828, 11895 (vi), 12945; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 13257 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11126 (vi).

——— in Com., 11163, 11165, 11203, 11408,11503, 11453, 11940; on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 11978 (vi); on Senate Amts., 13522 (vii).

Dom. Loan and Overdrafts, Disposition of, &c. (Ques.) 313 (i).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10796 (vi).

Doukhobors, Condition of, Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (remarks) 2218 (ii).

Draper, P. M., Candidate for Municipal Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4679 (iii).

Dunsmuir, Lt. Gov. of B. C. and Natal Act, &c. (remarks) 1738 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4239, 4577 (iii).

Estimates, Insufficient Votes, *re* Public Works, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5923 (iii).

Falconer, K., Payments by Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).

Falconer, K., Payment to for Services (Ques.) 8890 (v).

——— Emplymt. by Ry. Dept. (Ques.) 5078 (iii).

'Fielding' Dredge, Number of Days Working (Ques.) 7199 (iv).

Financial Review, (amt.) on M. for Sup., 13420 (vii).

See 'Budget.'

Fire Extinguishers purchased by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7646 (iv).

——— Cor. quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7784 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Original Papers, 8901 (v).

——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7664 (iv).

——— Production of Original Papers (remarks) 9281 (v).

Fish Exportations from Man., Value, &c. (remarks) 4241 (iii).

Fisheries Negotiations with Provs., Instruction to Mr. Bastedo (remarks) 4407 (iii).

Fort William Terminals Co.'s B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6224 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com. on Res., 1253 (i); on M. for 2°, 2220; in Com., 3582 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4341 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, Discussion *re* prop. Res. (remarks) 942 (i).

——— preparation of stmnt *re* duty units, 943 (i).

——— Delays in Ratification (remarks) 13536 (vii).

——— Distribution of, to Members (remarks) 606 (i).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 570 (i).

——— Information in Detail asked for, 1585 (i).

——— and Most Favoured Nation Clause, &c. (Ques.) 564 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 931 (i).

——— Printing and Distribution (remarks) 93 (i).

——— Ratification by French Senate (remarks) 13083 (vii).

——— (remarks) in debate on Address, 86 (i).

——— Stmnt. *re* Tariffs (remarks) 8 (i).

——— U. S. Exports, Articles, &c. (Ques.) 896 (i).

Geological Survey Technical Officers (remarks) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 4230 (iii).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 991

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Girouard, Mr., Resignation from Yukon Council (remarks) 11634, 11938 (vi).
See 'Yukon.'

Gold Commissioner's Office, Yukon, Number of Clerks, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).

Govt. Employees, Interference in Elections, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 115, 11908 (vi).

Govt. Ownership, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 75 (i).

Govt. Steamers, Amounts paid for Provisions, &c., for three years, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1512 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1099 (i).

Grain Transportation from the West, Financial Aid, Explanation in the Senate (remarks) 607 (i).

G. B., Australia and Canada, &c., Fast Line Steamers, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 558 (i).

G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2227 (ii); in Com., 12061 (vii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8134 (iv).

——— Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 8837 (v); in Com., 10772 (vi).

G.T.P. Ry., Bond Issue, Sale, &c. (Ques.) 8440 (v).

——— Commissions issued to Inspectors (remarks) 9716 (v).

——— Contracts, Date, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 6458, 6636 (iv).

——— Contracts *re* Eastern and Western Sections (Ques.) 6234 (iv).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. (Mr. Graham) to lay on Table, 12049 (vii).

——— Liquor Prohibition Sale: Inquiry for Ret. 2024 (ii).

——— Miles under Construction, &c. (Ques.) 165 (i).

——— Police Patrol (remarks) 7997 (iv).

——— Prohibition Zone, Cor. Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 558 (i).

——— Purchase of Rails for Eastern Division, &c. (Ques.) 9263 (v).

——— Securities *re* Construction Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 356 (i).

——— Transcontinental Commission, Total Salaries, Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 13226 (vii).

Halifax Platform of Conservative Leader (remarks) in debate on Address, 66 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 4224 (iii).

Hay Shipments to S. Africa, Claims *re* Damages (remarks) 5791 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Hillsborough Bridge Claims, on Inquiry for Ret., 3691 (ii).

Hillsborough Bridge Ret., Inquiry for, 2882 (ii).

Hindus in B.C., Protests against by Immigrants, Par. in Ottawa Citizen, 5488 (iii).

——— Tel. *re* Contract Labour (remarks) 4407 (iii).

Homestead Patents, Settlement Conditions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10095 (v).

Honey Imports, from 1898-1908, Amount, Value, &c. (Ques.) 8177 (iv).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5729 (iii), 10495 (vi).

——— Rules for Hours of Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wright) 591 (i).

——— and Senate, Cost outside of Indemnities (Ques.) 4760 (iii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction of, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).

Hyman, Hon. C. S., Date of Resignation, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 166 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5657 (iii).

Imperial Conference, 1907, Expenditure by Govt. (Ques.) 511 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses of Minister, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1513 (i).
See 'Colonial.'

Imports and Exports, ending Sept. 30th and Oct. 30th, 1907 (Ques.) 350 (i).

——— Values from June, to Dec. 1907 (Ques.) 1112 (i).

Imports for Home Consumption, Values for 1907-8 (Ques.) 13063 (vii).

Indian Schools, Rep. of Dr. Bryce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6467 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 833; on M. for 2°, 1742 (i).

Insurance Bill, Discussion *re*, 1107 (i).

——— Discussion *re* (personal explanation) Par. in Montreal 'Star,' 1860 (i).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 7099 (iv), 8386 (v).

Insurance Commission, Rep. *re* Political Literature, Ques. of Priv., 10792 (vi).

——— Rep., Ques. of Priv., 9461 (v).

——— Total Expenditure of Commission, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 232 (i).

I.C.R., Audit System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).

——— Cars sent to U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10222 (v).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Circular Letter *re* Payments of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10127 (v).
——— Claims for Damages, by A. W. Belyea, &c. (Ques.) 9472 (v).
——— Employees, and N.B. Elections (remarks) 3317 (ii).
——— Extension Policy (remarks) in debate on Address, 73 (i).
——— Train Service, Explanations *re* Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Reid) for Ret., 6242 (iv).
——— Transportation, &c. on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4424 (iii).
Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 970 (i).
——— B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4671 (iii).
Japanese Immigration into B.C. (remarks) in debate on Address, 77 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for O.Cs., &c., 881 (i).
——— Ques. of Order *re* Attacks on Prov. Govt., 1763 (i).
——— Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2101 (ii).
Lacas, E., Payments to, by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 980, 1035 (i).
Ladysmith Wharf, B.C., Cost of (Ques.) 8176 (iv).
Lafferty, Thos., Payment *re* Removal of Snags in St. John River (Ques.) 8379 (v).
Land Titles Act Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 10526; in Com., 10528 (vi).
Lead Bounties B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 10952 (vi).
Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11235; in Com., 11243; on M. for 3° (remarks) 11250 (vi), 12054 (vii).
——— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 11407 (vi).
Lead Production, by Lead Producers, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 11705 (vi).
Lighthouse Service on St. Lawrence, Steamers chartered, &c. (Ques.) 11299 (vi).
Loan of 1874, Commission for Renewal (Ques.) 11501 (vi).
Loan of Aug., 1907, Names of Banks where discounted (Ques.) 564 (i).
Loans negotiated in London, Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts, &c. (personal explanation) 13582 (vii).
Loans, Temporary or Advances, Rates of Interest outstanding, &c. (Ques.) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts: *See* 'Dom. Loans.'
'Lord Kitchener' Tug Boat, Payments *re* Services (Ques.) 7198 (iv).
MacIlreith, Mr., Legal Agent for Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11220 (vi).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

MacIlreith, Mr., Payments to for Legal Services (Ques.) 695 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12789 (vii).
Marconi Co., and Commercial Press Business, (Ques.) 512 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Change of Book-keeping System, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 510 (i).
——— O.Cs., Cor., &c., *re* System (M. for copies*) 852 (i).
——— ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3989 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries, Acting Deputy (remarks) 11939 (vi).
——— Deputy Minister, Date of Apptmts. of Suspended Officers, &c. (Ques.) 6982 (iv).
——— Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7335 (iv).
——— Amounts paid Counsel (Ques.) 8837 (v).
——— Delay in Investigation, &c., C. S. Report, &c., M. to adjourn (remarks) 8445 (v).
——— Evidence *re* (remarks) 11203 (vi).
——— Evidence, Distribution of (remarks) 10789 (vi).
——— Evidence and Reports, Printing, &c. (remarks) 11301 (vi).
———Issue of Judge Cassels' Commission (remarks) 6466 (iv).
——— Method of Procedure (remarks) 10741 (vi).
——— Minister's Travelling Expenses, Refunds, &c. (Ques.) 8889 (v).
——— Public Investigation, &c. (remarks) 7321 (iv).
——— Rep. of Judge Cassels (remarks) 10915 (vi).
Marine and Fisheries Returns, Inquiry for, 2883 (ii).
Marine Signalling at Briar Island, Change of System (Ques.) 9266 (v).
Militia Depts., Threats by Min. of Militia (remarks) 13583 (vii).
Militia Schools, Garrisons, &c., Amounts paid for Provisions, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1512 (i).
Militia Stores, Inspection of, &c. (Ques.) 8181 (iv).
Mines Branch, Acting Director, Additional Salary (remarks) on Conc., 13569 (vii).
Ministers' Travelling Expenses from March, 1907 (Ques.) 562 (i).
Mint, Date of Operation, Values of Coinage, &c. (Ques.) 11296 (vi).
——— Sums expended, Apptmnts., &c. (Ques.) 232 (i).
——— Total Expenditure (M. for ret.*) 557 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 938 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

'Montcalm,' Str., Amount expended, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1886 (i).

'Montcalm,' Str., Investigation *re* Accident (remarks) 8171 (iv), 9715 (v).

——— Rep. *re* Accident (remarks) 10121 (v).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9483 (v).

Motions, Unopposed (remarks) 8839 (v).

National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13500; in Com., 13502 (vii).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11991 (vi).

N.B. Cold Storage Bait Co., Ministerial Interests, &c., on M. for Sup., 9283; on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 9425 (v).
See 'St. John,' &c.

N.B. Elections, Interference of Govt. Officials (remarks) 3579 (ii).

——— Telegram (read) *re* Interference, 3229 (ii).

——— M. to adjn. House, 3657, 3678 (ii).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3060 (ii).
See 'Govt. Officials.'

Newspaper Advertising, Amounts paid (Ques.) 509 (i).

Niagara Lands, Sale for Military Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13540 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) 5060 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts paid and Claims, &c. (Ques.) 167 (i).

Obstruction Tactics, Discussion of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9220 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10033 (v).

——— Order, Question of (Mr. D. Ross) 10024 (v).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10332 (vi).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4691 (iii); in Com., 10850 (vi).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2425 (ii).

Opium Prohibition B. 205 (Mr. Lemieux) on Senate Amts., 13523 (vii).

Ottawa Improvement Commission, Amount expended to Jan. 1st, 1908, &c. (Ques.) 11499 (vi).

Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, Releases since 1896 (M. for ret.) 2822; (amt.) to Ret., 2846 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 9579 (v), 12919 (vii).

Patronage *re* Civil Service, &c. (M.) to drop, 6243 (iv).
See 'Civil,' &c.

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Port Medway and Medway Station Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 11300 (v).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10704 (vi).

Preston, W. T. R., Employment by Govt. (Ques.) 360 (i).

P.E.I. Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2743 (ii).

Printing in 'Sun,' &c., Inquiry for Ret., 5661 (iii).

Prisoners, Released, &c.: *See* 'Pardoning Power.'

Protection Tariff, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 74 (i).

Provincial Subsidies, Dates of last Payments, &c. (Ques.) 237 (i).

——— Sums owing, &c. (Ques.) 564 (i).

——— (remarks) in debate on Address, 79 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Meetings of (remarks) 945 (i).

——— Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3106 (ii).

——— Production of Original Documents (remarks) 4496 (iii).
See 'Documents,' &c.

Public Lands of Dom. (remarks) *re* in debate on Address, 70 (i).

Public Works, Applications *re*, Useless Expenditures (remarks) in Com., 5923 (iii).

——— Deptl. Salaries in Hamilton, Delays (remarks) 10016, 10119 (v).

——— Expenditure in Mar. Provs., since 1896 (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry., &c., Cost of Mail Service (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

Quebec Bridge Commissioners' Report, Inquiry for, 4494 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13403 (vii).

Quebec Bridge and G.T.P., Agreement *re* Rental, &c. (remarks) 13227 (vii).

Quebec Bridge, Salaries to Officials (Ques.) 13517 (vii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Army and Navy Veterans Association (remarks) 7448, 7998 (iv), 8695 (v).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 10633; in Com., 10638; on M. for 3°, 11613 (vi).

Railway Estimates, Obstruction of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10129 (v).

Ry. Mail Clerk at Edmonton, Expenses *re* Trial (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9108 (v).

Rv. Subsidies, on prop. Res. (Mr. Graham) 13069 (vii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Returns, Inquiry for, 1018, 1740 (i), 2385, 2882, 3318 (ii), 4223, 4832, 6010 (iii), 13081 (vii).

Returns ordered and lost in H. of C., placed in Record Dept. (remarks) 2882 (ii).

—— Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv. 4663 (iii).

Rideau Hall Improvements, Expenditure (Ques.) 5467 (iii).

Roberts, Mr. J. M., Promotion in Interior Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9693 (v).

Ross Rifles, Number ordered, Payments, Total Number delivered, Advances, &c. (Ques.) 168 (i), 8180 (iv).

—— Contract for Bayonets (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13542 (vii).

St. John Cold Storage Ret., Inquiry for, 2309, 3690 (ii).

—— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 3580 (ii). *See* 'N.B. Cold Storage.'

St. Louis, H., Employment by Govt., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 1347 (i), 2977 (ii).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4232, 4579 (iii).

School Lands Exhange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 8086 (iv); on M. for 2°, 8472 (v).

Seed Grain buying and distribution, Information *re* (remarks) 13420 (vii).

—— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10122 (v).

Senate, Number of Sittings, Cost, &c., for 1895 and 1906-7 (Ques.) 1114 (i).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1574 (i).

—— (remarks) in debate on Address, 70 (i).

Shepley, Mr. G. F., Payments to (Ques.) 1112 (i).

—— Payments to (M. for ret.*) 1295 (i).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5410 (iii).

'Sir Wilfrid Laurier' Dredge, Completion, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 5207 (iii).

Smith, Mr. Obed, Status in London (remarks) 5491 (iii).

Spain, Commander, Expenses *re*, Inquiry for Papers, 4670 (iii).

—— Aud. Gen.'s Rep. *re* (Ques.) 4405 (iii).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010, 1033 (i).

Stanstead Election Papers, Disappearance of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 8847 (v).

Sub-target Machines, Number ordered, Dates of Order, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 171 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Sub-target Machines, Papers referred to Com. for last Session (remarks) 945 (i).

—— Return, Ref. to Public Accounts Com. (remarks) 312 (i).

Supplies for Govt. Contracts, Tenders, Appmt. of Purchasing Commission (prop. res.) 5802; Neg. (Y. 44; N. 99) 5880 (iii).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 5838 (iii).

Supply, Changes in Procedure (remarks) 1884 (i).

Supply (seed grain) B. 96 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 2783 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Galops (upper entrance) 5671 (iii).

Canals—Generally (extra remuneration) 5697 (iii); (salaries) 10325; (statistical offices) 10317; (surveys) 10340 (vi).

Canals—Lachine (slope walls) 5663; (staff salaries) 5696 (iii).

Canals—Welland (electric lighting) 12195; (piers and bridges) 12207; (Port Colborne) 12212 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5675 (iii); (surveys) 12207; (widening) 12211 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 636 (i); Finance (Artz, J. G.) 13578 (vii); (salaries) 637; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 610; Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 623 (i); Interior (astronomical survey) 9737 (v); (salaries, &c.) 619 (i); 9693 (v); Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 976, 1033; Militia (salaries) 611 (i), 8871 (v); Printing and Stationery (salaries, &c.) 614; Privy Council (salaries, &c.) 610; Public Works (salaries) 639; Sec. of State (salaries, &c.) 611 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9229, 9444; (ports, &c.) 9220 (v).

Dom. Lands (forest reserves) 10054; (homesteads) 10086 (v).

Geological Survey (explorations, officers, &c.) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

House of Commons (Clerk of Crown in Chancery) 10508; (contingencies) 10502; (printing, &c.) 10507; (Library of Parlt.) 10504; (salaries) 10501 (vi); (salary increases) 13562 (vii); (Sergeant-at-Arms) 10503 (vi); (sessional clerks) on Conc., 13577 (vii).

Immigration (general expenses) 5754 (iii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5755 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (dredging plant) 4754 (iii); (Hudson Bay patrols) 3985 (ii), 4747 (iii); (ice-breakers) 1885, 1904 (i); (Lake St. Peter piers) 4752; (Sorel property) 4751 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5662, 5732 (iii), 10289 (v), 13540 (vii); (customs dues) 5662 (iii); (Ross rifle) 13542 (vii); (supplies, &c.) 5662 (iii).

Miscellaneous (charwomen) 10509 (vi); (seed grain) 2773 (ii).

N.W.M. Police (compensations) 8870; (pay of force) 8863; (pensions) 8870; (salaries) 8863 (v).

N.W.T. (Govt salaries) 10116; (school grants) 10117 (v).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1086 (i); (ice-breakers) 2969; (life-saving awards) 2972; (masters and mates) 2971 (ii).
Post Office (extra assistance) 9112; (inspectors) 9108; (uniforms, &c.) 9110 (v).
Public Works (Ass't. Dep. Min.) 5698 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, Alberta (Edmonton) 5705 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Fernie) 5706 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 8519; (Dauphin) 8520 (v); (Winnipeg hospital) 10955; (Winnipeg military) 10969 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives fittings) 5700; (improvements) 5707; (rents, &c.) 5707 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Quebec (Montreal pneumatic postal station) 5703 (iii); (Montreal station C) 7419; (Pointe St. Charles) 7419 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11210; (Baddeck) 11219; (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hilford) 11267; (Port Hood) 11273; (Porter's Lake) 11263 (vi).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (Architects' branch) 11096; (cement testing) 11088; (clerical assistance) 11099, 11100; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11101 (vi); (gratuities) 5730; (graving docks) 5731 (iii); (telegraph branch) 11097 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Ashcroft-Dawson) 5731; (B.C., Cape Beale Lines) 5731; (cable service) 5731 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (collection of revenues) 5695 (iii); (salaries) 10126; (train service) 10159 (v).
Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10329; (unprovided items) 10328 (vi).
Senate (salaries, &c.) 10489 (vi).
Yukon (Govt. salaries) 10107 (v).
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Contracts *re* (Ques.) 5206 (iii).
Temple, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Govt. in Yukon (Ques.) 1126 (i).
Thirteenth Hussars, Service Medal, *re* Fenian Raids (remarks) 13533 (vii).
Timber Leases *re* Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., on M. (Mr. Turriff) 8703 (v).
Timber Licenses, Applications to Mr. Mackenzie's Govt. (M. for ret.*) 3242 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 3038 (ii).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).
——— Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Lake) for Copies, 2855 (ii).
Timber Limit Grants to Messrs McLeod, Lundy, &c. (Ques.) 236 (i).
——— Statement quoted by Mr. Turriff, Inquiry for, 2386 (ii).
Timber Sales, Opening of Tenders, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turriff), Ques. of Order, 11304 (vi).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10700 (vi).
Toronto Island Tunnel, Construction by Govt. (remarks) 5565 (iii).
Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of (remarks) 2594 (ii).
Torrens Land Title Fund, Information (remarks) 10916 (vi).
Transcontinental Ry. Commission, Expenses in Salaries, Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 13517 (vii).
Travelling Expenses of Ministers at Colonial Conference (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1040 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. in Com. of Sup., 3985 (ii).
——— Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4117 (ii).
Travelling Expenses of Ministers from March, 1907 (Ques.) 562 (i).
Travelling Expenses of Minister of Marine (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 994 (i).
Trent Canal, Newmarket Canal, Reps., Surveys, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10315 (vi).
Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve, on M. for Sup., 7651 (iv).
Victoria Beach Piers, Amounts expended, &c. (Ques.) 237 (i).
Washington Treaty Negotiations and Behring Sea Commission, Duration of, &c. (Ques.) 2165 (ii).
Water Carriage of Goods B. 178, on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).
Wednesday Evening Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11233 (vi).
Western Block Extension, Total Cost, Area, &c. (Ques.) 512 (i).
Whale Fishing Cos. in B. C., Licenses granted, on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10283 (v).
Wheat Transportation, Financial Aid by Govt. (M.) for Copies of Memorials, Cor., &c., 899 (i), 2173 (ii).
Wheat Transportation from West, Negotiations with Banks, &c. (Ques.) 171 (i).
See 'Bank,' 'Financial Stringency'
Whitehorse Townsite, Portions sold and retained, &c. (Ques.) 11496 (vi).
——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 181, 11166 (vi).
Wiley, Mrs. Louise, Claims against Mr. Congdon, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1131 (i).
See 'Congdon,' &c.
Woollen Industry, Reply to Manufacturers Ass'n. by Prime Minister (remarks) 13420 (vii).
Woollen Industry, Pet. *re* (remarks) 13518 (vii).
Young, Mr. W. C., Inquiry *re* Charges as Mining Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 1127 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10529 (vi).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. for Sup., 9580 (v).

——— Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

——— Incomplete Return (remarks) 5785 (iii).

Yukon-Congdon, F. T., Investigation *re* Estates and Trusts (Ques.) 12050 (vii).

See 'Wiley.'

——— Election Conspiracy, Cor., &c., *re* Trial (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1114 (i).

——— Expenditures, Total Amount (remarks) *re* Question, 1128 (i).

——— Revenue and Expenditures from March 31st to June 30th, 1907 (Ques.) 1346 (i).

Yukon Financial Administration, Rep. of Mr. Beddoe (M. for copy*) 1132 (i).

——— Inquiry for, 6464 (iv).

Yukon, Govt. Officials, Re-arrangement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).

——— Lithgow, J. V., Girouard, J. E., and F. T. Congdon, Emplymt. by Govt., Date of Apptmt., &c (Ques.) 5999 (iii).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10519 (vi).

Yukon Sunday Observance Law, Instruction to N.W.M.P. *re* (Ques.) 565 (i).

——— Telegraph System, Receipts and Expenditures (Ques.) 512 (i).

——— White Horse Ter., Original Grants of Lands, Names (M. for ret.*) 2796 (ii).

——— Whiskey Permit Agents, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1127 (i).

——— Wiley vs. Congdon, O.C.s., &c., *re* Charges (M. for copies) (amt.) 1691 (i).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W., *Kings and Albert, N.B.*

Anse St. Jean Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).

Architects on Public Works, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 10923 (vi).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7669 (iv).

Budget Debate, Ques. of Order, 6616 (iv).

Buildings, Architectural Designs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).

Campaign Literature (French) sent by Justice Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10354 (vi).

Campbellton Harbour, Gas Buoys, Tender *re* (Ques.) 8612 (v).

Campbellton Wharf, Tender *re* Piling Supply (Ques.) 8612 (v).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

Chapman, Mr. F. O., Emplymt. in Immigration Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9964 (v).

Chicoutimi Public Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vii).

Cigarette Restraint Bill (Mr. Aylesworth) on Senate Amts., 13045 (vii).

Civil Servants, Increases, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11362, 11553 (vi); on Senate Amts., 13520 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report (remarks) on Presentation, 5640 (iii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9187 (v).

Clifton Breakwater, N.B., Amount of Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 695 (i).

Debates of the House, Time occupied by Members (remarks) 13540 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11842 (vi), 13033 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11162, 11165, 11475, 11508, 11964 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10823 (vi).

Doukhobors Bonuses *re* Immigration (remarks) in Com. of Sup, 9952 (v).

Fisheries Regulations, Violation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5782 (iii).

Foresters, I. O., Charges in 'Le Canala,' Ques. of Priv., 6005 (iii).

Fraser, Mr. Donald, Dismissal from Customs, &c. (Ques.) 5473 (iii).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12677 (vii).

G.T.R. Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12072 (vii).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6647 (iv).

Hillsborough Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7188 (iv).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6391 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6435 (iv).

Indian Lands, B.C., and Provincial Rights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 629 (i).

Insurance Commission, Evidence, Sale of for Private Profit (Ques.) 6059 (iii).

I.C.R., Answer to Questions (remarks) 13415 (vii).

——— Earnings and Expenses (Ques.) 13510 (vii).

——— Employees, Circular *re* Non-Payment, Par. in St. John Press, on M. for Sup., 10016 (v).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2465 (ii).

——— Gross Earnings for 1908 (Ques.) 13225 (vii).

——— Newcastle Station, Inspector of Work, &c. (Ques.) 13511 (vii).

——— Receipts and Expenses (Ques.) 10514 (vi).

——— Stewart, Mr. James A., Emplymt. of (Ques.) 9712 (v).

Lobster Fishing Licenses, Refusals in Northumberland Co. (Ques.) 9472 (v).

Loggieville Dredging, Payments *re* (Ques.) 9472 (v).

Lyall, Mr. Peter, Contractor for G.T.P. Terminals at Winnipeg (Ques.) 7991 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12793, 12816 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries Dept., Misconduct of Official, Remarks checked, 6633 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries Warehouse, Sussex St., &c. (Ques.) 13062 (vii).

National Battlefields Commission (land) Amt. B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13500; in Com., 13505 (vii).

N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connection *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9328; (M.) to adjn. debate, 9330; rsmd., 9344 (v).

N.B. Elections, Mr. Pugsley's Political Connection with (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7130 (iv).

——— Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3054 (ii).

N.B. Post Offices, Closing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).

N.B. Ry. Mail Service Vacancy, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9107 (v).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10331 (vi).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10854 (vi).

Parliament Grounds, Circular Letter from C. S. Association (read) in Com. of Sup., 11012 (vi).

Presbyterian College Board, Halifax B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7668 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13485 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3130 (ii).

Public Works, Estimated Cost, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7153 (iv).

——— Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4924 (iii).

Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s B. 217 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 13491 (vii).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

Quilty, H. A., Examination *re* Train Despatcher (Ques.) 13225 (vii).

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 13485 (vii).

Rattenbury & Co., Govt. Agents *re* purchasing Oats in P.E.I., Assignment, &c. (Ques.) 12392 (vii).

Richibucto Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12000 (vii).

Ross Rifle Defects, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 9053, 9070 (v).

St. John River, Removing Snags, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3477 (ii).

Salmon Fishing by Nets, Privileges in Restigouche River (Ques.) 13518 (vii).

Seed Oats purchased in P.E.I., Prices, &c. (Ques.) 12391 (vii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12598; in Com., 13047 (vii).

Stewart, Mr. James, Inspecting Auditor on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10151 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10607 (vi); (live stock) 12899; (seeds) 12891 (vii).

Canals—Generally (surveys, &c.) 10340 (vi); Lachine (Richard, Jos., compensation) 13174; Trent (damages) 12768 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (Dep. Minister) 12878; Finance (Ross, H. T.) 12914; Marine and Fisheries (asst. dep. min.) 12915; Railways (Butler, Mr. M. J.) 12755; Sec. of State (C. S. examiners) 12917 (vii); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 650 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9240, 9260, 9444 (v).

Dom. Lands (forest rangers) 10041, 10051; (salaries) 10038; (surveys) 9987 (v).

Geological Survey (oil boring) 13165 (vii).

House of Commons (salary increases) 13567 (vii).

Hydrographic Surveys (Gulf of St. Lawrence) 13170 (vii).

Immigration (agents, U.S.) 9965; (literature, &c.) 9950; (relief to settlers) 9985 (v).

Indians—B.C. (land sales) 12752; (salaries) 12736, 13170; (schools) 13170 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (pensions) 13324 (vii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G.B. and Canada) 12728 (vii).

Militia (annual drill) 5741 (iii), 10287 (v); (gratuities) 13177; (R.M. College) 13177; (Stoney Creek monument) 13177 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Bank of Commerce, Yukon) 13168; (Chinese riots) 13156; (Civil Service Commissioners) 13168; (Olympic games) 13167 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2954 (ii).

Penitentiaries—B.C. (land purchase) 12918 (vii).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office (inspectors) 9107 (v), 13153 (vii)
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cranbrook) 13338; (Ladysmith) 13338 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (cattle quarantine stations) 11008; (rents, &c.) 10982 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 10974 (vi); (Portage la Prairie) 13336; (Winnipeg) 13336 (vii); (Winnipeg hospital) 10960; (Winnipeg military) 10970 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fairville) 13328; (Hillsborough) 13328 (vii); (Quarantine, steam sterilizer) 7187; (quarantine, water service) 7186; (St. John, military) 7186; (Tracadie, lazaretto) 7187 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7112; (Bridgewater) 7135; (Halifax) 7140; (Halifax, customs) 7151; (Yarmouth) 7181, 7182 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7490; (Guelph, armoury) 7684; (Hamilton, drill hall) 7692; (Hamilton, post office) 7698; (Kincardine) 7698; (Kingston) 7814; (Kingston, artillery park) 7701; (Kingston, gun shed) 7700; (Kingston, hospital) 7702; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7702; (London, magazine) 7706; (London, military) 7706 (iv); (Niagara) 13332 (vii); (North Bay) 7811; (Owen Sound) 7817; (Port Arthur) 7825; (Renfrew) 7825; (St. Mary's) 7826; (Welland) 7830 (iv).
Public Works—Building—Ottawa (elevator attendants) 11011; (grounds) 11012; (heating, &c.) 11010 (vi); (museum) 1504 (i); (rents, &c.) 10983; (Rideau Hall) 11005 (vi); (skylights) 7816 (iv); (telephones) 11012 (vi); (Victoria Museum) 13477 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Chicoutimi) 7279; (Cookshire) 7281; (Dom. renewals) 7286; (Farnham) 7287; (Grosse Isle) 7289; (Lachute) 7294; (Lake Megantic) 7294; (Levis) 7298; (Longueuil) 7305; (Montreal, post office) 7417; (Montreal, station C) 7420; (Montreal, warehouse) 7424; (Nicolet) 7428; (Plessisville) 7430; (Pointe St. Charles) 7419; (Quebec, citadel) 7430; (Quebec, Dom. arsenal) 7435; (Quebec, drill hall) 7431; (Quebec, hospital) 7433; (Quebec, immigrant) 7432; (Quebec, warehouse) 7432; (St. Hyacinthe) 7440; (St. John's) 7441; (St. John's, military) 7442; (St. Rochs) 7438 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta. (Moose Jaw) 13337; (Prince Albert) 13337 (vii); (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10975 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (maintenance) 11005 (vi).
Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (North Thompson River) 13351 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 12028 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Beaver Harbour) 13344; (Dorchester) 13344; (Harvey) 13344; (Leonardsville) 13344; (Lorneville) 13344; (Miscou) 13344 (vii); (St. Andrews) 12011; (St. John) 12013; (St. John, tidal waters) 12000 (vi); (St. John, wharfs) 13345; (Tracadie) 13349 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Pugwash wharf) 11279; (Round Hill wharf) 11282; (Yarmouth) 11291
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Goderich breakwater) 13350; (Juniper Island) 13350; (McGillicuddy & Smeeth claims) 13350 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Souris) 13341; (Summerside) 13343 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse a la Barbe) 12028; (Anse a l'Ilot) 12029; (Barachois de Malbaie) 12029; (Batiscan) 12036; (Berthier) 12029; (Bic) 12030; (Bonaventure) 12036; (Chateauguay) 12030; (Chicoutimi) 12030; (Clarke City) 12031; (East Templeton) 12031; (Lake Aylmer) 12032; (Lavaltrie) 12033; (Les Eboulements) 12033; (Montmagny) 12034; (Nicolet) 12034; (Notre Dame de Portage) 12034; (Peribonka) 12035; (Petite Decharge) 12034; (Piche Point) 12035; (Richelieu) 12037; (Rimouski) 12035; (Rivière du Lievre) 12037; (St. Laurent) 12042; (St. Maurice) 12041 (vi); (Three Rivers, deep water wharf) 13349 (vii); (Yamaska, dredging) 12043 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. and Alta. (Lesser Slave) 13351 (vii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (architects' branch) 11096; (clerical assistance) 11099; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11102; (telegraph branch) 11097 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Chicoutimi) 13179; (operating) 13178 (vii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Fredericton) 12758 (vii); (locomotives) 10150 (v); (Moncton-Truro, additional line) 12760; (Petit Rocher spur) 12759; (St. Cyrille diversion) 12756 (vii); (stationery) 10181 (v).
Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10329 (vi).
Railways—P.E.I. (Haney, M. J., claims) 12762 (vii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (Que. Bridge) 12769 (vii).

Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve (remarks) on M. for Sup, 7653 (iv).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 178, on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10533 (vi).

GALLIHER, Mr. W. A., *Kootenay.*

Alberta and British Columbia Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 192) 1°*, 11120 (vi).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3474 (ii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5950 (iii).

GALLIHER, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 13) 1°*, 350 (i).

Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.'s (B. 33) 1°*, 606 (i).

Cannon, Catharine Ann Relief (B. 175) M. to remit Fees, 13510 (vii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10546, 10760 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5128 (iii).

Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1170 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8619 (v); in Com., 11894 (vi); on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) to M. for 3°, 13256 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4578 (iii).

—— B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13280 (vii).

Fort William Terminals Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6225 (iv).

Gammell, Edith Maud Rosario Relief (B. 139) 1°*, 5913; 2° m., 6190 (iii); in Com., 7141 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6437 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6492 (iv).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 959 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).

—— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for O.Cs., &c., 878 (i).

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6519 (iv).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11237; in Com., 11243 (vi); on M. for 3°, 12059 (vii).

Metal Shingle Patent Relief (B. 207) 2° m., 12649; (M.) to ref. to Com. on Private Bills, 12649 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4997 (iii).

Northwestern Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 54) 1°*, 1108; 2° m., 1468 (i).

Obstruction Tactics (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9224 (v).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4929 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Rep., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Conc., 13405 (vii).

—— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13404 (vii).

GALLIHER, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*

Railway Act (commission) Amt B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4967 (iii).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10653 (vi).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4580 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, Extension of Time for Payments, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2920 (ii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5413, 5519 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3808 (ii).

Suburban Mail Delivery, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3284 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Dom. Lands (coal lands) 10070 (v); Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Mint) 1484 (i).

Travelling Expenses of Ministers to Colonial Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3993 (ii).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4580 (iii).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8489 (v)

GANONG, Mr. G. W., *Charlotte.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3870 (ii).

Charlotte County Wharf, Pet. *re* Erection (Ques.) 5202 (iii).

Cirkel, Franz, Remuneration *re* Geological Report *re* Graphite Properties, &c. (Ques.) 7935 (iv).

Glucose, Quantity imported from G. B. (Ques.) 6980 (iv).

Grand Manan Telegraph System, Application *re* Leasing (Ques.) 6463 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6493 (iv).

I.C.R. Station, Asphalt Platforms, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 5466 (iii).

Leonardville Wharf, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost (Ques.) 6463 (iv).

N.B. Coal and Ry. Co., Balance of Subsidy, Claims *re* (Ques.) 9270 (v).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3667 (ii).

Pianos rented, &c., for Speakers' Rooms (Ques.) 563 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4935 (iii).

Rails purchased from Govt. by N. B. Coal and Ry. Co., &c., Amounts paid and still due (Ques.) 9269 (v).

GANONG, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

Richibucto Wharf, Length, Purchase Price, &c. (Ques.) 12412 (vii).

Seal Cove Dredging, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost (Ques.) 6463 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5040; (Thunder Bay ice-breaker) 5043 (iii).

Marine, &c., Public Works (ship channel) 5036 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10883; (Victoria immigration) 10883 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10897 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8533 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7497; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7705; (Leamington) 7705; (Markham) 7710; (North Bay) 7718 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 11009; (rents, &c.) 11002 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (supplies) 10189; (train service) 10160 (v).

Welchpool, N.B., Wharf, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 7935 (iv).

White Head Wharf, Report *re* Cost (Ques.) 6463 (iv).

GAUVREAU, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12923 (vii).

I.C.R. Employees Provident Fund Act, Names on List (Ques.) 4582 (iii).

Lighthouses in Quebec, Classification, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 172 (i).

——— Rep. of Inspectors, &c. (M. for copy*) 697 (i).

Literary Aid Fund, Proposed Govtl. Action (Ques.) 1286 (i).

Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co., Amount of Deposit with Govt., &c. (Ques.) 3485 (ii).

Rivière du Loup Station, Improvement to (Ques.) 5468 (iii).

Shipping Master, Quebec, Apptmt. of, Capt. Koenig's Duties (Ques.) 11699 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4757 (iii).

Trois Pistoles Station, I.C.R., Construction of (Ques.) 12652 (vii).

GEOFFRION, Mr. V., *Chambly and Vercheres.*

G.T.P., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re* (M.) to conc. in Rep. of Special Com., 12265, Agreed to, 12389 (vii).

——— 1st rep. (presented) 8515 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works — Buildings — Que. (Longueuil) 7305 (iv).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 4852 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., &c., Ques. of Order, 2809 (ii).

Dom. Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. (B. 84) 1°*, 1859 (i).

Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s (B. 48) 1°*, 891 (i).

Port Colborne Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12211 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3093 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 12212; (surveys) 12207 (vii).

GERVAIS, Mr. H., *Montreal (St. James).*

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) on prop. Res., 2881 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4854 (iii).

Anglo-Canadian Insurance Co.'s Change of Name (B. 126) 1°*, 5256 (iii).

Architects, Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5379, 5408, 5785, 5953 (iii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10950 (vi).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) on M. for 2°, 3419 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11538 (vi).

Criminal Code (libel) Amt. (B. 92) 1° m., 2543 (ii).

——— (trade restraint) Amt. (B. 96) 1° m., 2976 (ii).

Debates, Official (M.) *re* Correction in Res. on Committees, 824 (i).

——— 1st Rep. (presented) 2590 (ii).

——— 2nd and 3rd Reports of Committee (presented) 6979 (iv).

——— 2nd Rep. (M.) to conc., 7834 (iv); (amt.) 13224 (vii).

——— 4th Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 8835 (v).

——— 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10228 (v).

Debates, Official Reporters, and Civil Service Bill (remarks) in Com. on B. 189, 11539 (vi).

Dom. Guarantee Co., Limited (B. 127) 1°*, 5255 (iii).

G.T.P., Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13302 (vii).

Montreal Circuit Court Judges, Increase in Salary (remarks) in Com. on Bill 206, 12552 (vii).

Montreal Excise Officers, Increases to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, Attack of Hon. Mr. Scott, Ques. of Priv., 4064 (ii)

GERVAIS, Mr. H.—*Con.*

St. Lawrence Power Co. and Long Sault Dam, Cor., Plans, &c. (M. for copies) 2996 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Excise (provisional allowances) 817 (i).

Supreme Court Act (appeals) Amt. (B. 91) 1° m., 2542 (ii).

Travellers Life Assurance Co.'s Incorp. (B. 35) 1°*, 606 (i).

GIRARD, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*

Chicoutimi Public Works Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13188 (vii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4886 (iii).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s (B. 107) 1°*, 3834 (ii); in Com., 5386 (iii).

GORDON, Mr. D. A., *Kent, E.*

Battlefields of Canada, B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4389 iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of Sale, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5253 (iii).

Floods at Chatham, Damages *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4743 (iii).

Giraud, Eugene Francois, Patent Relief (B. 52) 1°*, 1108 (i).

Immigration Agents in Ont., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 3176 (ii).

Immigration Distribution Agents, James S. Waugh, Cor., &c. (M. for copy*) 1690 (i).

Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9898 (v).

Railway Act (Commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4970 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7486 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P., (Minister of Railways and Canals) *Brockville.*

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4721 (iii).

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 892 (i).

Algoma Steel Co., Orders for Steel, &c. (remarks) 8606 (v).

Bear River Station Dwelling, P.E.I. Tender, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 2161 (ii).

Beauharnois Canal, Investigation by M. Dupuis, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 3038 (ii).

—— Lease to Robert Co., &c. (Ans.) 8443 (v).

—— Lease on Inquiry for, 1740 (i).

—— (remarks) 13475 (vii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. Co. and G.T. Ry., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2811 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv), 8552, 9066 (v).

'Bessie Butler' Str., Dimensions, &c., Use of by R. C. Clergy (Ans.) 12411 (vii).

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2993 (ii).

—— Transfer of Power Plant, &c. (Ans.) 1114 (i).

Boone, C. S., Co., Amounts paid for Dredging (Ans.) 4244 (iii).

Bridge Subsidies to Ry. Cos., on Amt. (Mr. Leonard) 13310 (vii).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry. Service, on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn. (remarks) 192 (i).

—— Connections with C.P.R. (remarks) 432 (i).

Brockville-Ottawa and Prescott Ry. Connections, &c. (remarks) 434 (i).

Buell, W. S., Employment *re* Telephone Commission (Ans.) 10011 (v).

Campaign Literature sent by Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10343 (vi).

Campbellford, Lake Ontario & Western Ry. Co., Exercise of Powers, &c. (Ans.) 236 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com. 4231 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 214) prop. Res., 13282; in Com., 13420 (vii).

Canadian Northern Ry., Rep. of Engineer *re* Erwood Branch (remarks) in Com., 13309 (vii).

—— Rep. of Engineer *re* Erwood and Pas Mission (remarks) 13475 (vii).

C.P.R., Saskatchewan Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13305 (vii).

Canals, Statistical Branch, List of Officers (read) 10317 (vi).

Cataract Power Co., Amount of Water diverted at De Cew Falls (Ans.) 897 (i).

Central Ry. of Canada, Charter, Deposit, &c. (Ans.) 4767 (iii).

Charlottetown, Pipe Line to Tank, Contract *re* (Ans.) 5656 (iii).

Charlottetown Ry. Station, Contract Price *re* Construction (Ans.) 517 (i).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5894 (iii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9207 (v).

Cold Storage Co. of N.B., Lease of Land to, &c. (Ans.) 563 (i).

Cold Storage Cars for I.C.R. *re* Dairy Produce, Number, &c. (Ans.) 1688 (i).

Cooper & White, Payments to Govt. for Land at Welland (Ans.) 3841 (ii).

Cornwall Canal, Accident to Bank (statement, 11120 (vi).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Cornwall Canal, (remarks) 12660 (vii).
——— Rep. *re* Repairs, 12161 (vii).
——— Statement *re* Breakage, 11406 (vi).
Cornwall Canal, Arrangements with M'f'g. Cos., *re* Water Power (remarks) 13084 (vii).
——— Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).
Cowly and Highwood, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Deep Waterways Commission, Damming of St. Lawrence at Long Sault (remarks) 13152 (vii).
Dom. Power Co.'s Bill, on Inquiry for, 10919 (vi).
Dredging Contracts, Basis of Payments, &c. (Ans.) 9711 (v).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 213) prop. Res., 13258; in Com. on Res., 13278; 1° of B., 13282; in Com., 13419 (vii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4239 (iii).
Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5483 (iii).
Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13297 (vii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Express Charges in Mar. Prov., Complaints *re* (Ans.) 518 (i).
Falconer, Kenneth, Emplymt. in Ry. Dept. (Ans.) 5078 (iii).
——— Payments by Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).
Fort William Terminals B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6181 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3635, 3794 (ii).
Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6272 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6656 (iv).
——— Accidents *re* Construction, Prevention of (remarks) 6850 (iv).
——— Accidents to Workmen, Investigation, &c. (remarks) 10624 (vi).
——— Apptmt. of District Engineer at Kenora (Ans.) 895 (i).
——— Branch Lines, B. 51 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 7141, 8137 (iv), 8552, 8609, 8742, 9381 (v).
——— Classifications of Districts 'B' and 'F,' Investigation *re* (Ans.) 12051 (vii).
——— Construction, Accidents to Employees (remarks) 7447 (iv).
——— Contracts, Dates, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6458, 6637 (iv).
——— Contracts *re* Eastern and Western Sections, &c. (Ans.) 6234 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Ry., Contract for Supplies to District No. 3 (Ans.) 1120 (i).
——— Cost of Construction (M.) to lay on Table, 12049 (vii).
——— Cost of Construction, on Stmnt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 12247 (vii).
——— Cost of Construction (reply) on M. for Sup., 12662 (vii).
——— Cost of Construction (remarks) 10916, 11407, 11939 (vi).
——— Discrimination against Canadian Contractors (Ans.) 7936 (iv).
——— Eastern Division, Estimated Length, &c. (Ans.) 5563 (iii).
——— Eastern and Western Limits, Establishment of (Ans.) 9265 (v).
——— Engineering Staff, Changes *re* (Ans.) 509, 681 (i).
——— Estimated Cost, Inclusive of Terminals, &c. (Ans.) 9265 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10395 (vi).
——— Grand Falls and Moncton Section, Contract *re* (Ans.) 9266 (v).
——— La Tuque Branch, Damages by Floods, &c. (explanation) 8894 (v).
——— La Tuque Branch, Damages by Flooding (remarks) 8607 (v).
——— Liquor, Prohibition of Sale, on Inquiry for Ret., 2024 (ii).
——— Medical Officer Parent, Payments to (Ans.) 8618 (v).
——— Miles under Construction, &c. (Ans.) 166 (i).
——— Moncton and Winnipeg Section, Number of Miles located (Ans.) 2387 (ii).
——— Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).
——— and N.T. Ry., Disputed Question (Ans.) 6236 (iv).
——— Policy *re* Police Patrol (remarks) 7997 (iv).
——— Prohibition Zone, Reduction of (Ans.) 517 (i).
——— Protest *re* Land Acquisitions (Ans.) 6640 (iv).
——— Purchase of Rails, &c., for Eastern Div. (Ans.) 9264 (v).
——— Resignation of Major Hodgins, &c. (Ans.) 359 (i).
——— Return, on Inquiry for, 6288 (iv).
——— Steel Rail Contracts, Importations, &c. (Ans.) 12775 (vii).
——— Steel Rails, Names of Manufacturers, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 10790 (vi).
——— Steel Rails, Purchases, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 10738 (vi).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Ry., Steel Rails purchased, Corrected Answer, 13065 (vii).

—— Supplies to Prince Rupert via American Routes (remarks) 9026 (v).

—— Transcontinental Commission, Salaries, Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 13226, 13517 (vii).

—— Transportation of Supplies, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1932 (i).

—— Winnipeg to Moncton Section, Number of Miles completed, &c. (Ans.) 6643 (iv).

Gunnip, Mr. James, Pet. *re* Claims for Injuries (Ans.) 3844 (ii).

Halifax and South-western Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13296 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3226, 3621, 3702, 3726 (ii),4225; on M. for 3°, 4363, 4542 (iii).

Harlaka Junction, Ry. Connection (remarks) 434 (i), 3317 (ii), 10179 (v).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6648 (iv).

Hillsborough Bridge, Total Cost *re* Construction (Ans.) 1686 (i).

—— Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) 1739 (i).

—— on Inquiry for Ret., 2882, 3042, 3690 (ii).

Hodgins, Major, Resignation from G.T.P. Staff (Ans.) 516 (i).

Holland River Dredging, Divisional Engineer, &c. (Ans.) 4767 (iii).

—— Name of Inspector (Ans.) 3037 (ii).

—— Payments to Lake Simcoe Dredging Co. (Ans.) 2980 (ii).

Hunter, Henry C., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1292 (i), 3237 (ii).

I.C.R., Accidents, Letter *re*, &c. (remarks) 6987 (iv).

—— Amqui Station, Cost of Construction (Ans.) 10012 (v).

—— Amqui Station, Vote *re* Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 12774 (vii).

—— Asphalt Platforms: *See* 'Stations.'

—— Audit System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10151, 10214 (v).

—— Book-keeping System, Cor. *re* Par. in St. John Daily Telegraph, 5260 (iii).

—— Cars sent to U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10222 (v).

—— Circular *re* Payment of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10127 (v).

—— Claims Agent, Mr. E. H. Allen, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 3481 (ii).

—— Claims *re* Damages, Settled and unsettled (Ans.) 5793 (iii), 7196 (iv).

—— (remarks) 6002 (iii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Concrete Pipe Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 6640 (iv).

—— Connections with Quebec Central at Lévis (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10179 (v).

—— Dartmouth Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

—— Delays to 'Maritime Express' (Ans.) 8615 (v).

—— Deterioration in Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10149 (v).

—— Earnings and Expenses (Ans.) 13511 (vii).

—— (remarks) 13415 (vii).

—— Employees and Civic Elections in Halifax (remarks) 6845 (iv).

—— Increased Wages, &c. (Ans.) 2981 (ii).

—— Employees, and Municipal Elections (remarks) 2884 (ii).

—— Employees, Number and Names of Persons taken in N.B. during Jan. and Feb. (Ans.) 5793 (iii).

—— Employees Provident Fund Act, Names on List (Ans.) 4582 (iii).

—— Employees Provident Fund Amt. (B. 117) 1° m., 4576; in Com., 4994 (iii).

—— Employees and Provincial Elections (remarks) 9777 (v).

—— Gross Earnings for 1908 (Ans.) 13225 (vii).

—— Harlaka Junction, Ry. Connections, &c. (remarks) 434 (i), 3317 (ii), 10179 (v).

—— Horses killed at Truro, Compensation &c. (remarks) 434 (i), 3317 (ii), 10179 (v).

—— Ice Supply Contract (Ans.) 5259 (iii).

—— Ice supplied by J. A. McDonald, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 7446 (iv).

—— Lac Saumon Station (Ans.) 12652 (vii).

—— Moncton Workshops, Tenders *re* Leasing (Ans.) 5800 (iii).

—— Motor Cars, Test *re* Operation, &c. (Ans.) 566 (i).

—— Newcastle Station, Inspector of Work, &c. (Ans.) 13511 (vii).

—— Notices printed in French, &c. (Ans.) 7936 (iv).

—— 'Ocean Limited,' Number of Trips, &c. (Ans.) 6054 (iii).

—— O'Shaughnessy, Pass to (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

——Oxford and Pictou Branch, Total Expenditure *re* Construction (Ans.) 10733 (vi).

—— Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene Train Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10158 (v).

—— Passes issued to Mr. P. S. Archibald, &c. (Ans.) 2387 (ii).

—— Pictou Branch, Transfer from Halifax Division, &c. (Ans.) 12774 (vii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

I.C.R., answer to question (remarks) 12661 (vii).

—— Pictou and Copper Crown Co., Total Expenditure *re*, &c. (Ans.) 10734 (vi).

—— Pictou Engine House, Contract *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1683 (i).

—— Pictou Station, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost of Construction (Ans.) 10790 (vi).

—— Rates, Increase in Winter to P.E.I. (Ans.) 5995 (iii).

—— Receipts and Expenditures (Ans.) 10514 (vi).

—— Revenue from Terminals, &c. (Ans.) 5471 (iii).

—— Riviere du Loup Station Master (Ans.) 7445 (iv).

—— Rolling Stock, &c. (statement) in Com. of Sup., 5697 (iii).

—— Ste. Monique Gates, Number to be made (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

—— Stations, Asphalt Platforms, Contracts, *re* (Ans.) 5466 (iii).

—— Steel Rails purchased from Algoma Steel Co., Contracts *re* (Ans.) 9269 (v).

—— Stellarton to Pictou, Total Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 10734 (vi).

—— Stewart, Mr. James A., Emplymt. of (Ans.) 9712 (v).

See 'Audit,' &c.

—— Sunday Trains, Instructions *re* (Ans.) 10735 (vi).

—— Tatamagouche, Delay in Train Service (Ans.) 1292 (i).

—— Ties delivered, Change *re* Inspection (Ans.) 12052 (vii).

—— Trains, Hauling of Private Cars (Ans.) 5474 (iii).

—— Train Service, Explanations *re* Delays, on M. (Mr. Reid) for Ret., 6242 (iv). 10149 (v).

—— Transportation, &c. (annual statement) on M. for Sup., 4420 (iii).

—— Trois Pistoles Station (Ans.) 12652 (vii).

—— Truro Buildings, Name of Tenderers (Ans.) 6233 (iv).

—— Truro Engine House, Contract to Rhodes & Co. (Ans.) 1936 (i).

—— Truro Station, Unsanitary Condition (Ans.) 7211 (iv).

—— Williams, Mr., Emplymt. (Ans.) 2388 (ii).

—— Unopposed Returns (remarks) 5914 (iii).

International Ry., N.B., Directors, Stock, &c. (Ans.) 4246 (iii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Inverness County Ry. Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12235 (vii).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12404 (vii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).

Lyall, Mr. Peter, Name of Contractor of G.T.P. Terminals at Winnipeg (Ans.) 7991 (iv).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 893 (i).

—— Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

Moncton Shops, Payments to E. A. Wallberg (Ans.) 8892 (v).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C. P. Ry., Extension, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7659 (iv).

N.B. Coal and Ry. Co.'s Claim against Ry. Dept. (Ans.) 9270, 9714 (v).

N.B. Elections, and Govt. Employees (remarks) 3317, 3579 (ii).

—— Interference by Dom. Govt. on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3662 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5049 (iii); on Senate Amts., 10512 (vi).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288, 13289 (vii).

Nixon, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12390 (vii).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10330 (vi).

Otonabee Power Co., Amount of Payment *re* Horse Power (Ans.) 5471, 5656 (iii).

—— (remarks) 5567 (iii).

Ottawa, Brockville & St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s B. 74 (Mr. Grant) on Senate Amts., 6189 (iii).

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).

Owen Sound Dredging, Inspector Telford, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 3038 (ii).

Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 9070 (v).

Port Colborne Elevator, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4245 (iii).

Port Maitland Piers, Amount of Mr. Battle's Tender (Ans.) 691 (i).

—— Appmt. of Mr. W. W. Krick as Inspector (Ans.) 6919 (iv).

Port Mulgrave, N.S., Wharfs, Preventing Boats landing Cargoes (Ans.) 9274 (v).

P.E. I. Ry., Alma Station, Pet. *re* Construction (Ans.) 6642 (iv).

—— Bear River Stationmaster's Dwelling, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1737 (i).

—— Branch Lines, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3264 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13485 (vii).
——— Claims of Mr. James Maher, &c. (Ans.) 3834 (ii).
——— Complaints *re* Excessive Charges, &c. (Ans.) 1123 (i).
——— Contract *re* News Agency (Ans.) 8444 (v).
——— Dundas and Avondale Extension, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 8383 (v).
——— Earnings and Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 848 (i).
——— Harmony and Elmira Branch Line (B. 202) prop. Res., 12052; in Com. on Res., 12408; 2° m., 12628; in Com., 12631 (vii).
——— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* M. J. Haney's Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2751 (ii).
——— Hillsborough Bridge, Mr. Haney's Claim (remarks) 7100 (iv).
——— Montague Branch Extension (M.) to dsch. Bill, 11405 (vi).
——— Stanley Bridge Branch, Reps., Surveys, &c., on M. for Ret., 850 (i).
——— Stanley Bridge Extension, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 4829 (iii).
——— Station Agents, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 3236 (ii).
——— Time-Table, Protest *re* (Ans.) 1124 (i).
——— Train Service between Charlottetown and Murray Harbour (Ans.) 569 (i).
——— Tunnel, Rep. *re*, on Inquiry for (Mr. Lefurgey) 9893 (v).
——— Tunnel, Information *re* (Ans.) 562 (i).
——— Winter Communication, Mail Service, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 1206 (i).
Provincial Elections, and Federal Ministers' Speeches (remarks) 8851 (v).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s (B. 217) prop. Res., 13080; in Com. on Res., 13416; in Com., 13491 (vii).
Quebec Bridge Accident, Material on Hand, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 1291 (i).
——— Apptmt. of Engineer Hoare (Ans.) 8173 (iv).
——— Names of Jurymen (Ans.) 7991 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Agreement *re* Rentals, &c. (remarks) 13227 (vii).
——— Horse or Vehicle Traffic (Ans.) 10739 (vi).
Quebec Bridge Commissioners' Report (presented) 4566 (iii), 10915 (vi).
——— on Inquiry for Rep., 946, 1739 (i), 3043 (ii), 6223 (iv).
——— Distribution of Printed Copies (remarks) 5914 (iii).
——— Printing, &c. (remarks) 6924, 7099, 8171 (iv), 8608 (v).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Quebec Bridge, Distribution of Printed Evidence (remarks) 10302 (vi).
Quebec Bridge Co., Salaries to Officials (Ans.) 13517 (vii).
Quebec and Lake St. John (branch lines) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).
Quebec and N.B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13291 (vii).
Quilty, H. A., Examination *re* Train Despatcher (Ans.) 13225 (vii).
Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 581 (i); on Amt. to Senate Amts., 12192 (vii).
——— (construction) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 3412 (ii).
——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3389 (ii).
——— (fire damages) Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Kennedy) on M. for 2°, 939 (i).
——— (telegraph and telephones) Amt. (B. 118) 1° m., 4658 (iii); 2° m., 10625, 10633; in Com., 10636; 3° m., 10777; on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 10783, 11124; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11622; on Amt. (Mr. Macdonell) 11633; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 11607 (vi).
Railway Commission Act (Ass't Chief, &c.) Amt (B. 112) prop. Res., 3751; in Com. on Res., 3903; 1° m., 3933 (ii); in Com., 4964 (iii), 8510 (v).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Ry. Charters and Land Grants, Renewals of (Ans.) 9271 (v).
Railway Commission, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
——— Total Expenditure *re* Counsel Fees (Ans.) 10257 (v).
Railway Estimates, Vote for (remarks) 10007 (v).
Ry. Land Grants, Amounts and Names, &c. (Ans.) 9271 (v).
Railways and Municipal Agreements, &c. (remarks) 6988 (iv).
Rails purchased from Govt. by N.B. Coal and Ry. Co., Amounts paid and still due (Ans.) 9269 (v).
Ry. Semaphores, Iron Ladders and Posts, &c. (Ans.) 239 (i).
Railway Statistics Report (presented) 1346 (i).
Railway Subsidies (B. 215) prop. Res., 13066; in Com. on Res., 13285; 1° m., 13315; in Com., 13478 (vii).
——— (stmnt.) re Railways under Construction, 13478 (vii).
——— Applications for, Memorandum *re*, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies, Bridge Construction (remarks) in Com., 13309 (vii).

Ry. Surveys in Colchester County, Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 2981 (ii).

——— Correction *re* Answer, 5046 (iii).

Ry. Tracks crossed by Water Mains, &c. (Ans.) 690, 1109 (i).

Richibucto Wharf, Length, Purchase Price, &c. (Ans.) 12412 (vii).

Riviere du Loup Station, Improvement to (Ans.) 5468 (iii).

Ste. Barbe, Damages *re* Floods (remarks) 6987 (iv).

St. Lawrence Power Co., and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Plans, Surveys, &c., 3005 (ii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8562 (v).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4234, 4546, 4579 (iii).

Sault Ste. Marie Steel Works, Closing of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13474 (vii).

Sauve, Alfred, Rep. of Investigation *re* (Ans.) 9278 (v).

Semaphores at Interlocking Plant, London, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 9714 (v).
See 'Ry. Semaphores.'

Sharbot Lake to Carleton Place, Railway Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

Soulanges Canal, Electric Power, Contract with Govt., &c. (Ans.) 10011 (v).

——— Investigation *re* Overseer (Ans.) 6407 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Boyer, on Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9890 (v).

——— Rep. of Mr. Boyer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).

———(Ans.) 12413 (vii).

——— Total Expenditure *re* Investigation (Ans.) 10513 (vi).

Souris Wharf, Permission to Build, &c. (Ans.) 7728 (iv).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 3°, 1930 (i).

Stewart, Mr. James, Inspecting Auditor on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10151 (v).

Stoney Lake, Damage Claims (Ans.) 5565 (iii).

Stoney Lake Dock, Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 5649 (iii).

Sydney to Sydney Mines Branch Ry., Total Cost (Ans.) 7201 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Canals (additional remuneration) 13174 (vii).

Canals—Chambly (tow paths) 12226 (vii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—Galops (upper entrance) 5671 (iii).

Canals—Generally (extra remunerations) 5697 (iii); (salaries) 10325; (staff and repairs) 10304; (statistical branch) 10317; (surveys) 10340 (vi).

Canals—Cornwall (break in bank) 12768; (gate lifter) 12226 (vii).

Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5672; (slope walls) 5663; (staff salaries) 5696 (iii); (walls) 12226 (vii).

Canals—Murray (houses) 12227 (vii).

Canals—Quebec (steam road roller) 12225 (vii).

Canals—Rideau (improvements) 12227 (vii).

Canals—St. Lawrence (District office) 12225 (vii).

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 12223 (vii).

Canals—Soulanges (improvements) 12225 (vii); (Manning & Macdonald's claim) 5668 (iii).

Canals—Trent (Buckhorn dam) 12227; (construction) 12225 (vii); (damages) 10308 (vi); (damages) 12768; (improvements) 12227; (Lindsay lock) 12227 (vii); (surveys) 10338 (vi).

Canals—Welland (dredging slide) 5673 (iii); (electric lighting) 12195; (piers and bridges) 12207 (vii); (Port Colborne) 10312 (vi), 12211 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5673 (iii); (surveys) 12207; (widening) 12210 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Railways (Butler, M. J.) 12755 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston) 10913 (vi); (Owen Sound) 7822; P.E.I. (Georgetown) 7185; Que. (Dominion Arsenal) 7437 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11085 (vi).

Railways—C.P.R. (compensation) 5561 (iii).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10378; (inspection) 10390 (vi).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12764 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (advertising) 10187 (v); (Amherst) 12233; (Antigonish) 12229; (bridges) 12259; (Chatham diversion) 12757 (vii); (claims dept.) 10177 (v); (collection of revenue) 5694 (iii); (double tracking) 12236, 12250; (facilities, &c.) 12259; (Fredericton) 12758 (vii); (Halifax, accommodation) 5548 (iii), 12227; (Indiantown branch) 12258 (vii); (legal costs) 5557 (iii), 10190; (locomotives) 10150 (v); (machinery) 12257; (Moncton, car shops) 12250; (Moncton-Truro, additional line) 12760; (Mulgrave) 12229; (New Glasgow) 12230; (North Sydney) 12229; (Petit Rocher spur) 12759 (vii); (Pictou) 5558 (iii), 12230 (vii); (rolling stock) 5549 (iii), 12257; (St. Cyrille, diversion) 12756; (St. John, accommodation) 12257 (vii); (St. Rosalie, improvements) 5558 (iii); (Ste. Rosalie) 12259; (Sackville) 12236 (vii); (salaries) 10127 (v); (Springhill junction) 12233 (vii); (stationery) 10181 (v); (Stellarton) 12230; (surveys, branch lines) 12764; (Sydney Mines) 12229; (Sydney Mines, diversion) 12759; (Truro) 12231 (vii); (Windsor branch) 10145 (v).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10329; (extra clerks) 10342; (inspections, &c.) 10341; (litigation) 10357; (statistical branch) 10328; (unprovided items) 10328 (vi).

Railways—P.E.I. (Haney, M. J., claim) 12762 (vii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10362; (maintenance, &c.) 10385 (vi); (Quebec Bridge) 12769 (vii).

Talbot, Mr. Evariste, Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 6400 (iv).

Telephone Wires, Application to cross R. Tracks (Ans.) 690 (i).

See 'Ry. Tracks,' &c.

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5387 (iii).

Transcontinental Ry. Commissioners' Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

See 'G.T.P.,' &c.

Transportation: *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.

Trent Canal, Bradford Canal, Building of (remarks) 13476 (vii).

—— Cameron Lake, Water Level, &c. (Ans.) 9772 (v).

—— Contracts, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1735 (i).

—— Holland River Extension (remarks) 11940 (vi).

—— Tributaries, Completion of Works, &c. (Ans.) 1115 (i).

—— Tributary Works, Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 1114 (i).

—— Surveys, Rep. *re* (remarks) 6988 (iv).

Trois Pistoles Station, I.C.R., Construction of (Ans.) 12652 (vii).

Tusket Wedge, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13296 (vii).

Valleyfield Floods, Damages, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7808, 7996 (iv).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).

Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 87 (Mr. Sloan) in Com., 4545 (iii).

Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

Welland Canal, Cost of Construction (Ans.) 4245 (iii).

—— Culvert and Dock, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4245 (iii).

—— Investigation *re* Water Rents, &c. (Ans.) 175 (i).

—— Resignation of John E. Scott (Ans.) 6059 (iii).

White Horse Pass Ry. Co., Appeal of Dawson Board of Trade (Ans.) 10736 (v).

Wilberforce Dam, Obstruction to Traffic, &c. Cor., Plans, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Copies, 2989 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Williams, Thos., Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 2388 (ii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6185 (iii).

Yukon Freight Rates, Rep. of Ry. Commission *re* (Ans.) 894 (i).

GRANT, Mr. G. D., *Ontario, N.*

Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s (B. 74) 1°*, 1584 (i); on Senate Amts., 6189 (iii).

GREENWAY, Mr. T., *Lisgar.*

Dominion Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7880 (iv).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11992 (vi).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1355 (i).

GUTHRIE, Mr. H., *Wellington, S.*

Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank incorp. (B. 141) 1°*, 6054 (iii); in Com., 7724 (iv).

Budget, The, 6011 (iii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Power, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7608 (iv).

Commercial Travellers, Provincial Tax, Agreement *re* Abolition, &c. (Ques.) 5794 (iii).

Companies Act Amt. (B. 104) 1°*, 3653 (ii).

Eastern Trust Co.'s (B. 103) 1°*, 3653 (ii).

Foresters Subsidiary High Court, &c. (B. 62) 1°*, 1283 (i); in Com., 5174 (iii).

Hamilton Electric Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3697 (ii).

—— on Mr. Speaker's Ruling, *re* Ref. back to Committee, 3362 (ii).

Northern Bank and Crown Bank (B. 156) 1°*, 6525 (iv).

Ry. Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3339 (ii).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 16) 1°*, 350 (i).

Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry (prop. res.) 2856 (ii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G., *Lanark, S.*

Address, The, 548 (i).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3864 (ii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., and G. T. Ry., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2816 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co's B. 214 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13285 (vii).

C.P.R. Plaster Rock Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation *re* Depts., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 6153 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5643 (iii).

Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8899 (v).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1175 (i).

——— Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1655 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1778 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11882 (vi).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr Oliver) in Com., 758 (i).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6774 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13278 (vii).

Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5484 (iii).

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).

Fort William Terminals Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6224 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1240 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3632, 3803 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Surveys, Inquiry for, 1739 (i).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2238 (ii); in Com., 12062 (vii).

G.T.P. Ry., Branch Line Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8746, 9462 (v).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12717 (vii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12249 (vii).

——— Montreal Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).

——— Port Arthur Branch, in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3748 (ii), 4228 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6431 (iv).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13128 (vii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 1743 (i).

I.C.R., Circular *re* Payment of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10128 (v).

——— Rolling Stock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5698 (iii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Transportation, &c. (reply) to Annual Statement, 4448 (iii).

Interprovincial Bridge Co., N.B., Construction Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13289 (vii).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 8481 (v).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11245 (vi).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12802 (vii).

Man. Voters' Lists, Affidavits quoted, Ruling *re* Laying on Table, 7948 (iv).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 131 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Ordnance Lands Sale B. 218 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 13418 (vii).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6228 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3270 (ii).

——— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2744 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Disaster, ref. to in Debate on Address, 548 (i).

Quebec Bridge Report, Inquiry for, 6223 (iv).

Quebec and Lake St. John (branch lines) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6227 (iv).

——— Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13292 (vii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3907 (ii); in Com., 4980 (iii).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118, on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 10664 (vi).

St. Lawrence Power Co., and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., 3011 (ii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7723 (iv).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4579 (iii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5450 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Chambly (tow paths) 12226 (vii).
Canals—Cornwall (gate lifter) 12226 (vii).
Canals—Galops (upper entrance) 5671 (iii).
Canals—Generally (extra remuneration) 5697 (iii); (surveys, &c.) 10340 (vi).
Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5672 (iii); (walls) 12226 (vii); (slope walls) 5663 (iii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—Soulanges (Manning & Macdonald's claims) 5668 (iii).

Canals—Trent (improvements) 12227; (Lindsay lock) 12227 (vii).

Canals—Welland (dredging slide) 5673 (iii); (electric lighting) 12196 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5673 (iii); (surveys) 12207 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries, &c.) 617 (i).

Justice (salaries) 5505 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Mint) 1452 (i).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10381; (inspection) 10392 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridges) 12259 (vii); (collection of revenue) 5693 (iii); (double tracking) 12237; (facilities, &c.) 12259 (vii); (Halifax, accommodation) 5548 (iii), 12228 (vii); (locomotives) 10149 (v); (Moncton car shops) 12253; (North Sydney) 12229 (vii); (Pictou) 5559 (iii), 12230 (vii); (rolling stock) 5549, 5550 (iii), 12257; (St. John, accommodation) 12258 (vii); (St. Rosalie) 5558 (iii); (Sackville) 12236 (vii); (salaries) 10128; (supplies) 10202 (v); (Truro) 12231 (vii).

Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10329; Ry. Commission (maintenance, &c.) 10386 (vi).

Temiskaming Ry. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Res., 13305 (vii).

Tenders, *re* Opening of, Ques. of Priv., 2738 (ii).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2339 (ii).

Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Bridge Construction Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

HALL, Mr. R. R., *Peterborough, W.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 9 (i).

Dominion Lumbering and Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 172) 1°*, 9021 (v).

—— Pet. (presented) 1731 (i).

Petition (M.) to Present, 1731 (i).

HARTY, Mr. W., *Kingston.*

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clark) in Com., 3731 (ii).

Sharbot Lake to Carleton Place, Railway Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11091 (vi).

HENDERSON, Mr. D., *Halton.*

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 134 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 5763 (iii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4398, 4517 (iii).

See 'National,' &c.

Binder Twine Bounty, Amount paid from 1903 to 1907, &c. (Ques.) 4583 (iii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Bounties paid on Binder Twine, Lead, &c. (Ques.) 4583 (iii).

Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Service (remarks) on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 191 (i).

Bronte Harbour Dues for Wharfage, Amount collected (Ques.) 13064 (vii).

Canada and France Ocean SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6166, 6174, 6195 (iii); in Com., 6411 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 67 (Mr. Pardee) on Senate Amts., 5955 (iii).

C.P.R., Papineauville Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) in Com., 13507 (vii).

Cattle exported to U. S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2767 (ii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11257 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5119 (iii).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c. (remarks) 9734 (v).

Detroit River Tunnel, and Customs Tariff, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10488 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13022; on M. for 3°, 13229; on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) to M. for 3°, 13256 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11194 (vi).

Draper, P. M., Candidate for Municipal Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 613 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4545 (iii).

—— B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13268; in Com. on Res., 13280 (vii).

Estimates, Preparation of Insufficient Votes, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5920 (iii).

Fire Extinguishers, Purchase of, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7665 (iv).

—— Cor. quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7797 (iv).

Fort William Ry. Terminals B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6180 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3584 (ii).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10557, 10568 (vi).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3794 (ii).

Gold and Silver Marking B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12557 (vii).

'Grafter,' Use of, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 10994 (vi).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2236 (ii).

G.T.P., Branch Lines B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 7141 (iv), 8751 (v).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 95 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3194, 3621, 3712, 3735, (ii), 4226; on M. for 3°, 4542 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10499 (vi).

Immigration Bonuses, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1323 (i).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13137 (vii).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6901 (iv).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10528 (vi).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 3035 (ii).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C.P.R. Extension (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7661 (iv).

National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 13504 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5076 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses, &c. (remarks) 797 (i).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4698 (iii).

Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry Co.'s B. 74 (Mr. Grant) on Senate Amts., 6189 (iii).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6182 (iii).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and the U.S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3164 (ii).

Postal Rate Reduction, &c. (remarks) 3159 (ii).

Post Office Act (drop letter) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 7932 (iv); in Com., 10704 (vi).

Presbyterian College Board, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7667 (iv).

Presbyterian Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Funds B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2788 (ii).

Public Works, Estimated Cost, Extravagant Expenditure, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7145 (iv).

——— Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order, 4939 (iii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3913 (ii).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10669 (vi).

Railways and Municipal Agreements, Penalties *re* Violations (remarks) 6987 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7676, 7723 (iv).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4235, 4546 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2934 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2777 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12611 (vii).

Standard Plate Glass Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 41 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 6183 (iii).

Sugar Imports for 1908, Total Amount (Ques.) 13064 (vii).

Supply, Estimates, Total Appropriations, 5919 (iii).

Supply (seed grain) B. 96 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 2782 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Agriculture (dairying, &c.) 10398; (exhibitions) 10572 (vi); (seeds) 12891 (vii).

Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5672; (staff salaries) 5696 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical survey) 9748 (v); Printing and Stationery (salaries, &c.) 613; Sec. of State (salaries) 612 (i).

Excise (distilleries) 814; (tobacco stamps) 816 (i).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4207 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1896 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 10293 (v); (customs) 5662 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Prince Fushimi's visit) 5783 (iii); (seed grain) 2777 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5764 (iii); (wrecks) 3197 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5526; (maintenance) 5514 (iii).

Public Works (ass't. dep. min.) 5699 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cumberland) 10864; (Ladysmith) 10867; (Vancouver) 10868; (Vernon) 10870; (Victoria, immigration) 10876 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10887 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, military) 10973 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax) customs) 7143; (Halifax, immigration) 7143; (Halifax, miltary) 7143 (iv); (Parrsborough) 13327 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7498; (Guelph, armoury) 7680; (Hamilton, drill hall) 7694; (Hamilton, post office) 7696; (North Bay) 7714; (Owen Sound) 7818; (Sarnia) 7829; (Simcoe) 7830; (Welland) 7831 (iv).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rents, &c.) 10983, 10994 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bronte, dredging) 5708 (iii); (Bronte) 12091 (vii); (Tiffin, dredging) 5712 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11080; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11108 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 12728 (vii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10696 (vi).

Tobacco, Canadian, Protection to, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., 914 (i).

Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for 1908 (Ques.) 13064 (vii).

Vancouver Bank incorp B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4582 (iii).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 178, on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6185 (iii).

Winnipeg Bank incorp. B. 19 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 2787 (ii).

HERRON, Mr. J., *Alberta.*

Blairmore Townsite (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10087 (v).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12741 (vii).

Blunden, Fred. W., Imprisonment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vii).

——— on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3475 (ii).

Buffalo Herd, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10103 (v).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10547 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11367 (vi).

Coal and Govt. Lands, Acres in Possession of Govt. (Ques.) 843 (i).

Cold Storage Plants, Construction in Alberta, &c. (Ques.) 1685 (i).

Cowly and Highwood, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).

Customs Officers at Windsor, Age, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 12655 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11915 (vi).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 761 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11136; in Com., 11164, 11169, 11410, 11504 (vi); on M. for 3°, (amt.) 12397 (vii).

Fire Guardians, Number employed in Alberta, &c. (Ques.) 3433 (ii).

HERRON, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Fishery Inspectors in Alberta, Names, &c. (Ques.) 12390 (vii).

Fishing Leases granted between Lake Superior and Rocky Mountains, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1683 (i).

Grain Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13214 (vii).

Grazing Leases, Irrevocable for 21 years, Application for, &c. (Ques.) 1511 (i).

Homesteaders for Sections 16, 15, 27, &c., Issue of Patents, &c. (Ques.) 7503 (iv).

Hough, Campbell & Ferguson, Applications, &c. *re* Coal Mining Lands, (M. for copies*) 698 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3319 (ii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6386 (iv).

Immigration Expenditure from March, 1907, 1908 (Ques.) 5080 (iii).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4674 (iii).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2141 (ii).

Lands applied for by Mr. Aylwin under Irrigation Regulations (Ques.) 7209 (iv).

Land Patents, S.E. ¼ Sec. 2, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 2171 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 2169 (ii).

Lewis, N.W.M. Policeman, Murder of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8867 (v).

Macleod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co.'s (B. 22) 1°*, 430 (i).

Macleod Post Office, Report re Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12565, 13223 (vii).

Newspapers in Alberta, Amounts paid to by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 1690 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1511 (i).

Nixon, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 12390 (vii).

Piegan Reserve, Cattle Shipping, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 632 (i).

Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3402 (ii).

School Lands Exchange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 8470 (v).

Section 14, South-east Quarter, Application for, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 5476 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2921 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1360 (i).

Seed Grain Supply Bill, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2782 (ii).

Southern Alberta Land Co., Application *re* Change of Lands, &c. (Ques.) 7729 (iv).

HERRON, Mr. J.—*Con.*

S.A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3810 (ii), 12596; in Com., 12620; in Com., 13048 (vii).

S.A. Volunteers, Land Grants (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).

Squatters' Claims in Alberta (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10617 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 632 (i).

Dom. Lands (agents) 10044; (coal lands) 10072; (forest rangers) 10049; (salaries) 10044 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9881; (agents, U.S.) 9967; (deportations) 9884 (v).

Indians—B.C. (land sales) 12753 (vii).

Interior — Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5758 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5743 (iii).

N.W.M. Police (pay of force) 8867 (v).

Post Office (inspectors) 9109 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10874 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (cattle quarantine stations) 11008; (experimental farm, repairs, &c.) 10907; (quarantine stations) 11008 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Knowlton) 7292 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask., &c. (Edmonton) 8580; (Humboldt) 8587 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alberta (Old Man's River) 12142 (vii).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11076 (vi).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12765 (vii).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2373 (ii).

White Pass Ry. Co., Appeal of Dawson Board of Trade, &c. (Ques.) 10736 (vi).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6183 (iii).

HUGHES, Mr. J. J., *Kings (P.E.I.)*

Address, The, 380 (i)

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3878 (ii).

Budget, The, 6097 (iii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1709 (i).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name of I.C.R., &c. (prop. res.) 6243, 6284 (iv).

I.C.R. Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2449 (ii).

Labour Organizations *re* Ry. Employees, Par. in Halifax 'Herald,' Ques. of Priv., 8289 (v).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12826 (vii).

Nipissing Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 170) 1°, 8694 (v).

HUGHES, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3258 (ii).

—— Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 12635 (vii).

—— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2747 (ii).

P.E.I., Ice-Breaker, Contract for Construction, &c. (Ques.) 365, 1734 (i); 5796 (iii); 8444 (v).

—— Telegraphic Communication, Com. from Commercial Cable Co. *re* (remarks) 8515 (v).

—— Winter Comunication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4628 (iii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7752 (iv).

S.A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3762 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2943, 2953; (wrecks) 3191 (ii).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2212 (ii).

HUGHES, Mr. S., *Victoria and Haliburton.*

Advertisements in Montreal 'Star' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7479 (iv).

'Arctic,' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4030 (ii).

Balsam Lake and Gull River Ret., Incomplete, &c. (remarks) 6059 (iii).

Balsam Lake Section, Trent Canal, Damages (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10308(vi). *See* 'Trent,' &c.

Battlefields of Quebec B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 3902 (ii); in Com., 4399, 4417, 4527 (iii).

'Bessie Butler,' Str., Dimensions, &c., Use of by R. C. Clergy (Ques.) 12411 (vii).

Board of Trade Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11988 (vi).

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, Protection *re* (prop. rês.) 2992 (ii).

—— Transfer of Power Plant, &c. (Ques.) 1114 (i).

Booms in International Streams, Regulation B. 105 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 1°, 3655 (ii).

Canadian Naturalization and British Rights, on M. for Sup., 12084 (vii). *See* 'Naturalization.'

C.P.R. Papineauville Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

C.P.R., Saskatchewan Bridge Construction, Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13305 (vii).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Canadian Patriotic Funds B. 216 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 13320 (vii).

Cattle exported to U.S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2769 (ii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11256 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10745 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 11317; in Com., 11544, 11639 (vi).

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigations, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7579, 7596 (iv)

Cornwall Canal, Breakage, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 13085 (vii).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Sup., (remarks) 10136 (v).

Debates, Official (translators) 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10247 (v).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11808, 11837 (vi); 12955 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B.181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11127; in Com., 11170, 11950; on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 11978 (vi).

Drill Shed, Lindsay, Date of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1111 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13281 (vii).

Fishing Licenses in B.C., Grants to Japanese (Ques.) 7445 (iv).

Fruit Inspection, Apples, &c., Complaints *re*, 2757 (ii).

G.T.R., Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12078 (vii).

G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6657 (iv).

——— (remarks) 6850 (iv).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12680 (vii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10396 (vi).

G.T.P., Supplies, Transportation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10378 (vi)

——— Ties purchased in U.S. (remarks) 1448 (i).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6653 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6435 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6706 (iv).

Immigration Regulations *re* British Subjects, Deportation, &c. (Ques.) 9772 (v).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Indian Dept., Extravagent Management, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11045 (vi).

I.C.R., Accidents, Letter *re* (read) 6986 (iv);

——— Audit System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10218 (v).

——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4422 (iii).

Japanese Immigration, on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1601 (i).

Labour unemployed, Protection to (Ques.) 10735 (vi).

Lancaster, Cadet, R.M.C., Investigation *re* Conduct, &c., on M. for Sup, 1019 (i).

Lee-Enfield Rifles, Accident at Rockliffe Range (Ques.) 10014 (v).

Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 606 (i).

Lumber Duties from U.S., on M. for Sup., 9504 (v).

Lumber Industry, Duty, &c. (remarks) 10259 (v).

Militia Rations, Cost per Day (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).

National Battlefields (lands) Amt. B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 13505 (vii).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com.,11992 (vi).

See 'Canadian Naturalization.'

Newmarket Canal, Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10306 (vi).

Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., on M. for Sup., 10403 (vi).

Peace River Timber Limits, Cor., &c., *re* Granting (M. for copies) 3851 (ii).

Peace River Valley and Land Co., Cancelling of Grant (remarks) 11018 (vi).

——— Homesteads leased, sold, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1295 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2769 (ii), 6010 (iii).

Peace River Valley Lands, Terms and Regulations *re* Sale, &c. (Ques.) 1111 (i).

Postal Service in the House of Commons (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, Ques. of Order, 12629 (vii).

P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines, in Com. on B. 215 (remarks) 13485 (vii).

Prince Rupert Customs Collector, Transfer of Mr. B. R. McDonald (Ques.) 6401 (iv).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4953 (iii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Militia (remarks) 8696 (v).

——— City Corps., &c. (remarks) 8386 (v).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Quebec Tercentenary, Transportation of Volunteers (remarks) 8377, 8384 (v).
Ques. of Priv. *re* Doukhobors, &c., 7321 (iv).
Railway Act (construction) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 3413 (ii).
Rama Indian Fund, Payments *re* (Ques.) 8610 (v).
Religious Fanatics (remarks) 12161 (vii).
Ross Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Range, Report *re* (Ques.) 11494 (vi).
——— Contract for Bayonets (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vii).
——— Deficiency in Manufacture, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 9028 (v).
——— Par in Ottawa Citizen, *re* Accident at Rockliffe Ranges (Ques.) 10515 (vi).
———Ques. of Priv. *re* Mr. Bergeron's denial of Stmnt., 9330 (v)
——— Tests, &c. (remarks) 8169 (iv).
See 'Lee-Enfield,' &c.
R.M.C., Investigation *re* Conduct of Cadet Lancaster, on M. for Sup., 1019 (i).
School Statutes *re* Saskatchewan Prov., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6864 (iv).
Seed Grain for Settlers in N.W., Extension, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2903, 2935 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn.,1360 (i).
Seed Grain for Settlers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2775 (ii).
Shipping Rings, Combinations, &c. (remarks) 5919 (iii).
S. A. Contingent, Medals for 3rd Contingent (Ques) 1110 (i).
S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) on prop. Res., 3759 (ii); in Com. on Res, 12596 (vii).
S. A. War, Land Scrip for Volunteers, &c. (Ques.) 1110 (i).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 3°, 1930 (i).
Stewart, James, Inspecting Auditor, I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10152 (v).
Supply B. 96 (seed grain) in Com., 2783 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Agriculture (dairying, &c.) 10399 (vi).
Canals—Cornwall (repairs to bank) 12768 (vii).
Canals—Generally (statistical branch) 10319 (vi).
Canals—Trent (damages) 12768 (vii); (repairs, &c.) 10305 (vi).
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 12219 (vii).
Customs—Miscellaneous (printing, &c.) 9577 (v).
Excise (methylated spirits) 823 (i).
Geological Survey (oil borings) 13162 (vii).
Indians—N.B. (schools) 13170; Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12751 (vii).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4030 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 10293 (v); (customs dues) 12156; (Dom. arsenal) 12154; (provisions, &c.) 12152; (R. M. College) 12152 (vii).
Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13156; (Civil Service Commission) 13168; (cotton strikers) 13158; (Olympic Games) 13167; (Oriental immigration) 13156 (vii); (seed grain) 2775 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7495 (iv); (Kingston, magazine) 10907; (Kingston) 10913 (vi); (London, military) 7707; (Markham) 7709; (North Bay) 7712 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1459 (i); (ventilation) 11010 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10885 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11210; (Porter's Lake) 11263; (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hilford) 11267; (Port Hood) 11270; (Yarmouth) 11291 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Beaverton) 12090; (Belle River) 12090; (Blanche River) 12090; (Chute à Blondeau) 12092; (Colborne) 12095; (Collingwood) 12096; (Winnipeg River) 12138 (vii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11093; (engineering branch) 11095; (unprovided items) 11119 (vi).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11071 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraphs (operating) 13178; (Yukon) 13179 (vii).
Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10384; (inspection) 10390 (vi).
Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12765 (vii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton-Truro, additional line) 12760; (Petit Rocher spur) 12760; (Sydney Mines diversion) 12759 (vii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (Que. Bridge) 12769 (vii).

Tobacco Prohibition, &c., Ques. of Order *re* Resolution from Moral Reform Associations, 11302 (vi).
Trent Canal, Cameron Lake Water Level, Purchase of Lands, &c. (Ques.) 9772 (v).
——— Extension to Gull River, Reps., Plans, Surveys, &c. (M. for copies) 2991 (ii).
See 'Balsam,' 'Bobcaygeon,' 'Newmarket.'
——— Tributary Works, Completion of, &c. (Ques.) 1115 (i).
——— Tributary Works, Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 1114 (i).
Wilberforce Dam., Obstruction to Traffic, &c., Cor., Plans, &c. (M. for copies) 2988 (ii)

HUNT, Mr. A. B., *Compton.*

Pulp Wood Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4818 (iii).

JACKSON, Mr. S. J., *Selkirk.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8242 (iv); in Com., 13007 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11173, 11442, 11526, 11954 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act, Man. Voters' Lists, Polling Divisions made by Judges (remarks) 13139 (vii).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10819 (vi).

Grazing Lease of H. Riviere, Location, &c. (Ques.) 13060 (vii).

Hudson Bay Ry., Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6386 (iv).

Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11035 (vi).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12583 (vii).

Manitoba Voters' Lists, Ques. of Priv., 10793 (vi).

Ques. of Privilege, Letter from Mr. Cyr (read) 8460 (v).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1365 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12611 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents) 9881 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8526; (Selkirk) 8548; Sask. (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8602 (v).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12767 (vii).

JACKSON, Mr. W., *Elgin, W.*

Address, The, 412 (i).

Budget, The, 5959 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12899 (vii).

Cattle sold at Central Experimental Farm, Sale of (Ques.) 2389 (ii).

Experimental Farm (Central) Amounts paid for seeds, &c. (M. for ret.*) 556 (i).

—— Sale of Cattle, &c. (Mr. for ret.*) 2795 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4003 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6900 (iv).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Amount of Expenditure for Cleaning, &c. (Ques.) 8888 (v).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5076 (iii).

JACKSON, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Port Stanley Breakwater, Contractors, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 239 (i).

Quebec Bridge, Vehicle Traffic (Ques.) 10739 (vi).

St. Lawrence River Route, Wrecks and Collisions (Ques.) 10739 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10576 (vi); (live stock) 12899 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4758 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4086 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 3220 (ii); (Govt. steamers) 1077 (i); (naval schools) 3224; (wrecks) 3205 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Yarmouth) 7181 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8594 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Stanley) 12136 (vii).

'Vigilant' Cruiser, Investigation *re* Collision (Ques.) 682 (i).

JOHNSTON, Mr. A., *Cape Breton, South.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 13056 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5254 (iii).

Committee Meeting, Rep. *re*, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) Ques. of Order, 2383 (ii).

Co-Operation B. 5 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 4565 (iii).

Debates, Official (translators) 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10248 (v).

Fort William Terminals B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6180 (iii).

Govt. Employees, Interference in Dom. Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 615 (i).

'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9129 (v).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6651 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1337 (i).

I.C.R., Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4487 (iii).

Keewatin Diocese Synod incorp. (B. 179) 1°*, 9330 (v).

Kun, Agnes Ballum, Release of from Gaol (remarks) 9335 (v).

Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal (B. 185) 1°*, 10008; M. for 2°, 10122 (v).

JOHNSTON, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries, Purchase of Supplies for 1892-1896 (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

Metal Shingle and Siding Co.'s Patent (B. 210) 1° m., 12649 (vii).

Obstruction to Supply, Ques. of Order, 10024 (v).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2429 (ii).

Presbyterian College, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7667 (iv).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3128, 3139 (ii).

——— 3rd Rep. (M.) to conc., 9890 (v).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4949 (iii).

Public Works, &c., in N. S., Irrelevancy of Debate (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7129 (iv).

Railway Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. Macdonald) on order for 2° (remarks) 5211 (iii).

Sessional Papers and Returns: Number ordered, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2796 (ii).

——— Number presented, &c. (Ques.) 2592 (ii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7748 (iv).

Supplies purchased for Govt., &c., Ques. of Order, *re* Investigation by Pub. Accounts Com., 5830 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (slope walls) 5667 (iii).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9253 (v).

House of Commons (contingencies) 10502 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4759 (iii).

Marine (ice-breakers) 1906 (i).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1053 (i); (ice-breakers) 2958 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Digby) 11226 (vi); Ont. (Stanley Island pier) 5720 (iii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Campbellton) 12258 (vii); (supplies) 10201 (v).

Water Carriage of Goods (B. 178) 1°*, 9330 (v); on M. for 2°, 13509 (vii).

KEMP, Mr. A. E., *Toronto, East.*

Address, The, 434 (i).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3878 (ii).

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12460 (vii).

Boundary Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9738 (v).

Canadian Bank of Commerce, Letter of B. E. Walker (read) 6008 (iii).

KEMP, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12877 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6889 (iv).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 9735 (v).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12932; on M. for 3°, 13230 (vii).

Election Corruption, Charges of Hon. Mr. Pugsley, ref. to in debate on Address, 435 (i).

Gold and Silver Marking B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12554 (vii).

G.T.P., Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13301 (vii).

——— Winnipeg and Moncton Route, Miles Located, &c. (Ques.) 2386 (ii).

I.C.R., &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4422 (iii).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11247 (vi).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12567 (vii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6894 (iv).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9487 (v).

Ordnance Lands Sale B. 218 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 13418 (vii).

Port Colborne Elevator and Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12218 (vii).

Postal Arrangements between U. S and Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3893 (ii).

Ry. Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3346 (ii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3906, 3922 (ii).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4665 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Trent (constrution) 12226; (Port Colborne) 12212; (surveys) 12209 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9738; (salaries) 9699 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5773 (iii); (Point Pelee lightship) 13325 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13155; (cotton strikers) 13162 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt steamers) 5764 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2962; (life-saving stations) 2972 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (new deptl. building) 5701; (post office) 5705; (rents, &c.) 5706 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii); (Montreal,

KEMP, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

postal station B) 7419; (Montreal, post office) 7411; (Montreal, warehouse) 7424; (Point St. Charles) 7419; (St. John's, military) 7440 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's rapids) 5702; Ont. (Stanley Island pier) 5721 (iii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13321 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (salaries) 10146 (v).

Thanksgiving Day, Change from Thursday to Monday (remarks) 13085 (vii).

Toronto Harbour, (western entrance) Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 10014 (v).

KENNEDY, Mr. J. B., *New Westminster.*

B. C. Fishing Licenses to Packer's Association, Issue of (Ques.) 8173 (iv).

Customs Defalcations in B. C., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10485 (vi).

——— Ques. of Priv., 9459 (v).

Debates of the House, Time occupied by Speakers (remarks) 13537 (vii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1725 (i).

Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11031 (vi).

Japanese Immigration, &c., Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2144 (ii).

——— on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 748 (i).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9501 (v).

Obstructions *re* Supplies, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9943 (v).

Ry. Act, 1903 (fires, &c.) Amt. (B. 18) 1° m., 350; 2° m., 938 (i).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E., *Assiniboia, West.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11549 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11132; in Com., 11413, 11958 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10826 (vi).

G.T.P., Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8128 (iv), 9382 (v).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. for Sup., 6291 (iv).

Lumber Duties from U. S., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 9510 (v).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C. P. Ry., Extension of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7654 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 9068 (v).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E.—*Con.*

Seed Grain for Settlers in N. W., Extension of Time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2918 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1368 (i).

Seed Wheat in N. W., Charges by Mr. Macdonell, M.P., Ques. of Priv., 1438 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12595 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 9700 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10976 (vi); Sask. (Humboldt) 8596 (v).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12765 (vii).

Yeomans, Indian Agent, Complaints by John Franklin, &c., Letters, &c. (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9668 (v).

LAKE, Mr. R. S., *Qu'Appelle.*

Address, The, 459 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4713 (iii).

Autonomy Act Validity, Return, Inquiry for, 5727 (iii).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12740 (vii).

Bonn Post Office, Application *re* Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 10516 (vi).

Buchanan Townsite, Applications *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10079 (v).

Budget, The, 5605 (iii).

Cameron, John, Homestead Inspector, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4769 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry., Erwood and Pas Mission Branch, Rep. of Engineer (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 13309 (vii).

——— Rep. of Engineer *re* Erwood and Pas Mission (remarks) 13475 (vii).

C.P.R. Taxation, Test Cases, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 5049 (iii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6882 (iv).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10550 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11367 (vi).

Coal Areas, Agents for Applicants, &c. (Ques.) 5468 (iii).

Coal Lands, Timber, &c., Dates of Regulation, O.Cs., &c. (Ques.) 12656 (vii).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*
Coal Mines Royalty, Sums received by Govt. (Ques.) 12391 (vii).
Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
——— (remarks) 10916 (vi).
Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1637 (i).
——— on M. for Sup., 1839 (i).
Documents, Original, *re* Timber Berths (M. for papers, &c.) 2855 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8150 (iv), 11791; in Com., (amt.) 11898 (vi).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11127; in Com., 11158, 11168 11415, 11505, 11942; on M. for 3° (amt.) 11976 (vi), 12395; Neg. (Y. 39; N. 65) 12395; on Senate Amts., 13522 (vii).
Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 754 (i).
Dom. Lands, Area disposed of by Govt. (Ques.) 3431 (ii).
——— Sales of during 1907 (M. for ret.*) 3435 (ii).
——— Return, Inquiry for, 5727 (iii).
——— Total Area disposed of from 1896 to 1905, &c. (M. for ret.) 3852 (ii).
Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10816 (vi).
Doukhobor Prisoners at Fort William, Pardon by Justice Dept. (remarks) 6847 (iv).
——— Tels. *re* Pardon by Justice Dept. (Ques.) 6983 (iv).
Doukhobors at Yorkton, Tel. *re* Conduct, &c. (remarks) 7621 (iv).
Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, 6752 (iv).
Eagle Lake Coal Lands, Surrender of (Ques.) 694 (i).
Estevan Quarantine Lands, Disposal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10093 (v).
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3651 (ii).
Grain Commission's Rep., Inquiry for, 2381 (ii), 4224, 4316 (iii).
Grain Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13208 (vii).
G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 9469 (v).
Harbottle, N. F., Emplymt. in Excise Dept., &c. (Ques.) 7730 (iv).
Homestead Cancellations, Unfair Methods (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10100 (v).
Homestead Entries, Declarations, &c., by R. Cruickshank, of N. W. (M. for copies*) 698 (i).
LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*
Homestead Entry for S. W. ¼ Section 16-28-1, Issue of Patent, Duties performed, &c. (Ques.) 2167 (ii).
Homestead Entries N. E. ¼ Sec. 28, Permissions *re* Grants (Ques.) 1941 (i).
Homestead Entries in N. W. Quarter Section 35, &c. (Ques.) 4762 (iii).
Homestead Entry by Mr. Tanguay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10087 (v).
Homesteads, Sale of in Township 13, Range 13 (Ques.) 7206 (iv).
Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6368 (iv).
Indian Lands, Sale of, Ret., Inquiry for, 4495 (iii).
Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 962 (i).
Land Patents, Entry of Dates, Applications, Inspections, &c., of ¼ section 16, &c. (Ques.) 3432 (ii).
Land Patents, Sections 36, &c., Issue of (Ques.) 3481 (ii).
Land Sales in N. W. Indian Reserves, Applications, Advertisements, &c. (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).
Lands in Sections 2, 10, 14, 22 and 24, Disposal of (Ques.) 5083 (iii).
Land Titles Act Assurance B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 8481 (v).
Livingstone, Wm. G., Sale of Sections 22, 28 and 32, &c. (Ques.) 9475 (v).
Lumber manufactured in N. W., Royalties, &c. (Ques.) 3835 (ii).
McKenzie, Mr. K. W., Apptmt. as Dom. Lands Agent at Edmonton (Ques.) 6981 (iv).
Mackinnon Post Office, Establishment of, &c. (Ques.) 10516 (vi).
McLeod, Roderick, Date of Homestead Entry (Ques.) 6401 (iv).
Mail Matter lost in C.P.R. Accident at Kenora, Rep. *re* (remarks) 9281, 9723 (v).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12559, 13221 (vii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6890 (iv).
Moberly, Mr. H. J., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 3848 (ii).
Moose Mountain Buffalo Herd (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10102 (v).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9493; (amt.) 9494 (v).
Muskoday Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Sale (Ques.) 5082 (iii).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Sale of Lands (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12729, 12737 (vii).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*

Peace River Colonization and Land Development Co., Surveys, Reps., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10001 (v).

'Phoenix' Saskatoon, Number ordered, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 6920 (iv).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10713 (vi).

Postal Arrangements between Can. and U. S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3166 (ii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry. and SS. Co., Last Deficit, &c. (Ques.) 6459 (iv).

Quarter Sections 35, 31, 6, &c., Public and Private Sale, &c. (Ques.) 8176 (iv).

Railway Act (construction) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 3410 (ii).

——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3401 (ii).

Ramsland Homestead Entry, Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 5209 (iii).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4664 (iii).

Samovici, A., and H. Bolacan, Applications for Cancellation of Homestead Rights, &c. (M. for copy*) 557 (i).

Saskatchewan Act, May 23rd, 1906, Constitutionality of, Cor., &c. (M. for copy*) 3435 (ii).

———.Report *re* (Ques.) 6400 (iv).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Conditions of Sale, &c. (Ques.) 4761 (iii).

See 'Timber,' &c.

School Lands Exchange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 8472 (v).

Scrip and Money received by Govt. *re* Lands, Mines, &c. (M. for ret.) 3852 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 3431 (ii).

School, Timber and Coal Lands in Man., &c. Average Price, &c. (Ques.) 3430 (ii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, Extension of Payment, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 2896; Neg (Y. 58; N. 98) 2937 (ii).

Seed Grain, Distribution to Settlers in N. W. (Ques.) 692 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1352 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2772 (ii).

Six Nation Indians, Negotiations *re*, Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 6242 (iv).

——— Refusal of Inspection of Memorials, &c. (Ques.) 6239 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3790, 3831 (ii); in Com. (amt.) 12621; on Senate Amts., 13524 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9764 (v).

Dom. Lands (agents) 10041; (homesteads) 10082; (salaries) 10041 (v).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Geological Survey (specimens) 12261 (vii).

Immigration (agents) 9858; (deportations) 9882; (Doukhobors) 9956; (hospitals) 9983; (relief to settlers) 9983 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12733 (vii).

Inspection of Staples (inspectors) 12264 (vii).

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2772 (ii).

N. W. M. Police (pay of force) 8869 (v).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5527 (iii).

Post Office (inspection) 9114 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally Experimental Farms (repairs, &c.) 10906 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8531 (v); (Winnipeg, hospital) 10957 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10976 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston) 10910 (vi); (North Bay) 7715 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Alta (Edmonton) 8579; (Battleford) 8577; (Estevan) 8581; (Humboldt) 8582; (Regina) 8602 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.W.T. (Lesser Slave) 5719 (iii).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 12764; I.C.R. (surveys, branch lines) 12764 (vii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 1220-1272, on Order for Ret. (amt.) 849 (i).

Timber Licenses cancelled from May, 1905, to Nov., 1907, &c. (Ques.) 181 (i).

Timber Licenses, Conditions and Forms in force at present (Ques.) 359 (i).

Timber Licenses and Renewals in N. W., Number of Miles, &c. (Ques.) 181 (i).

——— (M.) for Com. of Investigation, 2260, 2269; Amt. Neg. (Y. 55; N. 111) 2736 (ii).

Timber Sales, &c., on Amt. to Com. of Sup., 8769; (amt.) 8778; Amt. neg. (Y. 46; N. 91) 8833 (v).

Vacant Land Reservation, Instructions to Agents *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1935 (i).

Wheat Feed Shipments, Special Arrangements with Ry. Cos. (Ques.) 893 (i).

Wheat Transportation, Financial Assistance, &c. (Ques.) 1938 (i).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10531 (vi).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8484 (v).

LALOR, Mr. F. R., *Haldimand.*

Address, The, 292 (i).

Apple and Fruit Inspectors, Number of Apptmts. (Ques.) 353 (i).

Apples seized by Inspectors at Montreal, Value, &c. (Ques.) 1508 (i).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6177, 6197 (iii).

Canada-Germany Trade Relations (remarks) 13081 (vii).

LALOR, Mr. F. R.—*Con.*

Cattle exported to U. S. during 1900-7, Value, &c. (Ques.) 1507 (i).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11252 (vi).

Cold Storage Cos., Grants to (Ques.) 1937 (i).

Dauphin Public Building, Valuation of Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13039 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13265 (vii).

Fisheries Regulations, Violation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5781 (iii).

Fruit Inspection, Complaints *re* Packing of Apples (remarks) 2760 (ii).

Gelinas, Mr., Repayment of Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 669 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11249 (vi).

Meat and Canned Food Inspectors, Number of Apptmts. (Ques.) 352 (i).

Militia Stores and Arms, Care of for Rural Battalions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5736 (iii).

Port Maitland, Piers, Amount of Mr. Battle's Tender (Ques.) 690 (i).

——— Apptmt. of W. W. Krick as Inspector (Ques.) 6919 (iv).

——— Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 1294 (i).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10714 (vi).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, &c. (remarks) 8862 (v).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10676 (vi).

St. John Cold Storage Co., Names of Stockholders, &c. (Ques.) 1938 (i).

Seed Inspectors, Number of Apptmts. (Ques.) 353 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census, &c.) 677 (i).

Canals, 10319 (vi); Welland (Port Maitland) 5676 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Trade and Commerce (salaries) 652 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 5735; (stores, care of) 5736 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Ladysmith) 10867; (Vernon) 10870 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8522 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Leamington) 7815; (Owen Sound) 7822; (St. Mary's) 7826; (Welland) 7832 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Hood) 11275; (Pugwash wharf) 11281 (vi).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2671 (ii).

LALOR, Mr. F. R.—*Con.*

Welland Canal, Feeder, Rep. of Judge Madden *re* Investigation (M. for copy*) 852 (i).

——— Investigation *re* Water Rents, &c. (Ques.) 174 (i).

——— Resignation of John R. Scott (Ques.) 6058 (iii).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., Financial Aid, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2189 (ii).

Wilson Cordage Co., Charges against A. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 657 (i).

Woollen Industry, Deputations *re* (remarks) 13082 (vii).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln & Niagara.*

Accounts and Claims against Govt., Total Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 362 (i).

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 4865 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G. T. Ry., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2816 (ii).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3473 (ii).

Campaign Literature, franking by Depts., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10351 (vi).

Canada Shipping Act: *See* 'Masters and Mates.'

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Fielding) on M. to place on Order Paper (remarks) 13494 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6875 (iv).

Cannon, Catherine Ann Relief B. 175, on M. (Mr. Galliher) to remit Fees, 13510 (vii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10744 (vi).

Cooper & White, Payments *re* Rental for Govt. Lands, Welland (Ques.) 3841 (ii).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12204 (vii).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on M. for Sup., 1814 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 11726; in Com. (amt.) 11816; (amt.) 11841 (vi), 12967 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11177 (vi).

Electrical and Gas Power Licenses granted under Statute, c. 16, &c. (Ques.) 360 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trades Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3532 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3801 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, on M. (Mr. McCool) for Plans, &c., 5239 (iii).

——— Rep. *re* (remarks) 12836 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Scheme (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10313 (vi).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

G.T.P., Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8746, 9382 (v).

—— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup. 12707 (vii).

—— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12318 (vii).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2246 (ii); in Com., 12076 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3718 (ii).

I.C.R. Employees Provident Fund Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4995 (iii).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12400 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12566 (vii).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. (B. 2) 1° m., 90 (i); 2° m., 3014; in Com., 3034 (ii).

—— on Order for 2° (remarks) 570 (i).

National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 13501 (vii).

N.B. Cold Storage Co., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9367 (v).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3057 (ii).

Niagara Lands, Purchase for Military Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13542 (vii).

Niagara Military Camp, Holding of (remarks) 9779 (v).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 5002 (iii).

Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9906 (v).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10854 (vi).

Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4103 (ii).

Port Colborne Elevator, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 4245 (iii).

Port Colborne, Total Expenditure *re* improvements (Ques.) 4403 (iii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. (B. 3) 1° m., 91; 2° m., 570; in Com., 583 (i); (amt.) on Senate Amts., 12191, Neg. (Y. 42; N. 85) 12192 (vii).

—— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3353 (ii).

——(compensation) Amt. B. 27 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 5247 (iii).

Railway Commission (ass't chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3909 (ii); in Com., 4967 (iii).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10645; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 11607; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 11624; on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3°, 10784, 11595 (vi).

—— (Ry. Commission) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3°, 10784, 11595 (vi).

Ry. Act (mortgages) Chap. 38, B. 204 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 12550 (vii).

S.A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12601 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Generally (repairs) 10309; (statistical branch) 10319 (vi).

Canals—Welland (electric lighting) 12195; (Port Colborne) 12221; (surveys) 12208 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9753 (v).

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9540; Miscellaneous (legal expenses) 9578; Outside Service (salaries) 9439 (v).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4050, 4103 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Colborne) 12096; (Collingwood) 12096; (Gore's Landing) 12101 (vii).

Railways — Miscellaneous (inspections) 10342 (vi).

Timber Marking Act Amt. (B. 193) in Com., 12408 (vii).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 178, on M. for 2°, 13509 (vii).

Waterways Commission *re* International Boundary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9753 (v).

Welland Canal, Cost of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 4245 (iii).

—— Deepening, Estimated Cost (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10311 (vi).

—— Culvert and Dock, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 4245 (iii).

Wheat Transportation from N.W., Financial Aid by Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2190 (ii).

LANCTOT, Mr. R., *Laprairie-Napierville.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 17 (i).

Annapolis and Digby Mail Service, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 12653 (vii).

Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Retirement of (Ques.) 516 (i).

—— O.C. *re* (M. for copy*) 557 (i).

Ry. Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3373 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay Patrol) 4027 (ii).

LAPOINTE, Mr. E., *Kamouraska.*

Experimental Farms, Establishment of, Names of Provinces (Ques.) 7990 (iv).

—— Number under Control of Dom. Govt. (Ques.) 3897 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4029 (ii).

LAURIER, Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid (Prime Minister) G.C.M.G.; *Quebec East.*

Address, The, (M.) *re* Precedence, 8 (i).

Address, The 40 (i).

—— on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 544 (i).

—— (M.) to present, 554 (i).

Adjournment for Christmas: (M.) 754 (i).

See 'Business,' &c.

Advertisements for Tenders of Public Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4706 (iii).

All-Red Line (prop. res.) 12414, Agreed to (Y. 109; N. 47) 12501 (vii).

—— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12495 (ii).

All-Red Route, Authority *re* Negotiations, &c. (statement) 366 (i).

—— Canadian Representatives in England, &c. (Ans.) 353 (i).

—— Irish Route, Opposition by Govt. (Ans.) 10254 (v).

—— Letter to Mr. Sifton (remarks) 948 (i).

—— Purposes of Mr. White's Presence in London (remarks) 608 (i).

—— Mr. White's Duties in England (Ans). 694 (i).

—— Resolutions (remarks) 12162 (vii).

—— Mr. Sifton's Address *re* Canada's Attitude (remarks) 947 (i).

—— Tenders, Proposals, Cor. *re* (Ans.) 6460 (iv).

Anglo-American Cable between P.E.I. and Mainland, Breaking of (remarks) 8440 (v).

Anglo-American Treaties, Cor. &c. (remarks) 9715 (v).

—— Further Information *re* (remarks) 7447 (iv), 8516 (v).

—— on Inquiry for Cor., 10120 (v).

—— Submitted to Can. Govt. (remarks) 6926 (iv).

—— Tel. from Mr. Bryce *re* (remarks) 6985 (iv).

Anglo-Japanese Treaty Cor, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 599 (i).

See 'Japanese.'

'Arctic' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4012 (ii).

Ash Wednesday Adjournment (M.) 4221, 4314 (iii).

Australian Mission of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2218 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Bate & Co., and W. C. Edwards & Co., Payments to (Ans.) 3234 (ii).

Battlefields of Canada (B. 111) prop. Res., 3579, 3901; 1° m., 3902 (ii); 2° m., 4376; in Com., 4393, 4408, 4497; 3° m., 4530, 4534, Agreed to (Y. 90; N. 11) 4535 (iii).

Battlefields Commission (lands) Amt. B. 219 1° m., 13495; in Com., 13501 (vii).

Beauharnois Canal Water Power, New Lease (remarks) 947 (i).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., and G.T. Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2820 (ii).

Binder Twine, Lead, &c., Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 4583 (iii).

Blue Books, Distribution to Members, &c. (remarks) 241 (i).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3471 (ii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5949

Bounties paid by Govt. since 1896 (remarks) 895 (i).

Bounties paid on Binder Twine, Lead, &c (Ans.) 4583 (iii).

Brier Island Fog Alarm, Contract *re* Installation (Ans.) 9474 (v).

Business of the House (M.) to take in Wednesdays, 5135 (iii), 9480 (v), 11232 (vi).

—— Public Bills, &c. (remarks) 2982 (ii)

See 'Govt. Business,' &c.

Cabinet Appointments, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 44 (i).

Campaign Funds, Charges and Investigation *re* (remarks) in debate on Address 65 (i).

Canada-Australian SS. Subvention, Discontinuance of (Ans.) 941 (i).

—— Yearly Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 1289 (i).

Canada and France SS. Communication, Provision *re* Treaty (Ans.) 12391 (vii.)

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6418 (iv).

Canada and U. S. Treaties, on Inquiry (Mr R. L. Borden) 7835 (iv).

See 'Anglo-American,' &c.

Canadians at Niagara, Indignity by Customs Officer of U. S. (remarks) 11122 (vi).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12849 (vii).

Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept. (remarks) 6060 (iii).

—— Conditions *re* Investigation of Marine Dept., 6143 (iii).

—— Cor. *re* Investigation of Marine Dept. Laid on Table, 6464 (iv).

See 'Civil Service,' &c., 'Marine and Fisheries.'

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Cattle Embargo by G. B., Cable *re* Removal (remarks) 13228 (vii).

'Champlain,' Str., Use in Quebec for Political Purposes (remarks) 9127, 9343, 9460 (v).

Chilvers, Messrs., Emplymt. of (Ans.) 8894, 9266 (v).

Chinese Immigration, Decision of N. S. Supreme Court *re* Evasion of Poll Tax (Ans.) 514 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on M. to resume adjn. debate, (remarks) 5246, 5251 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11562 (vi).

Civil Service Commission's Report, Investigation *re* Depts., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 6148 (iii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7535 (iv).

——— Marine, Deptl. Dismissals (announcement 6003 (iii).

——— Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to Adjn. House, 5887 (iii).

——— Report, (remarks) on Presentation, 5633 (iii).

——— Translation of (remarks) 11312 (vi).

Civil Service List (presented) 93 (i).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9200 (v).

Cold Storage, Papers on, Inquiry for, 3690 (ii).

See 'N.B. Cold Storage, &c.

Colonial Conference (remarks) in debate on Address 41 (i).

See 'Travelling,' &c.

Commercial Travellers Tax, Condition *re* Abolition of (Ans.) 5794 (iii).

Committees, Sel. Standing (M.) 6 (i).

——— (M.) to conc. in Rep., 90 (i).

——— Organization of (remarks) 505 (i).

——— (M.) to add Names, 1207 (i), 3315 (ii).

Companies Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5493 (iii).

Co-operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on Order for 2°, 583 (i); (M.) to transfer to Govt. Orders, 3654 (ii).

Copyright Act Amt. B. 28 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 2°, 940 (i).

Criminal Code Amendments, on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 9283 (v).

Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 2786 (ii).

Debates of the House, Average Price per Column (Ans.) 3479 (ii).

——— 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 7834 (iv).

——— (remarks) 12505 (vii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Debates of the House, 4th Rep. (translaters) on M. to ref. back to Com. (remarks) 8900, 9710, 9889, 10119, 10242 (v).

Debates, Official, French Edition, Delays in Printing (Ans.) 2978 (ii).

——— Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3491 (ii).

——— French Supt. of Printing (Ans.) 2978 (ii), 12411 (vii).

Dillon, Gerald P., Apptmt. to N.W.M. Police Force (Ans.) 6001 (iii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1137 (i).

——— Instruction *re* Laying on Table (remarks) 7810 (iv).

——— Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1623 (i).

——— Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1775 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. debate, 1845 (i).

——— Papers laid on Table, 1927 (i).

——— on Notice being called, 2794 (ii).

See 'Public Documents,' 'Timber,' &c.

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 5247 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8296 (v); in Com., 11807 (vi), 12922; on M. for 3°, 13231 (vii).

Dom. Election Bill, 1903, Preparation of (remarks) &c., 8393 (v).

Dom. Elections Act, and Govt. Measures, Proceeding with (remarks) 7721 (iv).

Dom. Guarantee Co.'s B. 127 (Mr. Pringle) on Senate Amts., 12773 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 11977 (vi).

Doukhobors, Prisoners at Fort William (remarks) 6848 (iv).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Violation of Laws (remarks) 7620 (iv).

Dredging Companies, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii).

——— O.Cs. *re* Renewals without Tenders (remarks) 6747 (iv).

Dredging in Quebec Harbours in 1907, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3240 (ii).

Drury, R. L., Apptmt. as Japanese Agent (remarks) 4769 (iii).

Dunsmuir, Lt. Gov. of B.C., Assent to Natal Act, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) 1738 (i).

——— Tel. of Sec. of State (read) 1859 (i).

See 'Immigration,' &c.

Easter Adjournment (M.) 6464 (iv).

Eclipse Manufacturing Co., Payments to (Ans.) 3239 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13276 (vii).

Elder-Dempster SS. Subsidy to S. Africa (Ans.) 2792 (ii).

Empire Day and Ascension Day, Adjnmt. (M.) 8894 (v).

Employees of Parlt. and Printing Bureau, Names, Salaries, Religions, &c. (remarks) 5206 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5485

Fisheries Act (trials) Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 5249 (iii).

Fisheries Negotiations, &c., between U. S. and Canada (remarks) 2023 (ii).

Fisheries Treaty Boundaries with U.S., Information *re* (remarks) 6632, 6740, 6844 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, Apptmt. to Hague Tribunal (remarks) 8295 (v).

Franco-Canadian Treaty (remarks) in debate on Address, 43 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty Bill (remarks) *re* 3°, 3754 (ii).

See 'Canada and France,' &c.

French Translation of Govt. Documents, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3181 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 4230 (iii).

Govt. Business, (announcement) 7834 (iv).

——— Introduction of Bills (remarks) 10258 (v).

——— Legislation (remarks) 10303, 10511, 11123, 11826 (vi).

——— Stmnt. *re* Legislation, 12049, 12163 (vii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays (M.) 6287 (iv).

Govt. Officials and Interference in Elections (remarks) 11903 (vi).

Govt. Ownership of Rys., &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 51 (i).

Grain Commission, Number of Members, &c. (Ans.) 3486 (ii).

Grain Commissioner's Report (Ans.) 180 (i).

——— on Inquiry for, 609 (i), 2381 (ii).

Grain Inspection, Total Expenditure and Receipts in 1906 (Ans.) 4586 (iii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 9465 (v).

G.T.P. Ry., Eastern Division, Recent Estimate of Cost (Ans.) 5259 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, Amt. to M. to ref. to Special Com., 7320 (iv).

——— Charges *re* Classification (remarks) 6844, 6925 (iv).

——— Statement from Mr. Parent (remarks) 6985, 7097 (iv).

——— (M.) to ref. to Com., 7213 (iv).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Ry., Location, Conference in Montreal, Par. in Toronto 'World' (remarks) 7809 (iv).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2224 (ii); in Com., 12071 (vii).

G.B. and U.S. Treaties, Papers laid on Table, 8694 (v).

See 'Anglo-American,' &c.

Guelph-Goderich Mail Service, Arrangements with C.P.R. (Ans.) 184 (i).

Halifax Garrison, Disbandment of (remarks) 1208 (i).

Halifax Platform, *re* Conservative Speeches (remarks) in debate on Address, 47 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3695 (ii), 4226 (iii).

Hansard, Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9131 (v).

Hillsborough Bridge Claims, on Inquiry for Ret., 3691 (ii).

Hindus, Immigrants and Contract Labour (remarks) 4407 (iii).

Hindus in B.C., Protests *re* Treatment (remarks) 5489 (iii).

Hodgins, Major, Retirement of (remarks) 366 (i).

See 'G.T.P.,' &c.

House of Commons Act Amt. B. 66 (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for 2°, 5226 (iii).

House of Commons, Allottment of Rooms in New Wing (remarks) 5729 (iii).

——— Employees, Apptmts. and Recommendations, &c. (Ans.) 3899 (ii).

——— Rules *re* Hours of Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wright) 588 (i).

House of Commons and Senate, Cost of outside of Indemnities (Ans.) 4760 (iii).

Hudson Bay Co., Lord Selkirk's Estate, Original Land Registers, &c. (Ans.) 4403 (iii).

Hyman, Hon. C. S., Date of Resignation, Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 166 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5657 (iii); in Com., 6432 (iv).

Immigration Act, B.C., known as Natal Act, Disallowance of (Ans.) 567 (i).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 7077 (iv).

——— on Notice of M. (Mr. Monk) 6289 iv).

——— Par. in 'Canadian Gazette' (remarks) 7454 (iv).

Immigrants, Fraudulent Circular issued, &c. (remarks) 607 (i).

Imperial Treaties, Status of Canada *re* Negotiations (Ans.) 1939 (i).

Indian Lands, Sale in Algoma, Tel. from Mr. Sifton (read) 13416 (vii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Indian Lands (remarks) 13532 (vii).
Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6479 (iv).
Insurance, Supt. of, Salary (prop. res.) 12162 (vii).
I.C.R., Claims for Damages by A. W. Belyea (Ans.) 9472 (v).
——— Freight Rate *re* Fredericton, on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Cor., 2562 (ii).
——— Moncton Shops, Contractor, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 1509 (i).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 7 (i).
International Boundary Line, Representation *re* Placing of Buildings (Ans.) 356 (i).
——— Correction of Answer, 519 (i).
Italy, Commercial Treaty with (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10596 (vi).
Japanese Immigration, Announcement of Mr. Lemieux's Mission (remarks) 1208 (i).
——— (remarks) 1424 (i).
Japanese Immigration into B.C. (remarks) on debate on Address, 58 (i).
——— Debate in Japanese Diet, *re* (remarks) 4738 (iii).
——— Information *re* (remarks) 947 (i).
——— Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2090 (ii).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration, O.Cs., Cor., Papers, &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Ret., 864 (i).
——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 1929 (i).
See 'Anglo-Japanese,' &c., 'Dunsmuir.'
Kun, Agnes Ballum, Release of, from Gaol (remarks) 9335 (v).
Labour Rep. (presented) 841 (i).
Library of Parlt., Com. (M.) 312 (i).
Literary Aid Fund, Establishment of, by Govt. (Ans.) 1287 (i).
Lovell, Mr. H., Decease of (remarks) 230 (i).
Lumber Duty, &c. (remarks) 10259 (v).
Mackenzie, Mr. Jas. H., Emplymt. in Inland Rev. Dept. at Toronto and Sub-Postal Stations (Ques.) 5798 (iii).
Mackenzie, Mr. Wm., Par. in 'Toronto Globe' *re* (remarks) 6986 (iv).
Major's Hill Park and G.T.R. Hotel (remarks) 1425 (i).
See 'G.T.R.,' &c.
Manitoba Boundaries (prop. res.) 12776 (vii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Consent of Legislature, &c. (remarks) 936 (i).
——— Bill *re* Extension (remarks) 1741 (i).
——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 2882 (ii), 7506 (iv), 11706 (vi).
Marier, J. E., Emplymt. on G.T.P. Commission (Ans.) 2162 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, &c., ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4006 (ii).
——— Dep. Minister, Resignation of (remarks) 7996 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Appointment of Ass't. Judge (remarks) 11312 (vi).
——— Delay in Investigation, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn. House, 8453 (v).
——— Delay *re*, on M. for Sup., 9731 (v).
——— Evidence transmitted day by day to House (remarks) 8293 (v).
——— Evidence, Distribution of (remarks) 10789 (vi).
——— Issue of Judge Cassels' Commission (remarks) 6466 (iv).
——— Postponement of by Judge Cassels (remarks) 8385 (v).
Marine Deptl. Officials, Suspension, &c. (remarks) 6003 (iii).
Members appointed to Offices, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 46 (i).
Midland Harbour Dredging, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3240 (ii).
Midland 'Times,' Truro, Amounts paid for Advertising (Ans.) 3235 (ii).
Montreal Directory in Library of House, (Ans.) 4764 (iii).
Montreal Examining Warehouse, on Inquiry for Ret., 3319 (ii).
Montreal and Quebec Ports, Expenditures *re* for the last fifty years (Ans.) 3482 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3441, (amt.) 3442, Agreed to (Y. 108; N. 53) 3464 (ii).
——— Claim of Govt. *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3465 (ii).
Morning Sittings (M.) 9477; on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 9495 (v).
Naturalization Act Amt. (B. 130) 1°*, 5256 (iii); in Com., 11990 (vi).
Naval Defences, Imperial; Contributions by Canada (Ans.) 1118 (i).
N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connections *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 9415 (v).
N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3049, 3075 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3675 (ii).
Newspaper Advertising, Amounts paid, &c. (remarks) 509 (i).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°*, pro forma, 3 (i).
Obstruction Tactics *re* Dom. Elections Bill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9225 (v).
Obstruction to Supply, on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10035 (v).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Office Specialty Co., and Eclipse Mfg. Co., Payments to (Ans.) 4244 (iii).

Old Age Pensions (M.) for Sel. Com., 2786 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2423 (ii).

Ontario, Northern Division of Prov. (remarks) 8294 (v).

Order Paper, French and English Editions (remarks) 6852 (iv).

——— Printing in French (remarks) 5407 (iii).

Pardoning Power *re* Criminals released since 1896, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2853 (ii).

Peace Interparliamentary Union, Meeting at Ottawa (remarks) 13581 (vii).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3971 (ii).

Petroleum Bounty Bill (prop. res.) 12162 (vii).

Pinette Harbour Dredging, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 9474 (v).

Postal Service, Complaints *re* Inadequacy, &c. (Ans.) 352 (i).

Postmasters, Rural, Salary Increases, &c. (Ans.) 183 (i).

Post Office, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 93 (i).

Presbyterian Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Fund B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2788 (ii).

P.E.I., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2742 (ii).

——— Mail Service, on M. (Mr. Martin) for Cor., &c., 1206 (i).

P.E.I. and Nova Scotia SS. Service, Re-Establishing of (Ans.) 8383 (v).

P.E.I., Queen's County, Complaints *re* Mail Service (Ans.) 355 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4650 (iii).

Printing and Lithographing outside of Canada, Amounts expended (Ans.) 1732, 1931 (i).

Printing, Supt. of, Apptmt. of a Frenchman (Ans.) 2978 (ii), 12411 (vii).

Printing of Parlt., Joint Com. (M.) 312 (i).

Private Bills Com., Extension of Time (M.) 891 (i).

Private Bills Fees, Discrepancy between Senate and House of Commons (remarks) 10123 (v).

Provincial Subsidies, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 61 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3075 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Public Accounts Com., Production of Original Documents (remarks) 1384 (i).

Public Accounts Rep. and Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (M.) to ref. to Public Accounts Committee, 311 (i).

Public Bills and Orders, Priority of Procedure (remarks) 2940 (ii).

Public Documents, Announcement *re* (remarks) 1426 (i).

——— Production in Committees, 1428 (i).

See 'Documents.'

Quebec Bridge, Change of Plans *re* Height (Ans.) 5203 (iii).

——— Change of Site, &c. (remarks) 7931

Quebec Bridge Co., Govt. Grants, Investigation *re*, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 2557 (ii).

——— Ref. to, in debate on Address, 544 (i).

Quebec Bridge Rep., Ques. of Order, 13103 (vii).

——— (remarks) 3901 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy, Apptmt. of Committee, 8440 (v).

Quebec Judges, Apptmt. of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 12190 (vii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Army and Navy Veterans (remarks) 7448 (iv).

——— Legal Holidays (Ans.) 7934 (iv).

——— Transportation of Volunteers remarks) 8378 (v).

Quebec Tercentenary, and Visit of Prince of Wales, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 5210 (iii).

Quebec Tercentenary: *See* 'Battlefields.'

Questions, Precedence of (Ans.) 350 (i).

Railway Act (water mains, &c.) Amt. B. 43 (Mr. Barr) on M. for 2°, 5225 (iii).

——— B. 85 (Mr. A. Lavergne) on M. for 2°, 5243 (iii).

——— (passenger tickets) Amt. B. 90 (Mr. J. D. Reid) on M. for 2°, 5245 (iii).

——— (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10644; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. for 3°, 11605 (vi).

——— (working hours) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. R. Smith)—(remarks) 10121 (v).

Ry. Subsidies (remarks) 12504 (vii).

——— on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12772 (vii).

Returns, Inquiry for 569, 1739 (i), 2024 (ii), 6010 (iii).

See 'Sessional.'

Rolla L. Crain, Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 3239 (ii).

Ross Rifle, Report from Public Accounts (remarks) 5914 (iii).

——— Target Practice, Suspension by N. W. M. Police (Ans.) 3818 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Rules of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to amend, 2986 (ii).

Russian Seizures of Canadian Vessels, Compensation *re* (Ans.) 2391 (ii).

St. Boniface Public Building, Contract Price, &c. (Ans.) 4246 (iii).

Ste. Hyacinthe, 84th Regiment, Amount of Pay unpaid, &c. (Ans.) 844 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Co. and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., 3012

St. Louis, H., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to (Ans.) 2977 (ii).

Saturday Sittings (M.) 11501 (vi).

School Statutes *re* Saskatchewan Prov., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6866 (iv).

Seed Grain Distribution, Extension *re* (remarks) 5408 (iii).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1567 (i).

Sessional Returns, Number presented, &c. (Ans.) 2592 (ii).

Shipping Cos., Pacific Coast, Amount of Subsidies (Ans.) 6920 (iv).

Souris Ry. Wharf, P.E.I., Contract for (Ans.) 2386 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants Bill, in Com. on Res., 3757 (ii).

S. A. School Teachers, Recognition by Govt. (Ans.) 2791 (ii).

South Huron Elections Expenses, Payment by Ret. Officer (Ans.) 11935 (vi).

Speech from Throne, Reply from Gov. Gen. (presented) 1584 (i).

Stanstead Election Papers, Disappearance of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 8846 (v).

Stanstead By-election Papers, Destruction of (remarks) 8087 (iv).

——— Ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elections (M.) 8887 (v).

Sub-Target Machines, on submitting Papers to Pub. Accts. Com. (remarks) 946 (i).

Suburban Mail Delivery, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3286 (ii).

Superannuation and Retirement Acts, Payments under (Ans.) 7989 (iv).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5816 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10594 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Privy Council (salaries, &c.) 611 (i).

N. W. M. Police (compensations) 8870; (pay of force) 8863; (pensions) 8870; (salaries, &c.) 8863 (v).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10364 (vi).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Telegraph and Telephone Bill, and Man. Boundaries (remarks) 3043 (ii).

Thanksgiving Day, Change from Thursday to Monday (remarks) 13085 (vii).

Timber Berths, Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Lake) for Ret. (amt.) 2856 (ii).

——— Returns, on Inquiry for, 1739 (i).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 921; Ques. of Order, 921 (i).

Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 5199 (iii).

Travelling Expenses of Ministers to Colonial Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3993 (ii).

Treaty Negotiations between Canada and U. S., &c. (remarks) 937 (i).

See 'Anglo-American.'

Trent Canal Extension, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Cor., 2992 (ii).

Truro, N.S., Tax Bill, &c. (Ans.) 3480 (ii).

Turgeon, Hon. A., Apptmt. to Senate (Ans.) 7936 (iv).

U. S. Training Ships passing through St. Lawrence Canals, Number, &c. (Ans.) 5789 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5338 (iii).

——— Inquiry as to Armaments, &c. (Ans.) 7502 (iv).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4582 (iii).

Wednesday Evening Sittings (M.) 9480 (v), 11232 (vi).

Winnipeg Bank Co.'s incorp. B. 19 (Mr. Henderson) in Com., 2788 (ii).

Wood and Pulp Industry, Preservation of (remarks) 7452 (iv).

Woollen Industry Relief, Legislation (remarks) 12772 (vii).

——— Memorandum from Mfg. Ass'n. read 13518-19 (vii).

——— Specific Duties (remarks) 6988 (iv).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9648 (v).

——— Finance Ret., on Inqiury for, 6464

——— Moral Reform, Letter of Rev. Dr. Shearer, on Inquiry for (Mr. Sproule) 10689 (vii).

——— (remarks) 10303 (vi).

Yukon Sunday Observance Law, Instructions to N. W. M. P. (remarks) 565 (i).

LAVERGNE, Mr. A., *Montmagny.*

Address, The, 476 (i).

Battlefields of Quebec B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 3902 (ii); in Com., 4410, 4499; on M. for 3° (amt.) 4533 (iii).

LAVERGNE, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Belgian Syndicate, Commission *re* Investigation (Ques.) 842 (i).

Bellechasse Islet Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 4830 (iii).

Cimon, Mr. Justice, Apptmt. to Quebec District (Ques.) 2978 (ii).

——— Jurisdiction of Justice Dept. *re* Residence (Ques.) 2545 (ii).

——— Payments *re* Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 2978 (ii).

——— Residence in District, &c. (Ques.) 2218 (ii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5900 (iii).

Criminal Code (libel) Amt. B. 161 (Mr. Beauparlant) on M. for 1°, 7319 (iv).

Customs Dues on French Books, Reduction *re* French Treaty (Ques.) 2160 (ii).

Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3487 (ii).

——— Delays in Printing (Ques.) 2978 (ii).

——— French Supt. of Printing, &c. (Ques.) 2978 (ii).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1827 (i).

French Language, Par. in 'La Presse,' Ques. of Priv., 8291 (v).

——— Pet. *re* (read) 8886 (v).

——— Ques. of Privilege *re* Par. in 'Le Soleil,' 1209 (i).

——— Use of on Railway Crossings, &c. (B. 85) 1° m., 2021 (ii).

Halifax Garrison, Replace by Imp. Troops (Ques.) 1288 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3716 (ii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6718 (iv).

——— on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1303 (i).

Immigration Premiums, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 1287 (i).

I.C.R., Notices printed in French, &c. (Ques.) 7936 (iv).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2137 (ii).

——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1603 (i).

Japanese Syndicate *re* Purchasing of Land in Alberta (Ques.) 2162 (ii).

Judges of Supreme Court, Quebec, Apptmnt. on Commissions (Ques.) 357 (i).

Justice, Administration of, in Quebec, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 842 (i).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R. M. C., on M. for Com. of Sup., 1023 (i).

LAVERGNE, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Marconi Station, Glace Bay, Interruption of Services, &c. (Ques.) 2161 (ii).

Marier, J. E., Emplymt. on G. T. P. Commission (Ques.) 2162 (ii).

Montmagny and Cap St. Ignace Wharfs, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1288 (i).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4070 (ii).

Order Paper, Printing in French (remarks) 5107 (iii).

Postage Stamps, Designs for Quebec Tercentenary, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 7934 (iv).

——— New Series, Issue of (Ques.) 6397 (iv).

Public Accounts Com., Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3095 (ii).

Quebec Superior Court, Apptmt. of Additional Judge (Ques.) 1288 (i).

Quebec Tercentenary, Legal Holidays (Ques.) 7934 (iv).

——— Par. in 'Le Canada,' Ques. of Priv., 4669 (iii).

——— Postage Stamps, Printing in French and English (Ques.) 7935 (iv).

——— Postage Stamps (remarks) 8895 (v).

——— Rep. of Commission (remarks) 7449 (iv).

——— Visit of Prince of Wales, Par. in Halifax 'Chronicle,' Ques. of Priv., 5209 (iii).

Ques. of Privilege, Par. in 'La Presse' *re* Vote on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 2022 (ii).

——— Voting of French Members (remarks) 7993 (iv).

Railway Act (dual language) Amt. (B. 85) 1° m., 2021 (ii); 2° m., 5242 (iii).

——— (scheduled time) Amt. (B. 106) 1° m., 3655 (ii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3914 (ii).

Revised Statutes, French Version, Date of Completion (Ques.) 357 (i).

R.M.C., Investigation *re* Conduct of Cadet Lancaster, on M. for Sup., 1026 (i).

Salvation Army Immigrants, Letter from Dr. Nadeau, Ques. of Priv., 7094 (iv).

School Acts, Saskatchewan, Disallowance of (Ques.) 6644 (iv).

——— Notice of Discussion, 6647 (iv).

——— (M.) to adjn., 6854 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants Bill, in Com. on Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3758 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4131 (ii).

Tercentenary at Quebec, Apptmt. of French Canadians as Commissioners, Ques. of Priv., 4770 (iii).

LAVERGNE, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Turgeon, Hon. A., Apptmt. to Senate (Ques.) 7935 (iv).

LAVERGNE, Mr. L., *Drummond & Arthabaska.*

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10494 (vi).

'La Gazette d'Arthabaska,' Postal Privileges *re* (Ques.) 6058 (iii).

P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines, Construction of, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3269 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Railways—I.C.R. (St. Cyrille diversion) 12756 (vii).

LAW, Mr. B. B., *Yarmouth.*

Presbyterian College Board (B. 154) 1*, 6525 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4758 (iii); (tidal service) 3215; (wrecks) 3189 (ii).

LEFURGEY, Mr. A. A., *Prince (P.E.I.)*

Adjournment of the House (M.) 4495 (iii).

Alberton Fire, Damage Claims, Inquiry for Ret., 1209 (i).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 13053, 13055 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187, on M. (Mr. Fielding) to place on Order Paper, 13494 (vii).

Cascumpec Harbour Buoys, Tenders for Placing, &c. (Ques.) 681 (i).

Chapel Point Ferry Wharf, Tenders re Construction, &c. (Ques.) 513 (i).

Charlottetown, Pipe Line to Tank, Contracts *re* (Ques.) 5655 (iii).

Clifton Wharf Repairs, Extension of Contract (Ques.) 4831 (iii).

Dom. Revenue from 1873 to 1907 (Ques.) 1733 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13276 (vii).

Estimates, Discussion on Resolutions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1726 (i).

Fisheries Jurisdiction between Dom. and Provs., Instructions to Agent (Ques.) 3429 (ii).

——— Conference *re* (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

Fish Island Lighthouse, Name of Present Keeper (Ques.) 6058 (iii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6261 (iv).

Grand River Wharf, Tenders, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 8382 (v).

LEFURGEY, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Higgin's Shore, P.E.I., Wharf, Pet. *re* Extension (Ques.) 694 (i).

Hillsborough Bridge Construction, Land Purchases, &c., Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 1686 (i).

——— Return, Inquiry for, 6160 (iii).

Howard's Cape Wharf, Pet. *re*, &c. (Ques.) 11702 (vi).

Ice-breaker for Northumberland Straits (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2944 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 10254 (v).

I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2444 (ii).

——— Motor Cars, Tests *re* Operation, &c. (Ques.) 565 (i).

Lennox Island Wharf, Contract *re* (Ques.) 8444 (v).

Lobster Fisheries, P.E.I., Pet. *re* Issue of Licenses (Ques.) 2388 (ii).

Lobster Fishing Fines, Names and Amounts (Ques.) 10256 (v).

Mail Service between Darnley and Kensington, P.E.I. (Ques.) 4828 (iii).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9502 (v).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2430 (ii).

Postal Arrangements between U. S. and Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3892 (ii).

P.E.I. Fisheries Protection Service, Annual Cost, &c. (Ques.) 359 (i).

P.E.I. Life-saving Stations, Establishment of (Ques.) 681 (i).

P.E.I. and Nova Scotia SS. Service, Re-establishment of (Ques.) 8383 (v).

P.E.I. Public Works, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1686 (i).

——— (M. for ret.) 2171 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 8696, 9893 (v).

——— (remarks) 11679 (vi).

P.E.I. Ry., Alma Station, Pet *re* Construction (Ques.) 6642 (iv).

——— Branch Lines, Cor., &c., *re* Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 3254 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13490 (vii).

P.E.I. Ry., Dundas and Avondale Extension, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 8383 (v).

——— Station Agents, Salaries, Pets., &c. (Ques.) 3236 (ii).

——— Tenders *re* News Agency (Ques.) 8444 (v).

P.E.I. Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4606 (iii).

——— Rep. *re*, Inquiry for, 9893 (v).

LEFURGEY, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Contract *re* Construction of Steamer (Ques.) 2546 (ii).
—— Discussion, &c , 4496 (iii).
—— Ice-breaker Str., Rep. *re* Plans, &c. (Ques.) 4583 (iii).
See 'Ice-breaker.'
P.E.I. Winter Service, Str. 'Stanley,' Route, &c. (Ques.) 172 (i).
—— Withdrawal of Steamer, &c. (remarks) 1208 (i).
Quahaug and Clam Fishing, Contemplated Changes (Ques.) 1940 (i).
Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3920 (ii); in Com., 4975 (iii).
Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9821 (v).
Returns, Detention of by Members, Ques. of Priv., 5048 (iii).
Seed Grain Purchases, Apptmt. of Agent in P.E.I. (remarks) 3690, 3752 (ii).
S. A. Volunteers Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3777 (ii); in Com., 13047 (vii).
'Stanley,' Str., Passenger Accommodation (Ques.) 687 (i).
Summerside Harbour and Str. 'Stanley' (remarks) 6160 (iii)
SUPPLY—
Marine (ice-breakers) 1899 (i).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2944, 2949 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, P. O.) 8576 (v); Ottawa (Mint) 1459 (i); Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Buctouche) 11679 (vi).
Tignish Breakwater Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 3229 (ii).
Tignish Harbour, Pet. *re* Extension (Ques.) 682 (i).
—— Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
Tobacco Infractions of Inland Revenue Act. in P.E.I., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 9526 (v).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R. (Postmaster General and Min. of Labour) Gaspe.

Alien Labour Regulations, Pet. *re* from Sault Ste Marie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12159 (vii).
Annapolis and Digby Mail Service, Amounts paid to (Ans.) 12653 (vii).
Arsenault, Mr. Auguste, Charges *re* Customs, Montreal (Ans.) 1347 (i).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 134) 2° m., 5763 (iii).
Australian Representative from Canada in 1901, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2168 (ii).
Bonanza Post Office Theft, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 1291 (i).
Bonn P. O., Application *re* Mail Service (Ans.) 10516 (vi).
Brass, Mr. Albert, Postmaster at Rusagornis, Charges *re* Political Activity (Ans.) 6642 (iv).
Brewster and Park Hill Mail Route, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 6404 (iv).
Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Connections (remarks) 1436 (i).
Canadian Newspapers, Refund *re* American Surtax (Ans.) 5203 (iii).
C.P.R., Papineauville Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).
Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12489 (vii).
Chambly Canton, Complaints *re* Postmaster (Ans.) 5654 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11403, 11636 (vi), 12179 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report (remarks) *re* Distribution to Press, 5723 (iii).
Conciliation Boards, Applications *re* Industrial Disputes Investigations, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3482 (ii).
Co-Operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) 2° m., 4547; in Com., 4564; 3°*, 4566 (iii).
Cotton Strikers, Disputes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Criminal Code (ry. mortgages) Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13317 (vii).
Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8897 (v).
Denis, Mr. Gaspard, Postmaster at St. Denis des Saintes, Charges *re* (Ans.) 9474 (v).
Desaulniers, Mr. Gonzalve, Emplymt. as Translator, &c. (Ans.) 1121 (i).
Digby to Westport, Mail Contractor, Name, &c. (Ans.) 7203 (iv).
Dom. Coal Co.'s Labour Dispute, Settlement Tel. (read) 4995 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11914 (vi), 13043 (vii).
Drop Letter One-cent Rate (remarks) 3159 (ii).
Egypte and St. Ephrem d'Upton Mail Contract, Renewal of (Ans.) 5257 (iii).
Farnell, Gordon, Contractor for Halifax Mails (Ans.) 7731 (iv).
French Translation of Govt. Documents, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3183 (ii).
Glencoe Post Office Building, Contract *re* (Ans.) 3846 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Govt. Steamers, Number purchased, &c. (Ans.) 10733 (vi).
Harlaka Ry. Connections (remarks) 1437 (i).
Hindoo Immigrants, and Contract Labour (remarks) 4407 (iii).
House of Commons Post Office, Delays in Mails (remarks) 11939; (stmnt.) 12044 (vi).
Hull Post Office, Total Revenue for 1906-8 (Ans.) 11704 (vi).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6444 (iv).
Immigration Agents in France (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9848 (v).
Japanese in B.C., Ques. of Priv. and Political Pamphlets, 12659 (vii).
Japanese Colony in the West, C.P.R. Application *re* (Ans.) 7197 (iv).
Japanese Immigration, Rep. of Mr. King laid on Table, 1550 (i).
——— Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2144 (ii).
——— Result of Mission (statement) 1585 (i).
Johnston, Mr. W. J., Extra Remuneration, Leave of Absence, &c. (Ans.) 5201 (iii).
Labour Gazette, Cost of Printing, &c. (Ans.) 6407 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Japanese Investigation) Rep. (presented) 1583 (i).
'Lady Evelyn,' Date and Place of Wintering, &c. (Ans.) 7937 (iv).
Langevin Block Basement, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 3483 (ii).
'La Gazette d'Arthabaska,' Postal Privileges to (Ans.) 6058 (iii).
Letter Carriers, Hours of Service, Pay, &c. (Ans.) 7728 (iv).
Literature distributed through Mail (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9096 (v).
Londonderry and Bass River Mail Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 2980 (ii).
Mackinnon Post Office, Application *re* Establishment (Ans.) 10517 (vi).
Mail from Canada to Europe, Quantity arrived, &c. (Ans.) 12653 (vii).
Mail Contract between Darnley and Kensington, P.E.I. (Ans.) 4828 (iii).
Mail Contract at Rimouski, Payments to Str. 'Rhoda' (Ans.) 5799 (iii), 8176 (iv).
Mail Matter, Fraudulent Weighing of, Inspection *re* (Ans.) 4827 (iii).
Mail Matter delayed by C.P.R. Accident (remarks) 9724 (v).
——— (remarks) 9281 (v).
Mail Matter mutilated in Transmission, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 2215 (ii).
Mail Service to Atlantic Steamers, Cost per Annum (Ans.) 5656 (iii).
Mail Service in B.C. (remarks) 3754 (ii).
LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Mail Steamer, Purchase of (Ans.) 4827 (iii).
Mail Service, Soulanges county, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 9278 (v).
Mail Service by Steamers, via Coteau Landing (Ans.) 9277 (v).
Mail Tenders at Rimouski, Complaints *re* 'Rhoda,' &c. (Ans.) 5799 (iii), 8176 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12830 (vii).
Mattawa Postmaster, Place of Residence (Ans.) 7209 (iv).
Montreal Postal Service, Irregularities, Delays, &c. (Ans.) 9275 (v).
Montreal P. O. Building Strike, Settlement of (remarks) 8608 (v).
Montreal Post Office Defalcations, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 7198 (iv).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3446 (ii).
N. B. Election, Patronage of Federal Govt., &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3046 (ii).
Newspaper Mail Regulations, Complaints *re* Delivery, &c. (Ans.) 11298 (vi).
——— Postal Arrangements *re* (Ans.) 6460 (iv).
Nicolet Post Office, Completion, Postmaster's Name, &c. (Ans.) 11499 (vi).
North Grove Post Office Ret., on Inquiry for, 5491 (iii).
Old Age Pensions Com., Progress *re* (remarks) 7722 (iv), 12660 (vii).
Opium Prohibition (B. 205) prop. Res., 12503; in Com. on Res., 12550; 2° m., 12851; on Senate Amts., 13523 (vii).
O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 11498 (vi).
Owen Sound Strike, Settlement of (remarks) 8606 (v).
Pakenham Mail Bags, Throwing off of Train (remarks) 1425 (i).
Port au Pique Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3232 (ii).
Port Medway and Medway Station Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 11300 (vi).
Postage Stamps, New Series issued *re* Quebec Tercentenary (Ans.) 6398 (iv).
——— Tenders *re* (Ans.) 7934 (iv).
——— Special Issue (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).
Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., Re-arrangements of (remarks) 3040 (ii).
——— (statement) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3159 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3886 (ii).
Postal Notes Business, Commissions, Expenditure *re* Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 9279 (v).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Postal Rates on Letters at Confederation (Ans.) 8175 (iv).

Postal Rates on Weekly Newspapers, Tel. *re* (Ans.) 3484 (ii).

—— Complaints *re* (Ans.) 5201 (iii).

Postal Revenue, One Cent Rate (Ans.) 8381 (v).

Postal Service, Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 7263 (iv).

Postal Service Improvements (Ans.) 8891 (v).

—— Ret., on Inquiry for, 4832 (iii).

Postmasters' Assessments, Amounts collected, &c. (Ans.) 6459 (iv).

Post Office Act (P. O. supt., &c.) Amt. (B. 162) 1° m., 7931 (iv); 2°*, and in Com., 10703 (vi); on Senate Amts., 12393 (vii).

Post Offices built since 1904, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 4761 (iii).

Post Office Irregularities in Western Canada (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8873 (v).

Post Office Returns, Number, &c. (Ans.) 6405 (iv).

Post Offices, Ret., on Inquiry for, 6288 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry. Mail Service, Delay in Distribution (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9094 (v).

Printing, Postal Service, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 5472 (iii).

Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).

Quebec Religious Feuds, Letter of Rev. Mr. Dumesnil to Papal Ablegate, signed 'P. M. G., Ques. of Priv., 11501 (vi).

Quebec Tercentenary, Postage Stamps, &c. (Ans.) 7935 (iv), 8895 (v), 12414 (vii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 5491 (iii).

Ricard, Mr., Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 11498 (vi).

Riviere du Loup Postmaster, Resignation and Salary (Ans.) 6399 (iv).

Round Bay, N.S., Removal of Post Office, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 11297 (vi).

Ryan, Mr. G. M., Apptmt. of a Successor (Ans.) 7504 (iv).

St. Francois Xavier Post Office, Apptmt. *re* Postmaster, Pet., &c. (Ans.) 5797 (iii).

St. Gabriel de Brandon Post Office Savings Bank, Recommendation *re* (Ans.) 4828 (iii).

St. Irenee des Bains, Apptmt. of Mr. Geo. Girard as Postmaster (Ans.) 5795 (iii).

St. Paschal and Kamouraska Mail Contracts, Tenders, Bondsmen, &c. (Ans.) 3236 (ii).

St. Peter's Bay Mail Contract with H. B. Finlay, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 1687 (i).

St. Peters Post Office, on Inquiry for Ret., 2787 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Sacred Heart Post Office, Establishment of Six Offices (Ans.) 5472 (iii).

Sandy Cove Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 8891 (v).

Scotch Hill East, Post Office, Establishment of (Ans.) 2793 (ii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7747 (iv).

Shortt, Prof., Amounts paid *re* Industrial Disputes, &c. (Ans.) 4766 (iii).

Southvale, N.S., Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal (Ans.) 4829 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10599 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Labour Dept. (salaries) 12159 (vii); Post Office (clerical assistance) 8872; (salaries) 8872 (v).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 9848 (v).

Labour Dept. ('Gazette') 12261 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13155; (cotton strikers) 13156 (vii); (Japanese riots, B.C.) 5783 (iii); (Oriental immigration) 13156 (vii); (Prince Fushimi's visit) 5783 (iii).

Post Office (contingencies) 5562; (Durston, R., promotion) 5561 (iii); (extra assistance) 9112; (inspectors) 9092 (v), 13155 (vii); (mail service) 5561 (iii); (North Bay inspectors) 13152 (vii); (outside service) 9092; (stamps, &c.) 9111; (uniforms, &c.) 9111 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brantford) 7459; (Hamilton, post office) 7697 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Levis) 7298; (Montreal, barracks) 7408; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 7427 (iv); (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5705 (iii); Montreal post office) 7411; (Montreal, station C) 7420; (Montreal station B) 7419; (Quebec drill hall) 7431; (St. Rochs) 7439 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12129 (vi).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10371 (vi).

Tenders, Advertisements *re*, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7477 (iv).

Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 2594 (ii).

Town Site, Erection of Public Buildings (Ans.) 1348 (i).

Trent Canal, Clearing of Logs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10310 (vi).

Valleyfield, P.E.I., Change of Mail Route (Ans.) 11297 (vi).

Woodstock, N.B., Postmaster L. C. Smith and Interference in Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2887 (ii).

—— Salary, &c. (Ans.) 2794 (ii).

Yukon Mail Service, Complaints *re*, 2022 (ii).

—— Service during Winter (remarks) 5137 (iii).

LENNOX, Mr. H., *Simcoe, S.*

Advertisements for Tenders of Govt. Works, &c., on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4708 (iii).

Alberta Closed Leases, Number granted, &c. (Ques.) 3037 (ii).

Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5379 (iii).

Battlefields of Canada (B. 111) in Com. on Res., 3901 (ii); in Com., 4507; on M. for 3°, 4530 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G. T. Ry., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2818

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7671 (iv).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6522 (iv).

Britton, Mr. Justice, Payment *re* Treadgold Commission (Ques.) 5474 (iii).

Campaign Literature sent from Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10346 (vi).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res.. 6164. 6215 (iii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12874 (vii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. Pardee) on Senate Amts., 5955 (iii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12348 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6875 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12882 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11361; on M. for 1°, 10729; in Com., 11394, 11553, 11659 (vi), 12183 (vii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9203 (v).

Criminal Code (ry. act.) Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13318 (vii).

Devil's Elbow, Canal Work (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals,, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1155 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1776 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11869 (vi), 13020 (vii).

Dominion Guarantee Co.'s B. 127 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 6231 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 9333 (v).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6750 (iv).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4678 (iii); in Com., 6912 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13263 (vii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4545, 4577 (iii).

Foreign Purchases, Customs Collection *re* (Ques.) 5475 (iii).

Fort William Terminals B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6180 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3615 (ii).

Fritz Cirkel, Mining Engineer, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 7202 (iv).

Gammell, Edith Maud Rosario Relief B. 129 (Mr. Galliher) on M. for 2°, 6190 (iii); in Com., 7141 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3622. 3794 (ii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5497 (iii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6270 (iv).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 7141, 7667, 8125 (iv), 8609, 8741, 9377 (v).

G.T.P., Classification of District 'B' and 'F,' Inspections *re* (Ques.) 12051 (vii).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12675 (vii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12271; (amt.) Minority Rep.. 12291. (Neg. (Y. 53; N. 98) 12388 (vii).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2233 (ii); in Com., 12062 (vii).

Grazing and Irrigation Lands, Reserved by Govt. (Ques.) 3479 (ii).

Grazing Lands Reservations, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3850 (ii).

Grazing Ranches, Names and Addresses of Lessees in Township 12 to 19 (Ques.) 7210 (iv).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3226, (M.) to ref. back to Com. on Rys., &c., 3228, in Com., 3692; on M. for 3°, 4540 (iii).

——— on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to ref. back to Com., 3362 (ii).

High Commissioner's Office, Increase of Salaries (Ques.) 10737 (vi).

Holliday, Mr. P., Payments of additional Living Allowance (Ques.) 5475 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10497 (vi).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6446 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt., O.C. *re* (Ques.) 7500 (iv).

——— Inquiry for, 8607, 8696, 9890 (vi.

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Immigration, O.C. *re* B.C. (remarks) 8171 (iv), 11018 (vi).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 7029 (iv).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6902 (iv).

I.C.R. Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4492 (iii).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction *re* B.C. Legislation, on M. for Sup., 1752 (i).

Japanese and Oriental Immigration, &c., on (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies of O.Cs., &c., 881 (i).

Judges' Salaries, Application *re* Payments (remarks) 11018 (vi).

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6519 (iv).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 10526; in Com., 10527 (vi).

Lockerby & McCombe, Amounts *re* Extra Harbour Dues (Ques.) 11935 (vi).

Lyall & Sons, Storage of Refuse on Harbour Property (Ques.) 11936 (vi).

McInnes, Hon. W. B., Employment in the Yukon, Total Amount paid to, &c. (Ques.) 5794 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12801 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Brodeur) to Com. of Sup., 7342 (iv).

Members and Senators appointed to Offices of Emolument, &c. (M. for ret.*) 556 (i).

Mining Regulations, published in 'Yukon World and Official Gazette' (M. for copy*) 5801 (iii).

Ministers of Crown and Govt. Contracts and Subsidies (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 9415 (v).

National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13501 (vii).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11997 (vi).

N.B. Cold Storage Co and Ministerial Connections *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9398; (amt.) 9415 (v).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Ref. to Mr. Blair's Letter *re* (Ques.) 2392 (ii).

Obstruction to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9935 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10020 (v).

Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re*, in Com. of Sup., 4108 (ii).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. Fisher) *re* Montreal Liquor Licenses, 4065 '(ii).

Pacific Coast Insurance B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6182 (iii), 6230 (iv).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Post Office Act (drop letter) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 7932 (iv).

Presbyterian College Board, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7669 (iv).

Quebec Bridge Rep., on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13403 (vii).

Quebec Harbour Improvements, Specification, &c., Stmnt. of Expenditure, &c. (M. for copies*) 5802 (iii).

Quebec and New Brunswick B. 128 (M.) Michaud) in Com., 6226 (iv).

Quebec Tercentenary, Rural Corps, Letter from Mr. G. W. Stoddart (read) in Com. of Sup., 10292 (v).

Railway Act (construction) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 3412 (ii).

———(demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean on M. for 2°, 3369 (ii).

——— (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3905 (ii); in Com., 4964 (iii).

——— (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 10625; in Com., 10639 (vi).

Ross Rifle Factory, Pet. *re* Establishment on Plains of Abraham (remarks) 3903 (ii).

——— Extension of Cove Field Lands, &c. (Ques.) 4404 (iii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7677 (iv).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4546, 4580 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2910 (ii).

Seed Grain Distribution, O.C. *re* Advances (remarks) 6634 (iv).

——— O.C. amending Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 6981 (iv).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5409, 5519; (amt.) 5445 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3767 (ii).

Supply B. 96 (seed grain) in Com., 2785 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals (repairs) 10306 (vi); Trent (construction) 12225 (vii); (surveys) 10339 (vi).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9257 (v).

Excise—(travelling expenses, &c.) 814 (i).

House of Commons (Library of Parlt.) 10504 (vi).

Immigration (agents) 9854 (v).

Justice (salaries) 5505 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (pensions) 13324 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol, 3996 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 10292 (v).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office (inspectors) 13154 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vancouver) 13339 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph) 13331; (Markham) 13331; (Walkerville) 13333 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal Barracks) 7409 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Richelieu) 12039 (vi).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (Deep Waterways Commission) 11103 (vi).
Railways (extra clerks) 10346; G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10380; (inspection) 10390 (vi).
Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12766 (vii).
Railways—I.C.R. (salaries) 10129 (v).
Railways—Miscellaneous (litigation) 10357 (vi).

Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance, &c.,) 10388 (vi); (Quebec Bridge) 12769 (vii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 1413, 1414 and 1415, Applications, Cor. *re* (M. for copies*) 2398 (ii).

——— Inquiry for, 4833 (iii).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5386 (iii).

Travelling Expenses of Ministers to Col. Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3996 (ii).

Trent Canal, Bradford, Building of (remarks) 13476 (vii).

——— Engineer's Rep., Inquiry for, 6925 (iv).

——— Newmarket, Extension to Devil's Elbow (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10306 (vi).

——— Holland River Extension (remarks) 11939 (vi).

——— Surveys, Inquiry for 6988 (iv).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) on Order for 2°, 779 (i); in Com., 4581 (iii).

Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 77 (Mr. Sloan) on Senate Amts., 6190 (iii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6187 (iii).

Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10275 (v).

Winding-Up Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6523 (iv).

Woodstock, N.B., Postmaster L. C. Smith, and Interference in Elections, on M. for Sup., 2889 (ii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10531 (vi).

Yukon, Judges Salaries (remarks) 11123 (vi).

——— Official Administrators, Charges against *re* Settlement of Estates, &c. (M. for copies*) 1690 (i).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Yukon Placer Claims, Renewals by Gold Commissioner, Fees, &c. (Ques.) 4245 (iii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 4588, 4589 (iii).

——— Public Administrators, Charges against, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2170 (ii).

LEONARD, Mr. J. E. E., *Laval.*

Bridge Subsidies to Rys. (amt.) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies Res., 13310 (vii).

Chambly Canton, Complaints *re* Postmaster (Ques.) 5653 (iii).

Chambly Common, Area, Rental &c. (Ques.) 5652 (iii).

Lobster Fishery Overseers in Lunenburg, &c., Names, &c. (Ques.) 2793 (ii).

Montreal Directory in Library of House (Ques.) 4764 (iii).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3442 (ii).

Rifles purchased by Govt. since 1896, Number, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 5654 (iii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Holidays for Officers (Ques.) 2791 (ii).

——— Officials interfering in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5538 (iii).

——— Votes of Officers in Municipal Affairs (Ques.) 2791 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4029 (ii).
Penitentiaries— (binder twine) 5522, 5530; St. Vincent de Paul (meat contracts) 5519; (officials) 5538 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Longueuil) 7305 (iv).

LEWIS, Mr. E. N., *Huron, W.*

Address, The, 242 (i).

Civil Service Commission Report, Distribution to Press (remarks) 5723 (iii).

Criminal Code Amendments, Placing on Govt. Orders (remarks) 9281 (v).

Criminal Code (offensive weapons) Amt. (B. 78) 1° m., 1668 (i).

——— (assaults) Amt. (B. 79) 1° m., 1670 (i).

——— (hunting) Amt. (B. 93) 1° m., 2590 (ii).

——— (motors) Amt. (B. 140) 1° m., 5993 (iii).

Immigration Act (concealed weapons) Amt. (B. 65) 1° m., 1284 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12789 (vii).

Pulp Wood, Export Duty on (prop. res.) 4774 (iii).

Railway Commission (Ass't. Chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3923

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1530 (i).

Wood and Pulp Industry, Preservation of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7449 (iv).

LOGAN, Mr. H. J., *Cumberland.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12480 (vii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4386 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3512 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for Copies, 1992 (i).

I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2460 (ii).

——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4460 (iii).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3066 (ii).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2417 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Pugwash wharf) 11280 (vi); Railways—I.C.R. (train service) 10165 (v).

LOGGIE, Mr. W. S., *Northumberland, N.B.*

Budget, The 6553 (iv).

Canada and France Ocean SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6169 (iii).

Canada Eastern Ry., Cattle killed, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) on M. for 2°, 13507 (vii).

Cigarettes, Sale and Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5253 (iii).

France and Canada SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6195 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7230 (iv).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M., *Pictou.*

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 4863 (iii).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6522 (iv).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12648; in Com., 13056 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5895 (iii).

Conciliation Boards, Application *re* Industrial Disputes Investigations Act, Number, &c. (Ques.) 3482 (ii).

Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1160 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13012 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3626 (ii).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6256 (iv).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 9467 (v).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12723 (vii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12340 (vii).

——— counsel fees, payment of (M.) 13578 (vii).

I.C.R., Employees and Municipal Elections, on M. (Mr. Sproule) to Com. of Sup., 2895 (ii).

——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4479 (iii).

MacIlreith, Mr., Legal Agent for Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11222 (vi).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12827 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel, for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7381 (iv).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9489 (v).

Phoenix Assurance Co.'s (B. 167) 1°*, 8603 (v).

P.E.I. Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2745 (ii).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4647 (iii).

Railway Act (liability) Amt. (B. 27) 1° m., 430 (i); on Order for 2°, 5211; in Com., 5246 (iii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7745 (iv).

S.A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3783 (ii); in Com., 12602 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4138 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (icebreakers) 2966 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston military buildings) 10909 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Caribou Island) 11225; (Round Hill) 11286 (vi).

Railways — I. C. R. (Campbellton) 12258; (double tracking) 12250; (Moncton, additional line) 12760; (Moncton, car shops) 12250 (vii); (rolling stock) 5558 (iii).

Railways—Railway Commission (Quebec Bridge) 12770 (vii).

Sutherland Rifle Sight Co., Patent Relief (B. 63) 1°*, 1283 (i).

MACDONALD, E. M.—*Con.*

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2712 (ii).

Timber Sales to Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 8778 (v).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C., *Toronto, S.*

Canada-Australian SS. Subvention, Continuance of (Ques.) 941 (i).

Canadian Naval Stations, Maintenance of, Arrangement with G. B. (Ques.) 1117 (i).

Canadians entering U.S., Deportation of Macedonians, &c. (remarks) 2738 (ii).

——— Letter form Messrs. Allen, Cassels & Defries (read) 2739 (ii).

Copyright Act Amt. (B. 28) 1° m., 508; 2° m., 939 (i).

Cosgrave, Mr. J. J., Total Cost of Investigation (Ques.) 5797 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. (B. 29) 1° m., 508 (i); 2° m., 5247 (iii).

Dom. Notes Outstanding, Total Amount 1907, &c. (Ques.) 691 (i).

Dredging Contract, Basis of Payments, &c. (Ques.) 9710 (v).

Drop Letter, One-cent Rate (remarks) 3158 (ii).

Electrical Power exported at Niagara Falls, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).

Fisheries Protection, Amounts expended since 1885, &c. (Ques.) 1118 (i).

Foss, C. O., Apptmt. on G.T.P. Engineering Staff, &c. (Ques.) 358 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3500 (ii).

Garrison Commons, Toronto, Date of Sale, &c. (Ques.) 353 (i).

Govt. Steamers, Number purchased, &c. (Ques.) 10731 (vi).

G.T.P., Apptmt. of Engineer at Kenora (Ques.) 895 (i).

——— Changes in Engineering Staff (Ques.) 509, 681 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).

——— Resignation of Major Hodgins, Appointment of Successor (Ques.) 358 (i).

G.T. Ry., Entrance into Toronto, O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 556 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3194, 3700 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4358 (iii).

Hydrographic Surveys, Amounts expended, &c. (Ques.) 1128 (i).

Immigrants, Bulgarians, Stranded in Toronto, Tel. (read) &c. 185 (i).

——— (remarks) *re* Questions, 242 (i).

Immigration Act, B.C., known as Natal Act, Disallowance of (Ques.) 567 (i).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Insurance Bill, Introduction of (Ques.) 9272 (v).

Insurance Commission, Exhibits of Commercial Travellers' Mutual Benefit Society, Originals, asked for, 7988 (iv).

Insurance Companies' Deposits, -Total Amount, Securities, &c. (Ques.) 241 (i).

Japanese Trade with Canada, Total Amount for 1905-6-7 (Ques.) 897 (i).

Letter Carriers, Hours of Service, Pay, &c. (Ques.) 7728 (iv).

Mackenzie, Mr. Jas. H., Emplymt. in Toronto Inland Revenue Dept. (Ques.) 5797 (iii).

Militia—Board of Officers, Rep. *re* Pay and Allowance, &c. (Ques.) 2165 (ii).

Militia Permanent Corps, Commission *re* Pay, &c. (Ques.) 1292 (i).

Naval Defence, Imperial, Contributions by Canada, &c. (Ques.) 1118 (i).

Naval Instructions, Drilling of Canadian Seamen, &c. (Ques.) 1119 (i).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4996 (iii).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and the U.S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3166 (ii).

Printing and Lithographing, Expenditure by Govt. outside of Canada (Ques.) 1506, 1732, 1931 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 2397 (ii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8851 (v).

Railway Commission (Ass't Chief) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3928 (ii); in Com., 4985 (iii).

Railway Commission, Total Expenditure in Counsel Fees, &c. (Ques.) 10256 (v).

Returns, Inquiry for, 569 (i), 2885 (ii).

Smith, Wm. R., Patent Relief (B. 198) 1°*, 12393 (vii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3820 (ii).

Standard Accident and Guarantee Co.'s incorp. (B. 132) 1°*, 5337 (iii).

Standard Plate Glass Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 41) 1°*, 754 (i); in Com., 6183 (iii).

Sugar Manufacture, Regulation *re* Saccharine Standards (Ques.) 351 (i).

SUPPLY—

Militia (annual drill) 5745 (iii).

Temperance Colonization Society, Land Grants to, Term of Settlement, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4774 (iii).

Toronto Barracks, Approval of Plans by Militia Dept. (Ques.) 7203 (iv).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Toronto Harbour Life Saving Station, Establishment of (Ques.) 4586 (iii).

Toronto Harbour, Murray & Cleveland's Contract *re*, Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).

Toronto Harbour (eastern gap) Amount of Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 354 (i).

——— Date of Murray & Cleveland's Contract, Total Cost, Changes, &c. (Ques.) 1507 (i).

Toronto Harbour (western gap) Construction of Entrance, &c. (Ques.) 354, 518 (i), 4587 (iii).

——— Delay in Contract (remarks) 5915 (iii).

Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 2594 (ii).

Winding-Up Act Amt. (B. 95) 1° m., 2974 (ii).

Woollen Industry, Number of Employees, Value of Output, &c. (Ques.) 7504 (iv).

Yukon Gold Co., Holdings by Guggenheims, &c. (Ques.) 7725 (iv).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8486 (v).

MACLAREN, Mr. A. F., *Perth, N.*

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11255 (vi).

Goderich Military Camp, Holding of (remarks) 9779 (v).

Guelph-Goderich Mail Service, Arrangements with C.P.R. (Ques.) 184 (i).

International Tunnel, Windsor, Customs Duty *re* Construction Material, &c. (Ques.) 3840 (ii).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11248 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11080 (vi).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K., *Lunenburg.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12870, 13052 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report (remarks) 5648 (iii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1718 (i).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3021; in Com., 3035 (ii).

N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connection *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9363 (v).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3113 (ii).

——— Ques. of Order, 3083 (ii).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*

Quebec Bridge Commission, Rep., Evidence, &c. (M.) to ref. to Special Committee, 10401 (vi).

——— Rep. of Sel. Com. (M.) to conc., 13353; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 13373 (vii).

Rules of the House, Amendments to (prop. Res.) 2984 (ii).

Shipping Act Amt. (B. 12) 1° m., 313 (i).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7754 (iv).

Supplies purchased by Govt., &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5834 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Bridgewater) 7136 (iv); Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (dredging) 13341 (vii); (Tancook island) 11230 (vi).

MACLEAN, Mr. M. Y., *Huron S.*

Budget Speech by Fin. Min., Distribution, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10351 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11871 (vi).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F., *York (O.) S.*

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10935, 10941 (vi).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 3902 (ii); in Com., 4504; on M. for 3°, 4532 (iii).

Belleville and Hastings Ry., Cor. with G.T. Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2808 (ii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry. Connections (remarks) 433 (i).

Buildings, Administrative, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).

Business of the House, Precedence on Tuesday (remarks) 2982 (ii).

——— Public Bills, &c. (remarks) *re* Procedure, 2786 (ii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12845; in Com., 12849 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10718, 10729; in Com., 11635 (vi).

Companies Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5493 (iii).

Criminal Code (trade restraint) Amt. B. 96 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 1°, 2976 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11126; in Com., 11170 (vi).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1692 (i).

Foresters' Subsidiary High Court B. 62 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 5175 (iii).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. *re* (remarks) 12836 (vii).
G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6658 (iv).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3726 (ii).
——— on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to ref. to Com., 3362 (ii).
Hindus in B.C., Protest *re* Treatment (remarks) 5490 (iii).
House of Commons Chamber, Ventilation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10979 (vi).
I.C.R., Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4484 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12787 (vii).
Marconi System, Regulation of Rates, &c. (Ques.) 174 (i).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3031 (ii).
Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C.P. Ry., Extension, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7657 (iv).
Public Bills and Orders, Precedence of (remarks) 2939, 3405 (ii).
Ry. Act (demurrage, &c.) Amt. (B. 6) 1° m., 93; on Order for 2° (remarks) 938 (i); 2° m., 3320 (ii).
——— (tel. cos.) Amt. (B. 11) 1° m., 231 (i).
Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3904 (ii).
Ry. Act (ry. comn.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3°, 10783; (amt.) 11602; on M. for 3°, 11613; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11619; on Amt. (Mr. Macdonell) 11633 (vi).
Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2903 (ii).
Seed Grain purchased, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ques.) 8185 (iv).
Standard Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 71) 1°*, 1424 (i).
Suburban Mail Delivery, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3282 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Immigration (agents, &c.) 9851 (v).
Militia (annual drill) 10291 (v).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2965 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (rents, &c.) 10981 (vi); Ont. (Guelph, armoury) 7678 (iv).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., 907 (i).
Toronto and Schomberg Ry. Blockade (remarks) 3901 (ii).
Toronto Ordnance Lands Sale B. 218 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 13417

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Water Carriage of Goods Bill (remarks) 13415 (vii).

MACPHERSON, Mr. R. G., *Vancouver City.*
All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12472 (vii).
Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5380 (iii).
Boundary Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9741 (v).
British Columbia Chartered Bank incorp. (B. 59) 1°*, 1283 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10745 (vi).
Chinese Immigration, Decision of N. S. Supreme Court *re* Evasion of Poll Tax (Ques.) 513 (i).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5132 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11384 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13032 (vii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4578 (iii).
Fort William Terminal Ry. and Bridge Co.'s (B. 101) 1°*, 3477 (ii); in Com., 6180 (iii), 6223 (iv).
G.T.P., Supplies to Prince Rupert via Seattle (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10376 (vi).
Hindus, Deportation from B.C., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (remarks) 5337 (iii).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6435 (iv).
Indian Dept., Extravagent Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11031, 11062 (vi).
Indian Lands, B.C. Provincial Rights, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 627 (i).
Japanese entering B.C., Passports, &c. (Ques.) 4243 (iii).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration into B.C., Restriction of, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 719 (i).
——— Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2087 (ii).
——— on Stmnt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1605 (i).
Japanese Immigration Restriction and B.C. Legislation, on M. for Sup., 1760 (i).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3018 (ii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6894, 7231; on M. for 3°, 7219 (iv).
Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 40) 1°*, 754 (i); in Com., 6182 (iii), 6227 (iv).
Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4983 (iii).

MACPHERSON, Mr. R. G.—*Con.*

Ross Rifle, Defects, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 9086 (v).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 627 (i); Interior (astronomical surveys) 9741 (v).

Ocean and River Service (wrecks) 3187 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cumberland) 10865; (Quesnel) 10868; (Vancouver) 10868; (Vernon) 10871 (vi); N.S. (Antigonish) 7121 (iv).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10703 (vi).

Vancouver Bank incorp. (B. 32) 1°*, 606 (i); in Com., 4580 (iii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 125) 1°*, 5255; in Com., 6183 (iii).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9662 (v).

McCARTHY, Mr. L. G., *Simcoe, N.*

Canada Shipping Act (mariñe engineers) Amt. (B. 17) 2° m., 3414 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11360; in Com., 11382 (vi).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1143 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12986 (vii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10762 (vi).

Gammell, Edith Maud Rosario Relief B. 139 (Mr. Galliher) on M. for 2°, 6190 (iii).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to Messrs. Birnie and Noble (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 987 (i).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12405 (vii).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3017 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Co., and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., &c., 3012 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 17) 1° m., 349 (i).

SUPPLY—

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2947, 2949 (ii).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10379 (vi).

Supreme Court Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5497 (iii).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S., *Calgary.*

Buffalo imported from Montana for Game Preserve, Alberta, Payments *re* (Ques.) 847 (i).

Buffalo Herds for Parks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

Buildings in Man. and N.W., Amounts paid by Govt., &c. (M. for ret.*) 698 (i).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*

Calgary Town Sites (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9775 (v).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10546 (vi).

'Coquitlam,' Str., Seizure of, Compensation *re* (Ques.) 2389 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11133; in Com., 11159, 11177, 11426, 11524, 11957; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 11975 (vi).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13280 (vii).

Game Preserve, Alberta, Buffalo imported from Montana, Payments *re* (Ques.) 847 (i).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6326 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6443 (iv).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 955 (i).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4671 (iii).

Irrigation in West, Investigations *re* Measurements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9989 (v).

Japanese Immigration, &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for O.Cs., &c., 881 (i).

Japanese and Oriental Immigrants in B.C., Number, &c. (Ques.) 692 (i).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr Oliver) in Com., 10527 (vi).

Life-Boats in B.C., Purchase of, from U. S. (Ques.) 683 (i).

McDougall, Rev. John, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 688 (i).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4981 (iii).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4666 (iii).

Russian Seizures of Canadian Vessels, Compensation *re* (Ques.) 683 (i), 2391 (ii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1376 (i).

S. A. Veterans, Land Grants to, &c. (Ques.) 563 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12605 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Dom. Lands (forest reserves) 10049; (surveys) 9989 (v).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 9967; (Doukhobors) 9956 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12750 (vii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5756 (iii)

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10979 (vi).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*

Timber Berths in Man. and N. W. Ters., under Licenses, Applicants' Names, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 852 (i).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2347 (ii).

Wireless Tel. Station on Pacific Coast, Erection of (Ques.) 683 (i).

McCOLL, Mr. J. B., *Northumberland, W. (O.)*

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5950 (iii).

Budget, The, 6073 (iii).

Campbellford, Lake Ontario & Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 14) 1°*, 350 (i).

Quebec Tercentenary Postage Stamps, Issue of Denominations (Ques.) 12414 (vii).

McCOOL, Mr. C. A., *Nipissing.*

Copper Cliff Postmaster and Elections (remarks) in Com. on B. 115, 11916 (vi).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber, on M. for Sup., 7805 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11914 (vi), 12973 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3626 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, Plans, Reports, &c. (M.) for Copies, 1941 (i).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5438 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 7811 (iv); Ottawa (Museum) 1503 (i).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E., *Saskatchewan.*

Boards of Trade Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11988 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11463, 11948 (vi).

Doukhobors, Manner of Living (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6323 (iv).

Keewatin Diocese incorp. (B. 179) 1°*, 9889 (v).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C. P. Ry., Extension of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7658 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 153) 1°*, 6525; in Com., 7675, 7722 (iv), 8560, 8610, 9068, 9166 (v).

Seed Grain for Settlers in N. W., Extension of Time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2924 (ii).

—— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1363 (i).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Immigration (general expenses) 5752 (iii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 652, &c., Applications, &c., &c., (M. for copies*) 4589 (iii).

—— Nos. 645, &c., Original Tenders, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).

McINTYRE, Mr. G. H., *Perth, S.*

Address, The, 455 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5130 (iii).

Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5482 (iii).

Hogs slaughtered, Compensations paid, &c. (remarks) 13094 (vii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6842, 6928 (iv).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1024 (i).

Patent Medicine B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 12623 (vii).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4970 (iii).

Rules of the House, Amendments to, on prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2986 (ii).

Senate Reform (prop. res.) 1513 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12607 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1458 (i).

Wheat Transportation in N. W., Financial Aid by Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2211 (ii).

McINTYRE, Mr. W., *Strathcona.*

Address, The, 445 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 81) 1°*, 1732 (i); in Com., 4231 (iii).

C. P. Ry. Co.'s (B. 45) 1°*, 891 (i).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2585 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11171, 11420, 11502 (vi).

Dom. Land Grants to Rys. prior to 1896, Total Acreage (Ques.) 8182 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4577 (iii).

Hudson Bay Ry., Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6390 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6436 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6735, 6956 (iv).

Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11034 (vi).

Inspection and Sale Act (oats) Amt. (B. 114) 1° m., 4312 (iii).

McINTYRE, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Postal Services, Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 7262 (iv).

Ruthenian Catholic Mission, &c., incorp. (B.69) 1°*, 1424 (i).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 70) 1°*, 1424 (i); in Com., 4231, 4546, 4579 (iii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1358 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants Bill, in Com. on Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3760 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5528 (iii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2327 (ii).

McKENZIE, Mr. P. H., *Bruce, S.*

Agriculture Com.'s Rep. (M.) to conc., 12409 (vii).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry. Service (remarks) 191 (i).

Budget, The, 6573 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12883 (vii).

G.T. Ry. and C.P.R., Connection at Wingham (remarks) 191 (i).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A., *Queens, P.E.I.*

Address, The, 420 (i).

'Arctic,' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4168 (ii).

Bear River Station Dwelling, Tenders, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 2161 (ii).

Brier Island Fog Alarm, Installation of, Contract *re* (Ques.) 9473 (v).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6204 (iii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12648 (vii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12842 (vii).

Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7246 (iv).

Charlottetown Ry. Station, Contract Price *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 517 (i).

——— (M. for copies*) 3241 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11984 (vi).

Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Operation at Canso, &c. (Ques.) 5651 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5777 (iii).

Draper, Mr., and Mr. Pepper, Candidates for Municipal Offices (Ques.) 687 (i).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 8503 (v).

Fishing Licenses, River John, Inquiry for Ret., 10511 (vi).

Forchu Fish Hatchery, Duties of Supervisor, &c. (Ques.) 3427 (ii).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6252 (iv).

Gunnip, Mr. James, Pet. *re* Claims for Injuries (Ques.) 3844 (ii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10490 (vi).

——— Post Office, Delays in Mails (remarks) 11939 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act, Violations, Inquiry for Ret., 4964 (iii).

I.C. Ry. Rates, Increase in Winter to P. E. I. (Ques.) 5995 (iii).

Legal Agents for Govt. in P. E. I., Names, &c. (Ques.) 4764 (iii).

Lobster Fisheries, Pet. from Fishermen's Union of N. S. *re* Regulations (Ques.) 6644 (iv).

Lobster Fishing in Lunenburg, &c., N.S., Reps. *re* Undersized Fish (Ques.) 2792 (ii).

Lobster Hatchery, License to E. H. McLennan and G. A. Redmond, Pets., Cor. &c. (M. for ret.*) 2983 (ii).

Louisburg, Harbour, N.S., Amount of Harbour Dues, 1906, &c. (Ques.) 7503 (iv).

——— Harbour Master, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 3428 (ii).

——— Marine Hospital, Condition of, &c. (Ques.) 4401 (iii).

McLeod, Alex., Dismissal from Valleyfield, P.E.I., Post Office (M. for cor.*) 5087 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12813 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4002 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7333 (iv).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6892 (iv).

Mess Pork, Quantity imported from U. S., &c. (Ques.) 5650 (iii).

'Montague,' Dredge, Amounts paid for Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 182 (i).

Naval Schools, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).

Obstruction Tactics (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9221 (v).

Pinette Harbour Dredging, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 9474 (v).

Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Completion of, &c. (Ques.) 3898 (ii).

Port Hood Fishery Officer, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 10254 (v).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Port Hood Harbour Works, Closing of Northern Entrance (Ques.) 10255 (v).

P.E.I., Lighthouse Supplies, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 358 (i).

——— Souris Breakwater, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 1685 (i).

——— Subsidy, Deduction *re* Hillsborough Bridge (Ques.) 5079 (iii).

——— Terms of Union with Dom., Nonfulfilment of, &c., Memorials, &c. (M. for copies*) 5801 (iii).

——— Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4620 (iii).

P.E.I. Ry., Bear River Station Master's Dwelling, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1737 (i).

——— Branch Lines, Construction re, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3261 (ii).

——— Construction of Freight Sheds, &c., Specifiations, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 5086 (iii).

——— Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 12631 (vii).

——— Mail Service, Delay in Distribution (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9092 (v).

——— Stanley Bridge Branch, Surveys, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 850 (i).

——— (Ques.) 4829 (iii).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10715 (vi).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3907 (ii).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9806 (v).

Scotch Hill East Post Office, Establishment of, &c. (Ques.) 2793 (ii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, &c., on M. for Sup., 7732 (iv).

Souris Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 1939 (i).

Souris Ry. Wharf, Contract *re* (Ques.) 2386 (ii).

——— Permission to Build, &c. (Ques.) 7728 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3767, 3825 (ii); in Com., 12611 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9770 (v).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9221, 9237 (v).

House of Commons (accommodation) 10490 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (wireless stations) 5045 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5768 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2947, 2949; (obstructions) 3212; (winter mail service) 3216; (wrecks) 3195 (ii).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office (inspectors) 9092 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Experimental Farms (repairs, &c.) 10905 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Elmwood) 13335 (vii); (Winnipeg, warehouse) 8572 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston, militia clothes) 10908 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John) 12027 (vi).

Public Works—Marine (ship channel) 5038 (iii).

Railways—I.C.R. (claims dept.) 10177 (v)

P.E.I. (Haney, M. J., claims) 12763 (vii)

Tobacco, Customs Seizure at Charlottetown, Penalties *re*, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2982 (ii).

Tobacco Infractions of Inland Rev. Act in P.E.I., on M. for Sup., 9514 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9237 (v).

Tobacco Manufacturers in Mar. Provs., Amounts of Fines and Penalties, &c. (Ques.) 363 (i).

Tracadie Harbour Breakwater, Pet. *re* Construction (Ques.) 5472 (iii).

Trap Bag Nets in Pokemouche River, &c. (Ques.) 9476 (v).

Travelling Expenses of R. A. Wiallard *re* Colonial Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3987 (ii).

Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I., Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 5471 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6136 (iii).

Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c. (M.) 10259 (v).

——— Penalties, &c. (Ques.) 5996 (iii).

McLEAN, Mr. P. D., *Centre York.*

Hogg, Mr. W. D., Payments to since 1896, &c. (Ques.) 2981 (ii).

McLENNAN, Mr. A., *Inverness.*

Ancoin *vs.* The King, Cor. *re* Suit in Supreme Court, N.S. (M. for cor.*) 558 (i).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2589 (ii).

Dog Fish Reduction Works at Canso, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 5790 (iii).

Inverness County and Increased Ry. Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12233 (vii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7744 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9546 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Inverness) 7173 (iv); (Lake Ainslie) 11228; (Margaree) 11229; (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hood) 11268 (vi).

McLENNAN, Mr. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton, additional line) 12761; (stations) 12233 (vii).

MARCIL, Mr. C., *Bonaventure.*

Interprovincial Ry. Bridge Co. of N. B. (B. 76) 1°*, 1584 (i).

MAJOR, Mr. C. B., *Labelle.*

C.P.R., Papineauville to Little Nation River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).

MARSHALL, Mr. D., *Elgin, E.*

Aylmer, Customs Collector, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 1506 (i).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6206 (iii).

Canned Pease imported from France, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 3847 (ii).

Cold Storage, Assistance *re* East Elgin Establishment (Ques.) 351 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1242 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3604 (ii).

Fraser, A. W., Emplymt. as Counsel *re* Sussex St. Property Purchase (Ques.) 3478 (ii).

Fruit Inspection, Complaints *re* Apple Packing, &c. (remarks) 2766 (ii).

Fruit and Vegetable Inspectors, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 516 (i).

Govt. Securities *re* Dom. Notes, &c. (Ques.) 6235 (iv).

Immigration Agents in East Elgin, Number employed (Ques.) 692 (i).

Meat and Canned Foods B. 149, in Com., 7227; on M. for 3°, 7215 (iv).

Port Bruce Harbour, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2389 (ii).

Port Burwell Harbour, Contracts, Payments, &c. (M. for ret.*) 556 (i).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3924 (ii).

Salmon Fishing Licenses in Gardner's Inlet, &c. (Ques.) 5652 (iii).

Salvation Army Immigrants, Stmnt. of Genl. Booth (Ques.) 2390 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Meats and Canned Foods Act) 12893 (vii).

Militia (annual drill) 5750 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10894 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7493; (Leamington) 7815; (St. Mary's) 7828; (Owen Sound) 7824 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (improvements, &c.) 5708 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii).

MARTIN, Mr. A., *Queens, P.E.I.*

Anglo-American Cable between P.E.I. and Mainland, Breaking of, &c. (remarks) 8439 (v).

Belle River Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 685 (i).

Budget, The, 6113 (iii).

Charlottetown Board of Trade, Pets. *re* Sailing Vessels (M. for copy*) 6240 (iv).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5099 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10723; in Com., 11559 (vi).

Coal Deposits in P.E.I., Boring for, &c. (Ques.) 515 (i).

Coal Shipments from N.S. and Cape Breton, Res. of Board of Trade, P.E.I. (Ques.) 5470 (iii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13273 (vii).

Express Charges in Mar. Provinces, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 518 (i).

Fisheries Dispute between Dom. and Mar. Provs., Jurisdiction *re* (Ques.) 2395 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10563 (vi).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6250 (v).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolishing of to Agents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1342 (i).

I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2450 (ii).

——— Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10157 (v).

Little Sands Wharf, Repairs, &c., Cor. *re* (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).

Lobster Fishing and Packing Licenses, Granting in P.E.I. (M. for cor.) 5475 (iii).

Lobster Licenses in Savage Harbour, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 4404 (iii).

McDonald, Archibald, Dismissal from Whim Road P. O. (M. for cor.*) 5087 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12798 (vii).

Murray Harbour Branch Ry. Improved Service, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 6239 (iv).

——— Inquiry for, 10123 (v).

Peat for Fuel, Deposits in Canada, Industry, &c. (Ques.) 515 (i).

Pinette Harbour, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Dredging (Ques.) 685 (i).

Pisquid Post Office, Removal of, Cor., Tels., Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 4588 (iii).

Port Vernon Bridge, P.E.I., Completion of Work, &c. (Ques.) 4404 (iii).

MARTIN, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Postal Arrangements between U. S. and Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3895 (ii).

P.E.I. Fishing Bounties, Stmnt. of Payments (M. for ret.*) 1295 (i).

P.E.I., Post Offices in Queens County, Complaints *re* Mail Service (Ques.) 355 (i).

——— Steam Communication between P.E.I. and C. B. (remarks) in Com. on Sup., 12754, 13353 (vii).

——— Tunnel, Information *re* (Ques.) 562 (i).

P.E.I., Winter Communication, Freight carried, Freight Rates, &c. (M. for ret.*) 936 (i).

——— (Ques.) 843 (i).

P.E.I., Winter Communication, Mail Service, Cor:, &c. (M. for copies) 1203 (i).

——— Tunnel Construction, Tels., Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 4589 (iii).

——— Withdrawal of Steamers from Georgetown Route, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

——— (remarks) 1207 (i).

——— (remarks) *re* Discussion, 1109 (i).

P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines, Cor., &c., *re* Construction (M. for copies) 3242, 3272 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry., Claims of Mr. James Maher, &c. (Ques.) 3834 (ii).

——— Complaints *re* Excessive Charges, &c. (Ques.) 1123 (i).

——— Freight Rates, Delegates from P.E.I., Reps. *re* (M. for copies*)6240 (iv).

——— Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 12408; on M. for 2°, 12628; in Com., 12631 (vii).

——— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2745 (ii).

——— Hillsborough Bridge, Mr. Haney's Claim, Progress *re* (remarks) 7100 (iv).

——— Mail Service, Delay in Distribution (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9094 (v).

——— Murray Harbour Branch, Expenditure and Earnings, &c. (Ques.) 848 (i).

———Time-Table, Protest *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1123 (i).

——— Train Service between Charlottetown and Murray Harbour (Ques.) 568 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11630 (vi).

Railway Commission (Ass't. Chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3926 (ii); in Com., 4978 (iii).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9811 (v).

Returns, Inquiry for, 5491 (iii), 7722 (iv).

MARTIN, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Returns, Unopposed (remarks) 5914 (iii).

St. Peter's Bay, Mail Contract with H. B. Finlay, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 1686 (i).

St. Peter's Bay Post Office, Charges against Mrs. Finlay, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 1687 (i).

——— (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2786 (ii).

Seed Grain, Distribution *re*, Purchases in P.E.I. (remarks) 3157 (ii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7738 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3812 (ii); in Com., 12610 (vii).

Supply B. 96 (seed grain) in Com., 2783 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Indians—B.C. (land sales) 12754 (vii).

Militia (annual drill) 5736 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1085 (i); (obstructions) 3213; (winter mail service) 3218 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 13339 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (New London) 11292; N.S. (Port Hood) 11276; P.E.I. (repairs) 11292; (Rustico) 11293 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (salaries) 10157 (v).

Toronto Island Tunnel, Deputation *re* Construction by Govt. (Ques.) 5564 (iii).

Valleyfield, P.E.I., Change of Mail Route (Ques.) 11297 (vi).

Wednesday Evening Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11232 (vi).

West India Trade, Reciprocity Negotiations (remarks) 1860 (i).

MARTIN, Mr. M., *Montreal (St. Mary's).*

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6728 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6511 (iv).

Monteal Excise Officers, Increases to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4911 (iii).

Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc., 13393 (vii).

Ry. Act Amt. (B. 100) 1° m., 3316 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5539 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Excise (provisional allowances) 817 (i).

MICHAUD, Mr. P., *Victoria, N.B.*

G.T.P., Madawaska Right of Way (remarks) 12661 (vii).

MacIlreith, Mr., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7176 (iv).

MICHAUD, Mr. P.—*Con.*

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3068 (ii).

Quebec and New Brunsick Ry. Co.'s (B. 128) 1°*, 5255; in Com., 6181 (iii), 6225 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8563 (v).

MILLER, Mr. H. H., *Grey, S.*

Address, The, 148 (i).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3860 (ii).

Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank incorp. B. 141 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5950 (iii).

Budget, The, 5567 (iii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11256 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5104 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 11707; in Com., 11844 (vi), 12944 (vii).

Fruit Inspection *re* Apple Packing, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 2764 (ii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6825 (iv).

Indian Department, Extravagent Management, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11068 (vi).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 131 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Postal Services, Delays, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 7261 (iv).

Presbyterian Widows' and Orphans' Fund B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2789 (ii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3102 (ii).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H McIntyre) 1533 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12620 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12749 (vii); Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4058 (ii); Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Owen Sound) 7817; P.E.I. (Georgetown) 7185 (iv).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2359 (ii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10693 (vi); on Sen. Amts., 13045 (vii).

Wheat Transportation from N.W., on M. Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2194 (ii).

MONK, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*

Actonvale Public Building, Total Cost of Construction (Ques.) 6232 (iv).

Address, The, 535 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4732 (iii).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3875 (ii).

——— All-Red Line, Irish Route, Opposition by Govt. (Ques.) 10253 (v).

——— Letter to Mr. Sifton from Prime Minister (remarks) 948 (i).

——— Negotiations, Canadian Representatives in England, &c. (Ques.) 353 (i).

——— Tenders, Proposals, &c., Cor. *re* (Ques.) 6460 (iv).

Anglo-American Treaty, Submitted to Can. Govt. (remarks) 6926 (iv).

Anglo-French Exhibition, Canadian Representative (Ques.) 8611 (v).

——— Purchase of Goods, &c. (Ques.) 8443 (v).

——— Total Expenditure by Govt. (Ques.) 8443 (v).

Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Cor. Rep., &c. (M. for copies) 594 (i).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4395 (iii).

Becancour, Blanche, &c., Dredging at during 1907, &c. (Ques.) 3040 (ii).

Bonus System, *re* Immigration (notice of motion) 6288 (iv).

Bridge Subsidies to Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Leonard) in Com., 13311 (vii).

B.C. Appeal Court B. 165 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 8466 (v).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6169, 6174, 6192 (iii), 6409 (iv).

Canada and France SS. Communication, Provision *re* Treaty (Ques.) 12391 (vii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12868 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5125 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10724; in Com., 11573 (vi).

Clarke City, Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ques.) 2394 (ii).

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i).

Co-operative Societies (B. 5) 1° m., 92; on Order for 2°, 583 (i).; on M. for 2°, 4558; in Com., 4564 (iii).

——— (M.) to transfer to Govt. Orders, 3654 (ii).

Coteau Landing Wharf, Repairs to (Ques.) 9277 (v).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Criminal Code (libel) Amt. B. 92 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 1°, 2544 (ii).

Cumberland Railway and Coal Co.'s (B. 46) 1°*, 891; 2°*, 1109 (i).

Debates, Official, 4th Rep. (translators) Notice to ref. back to Debates Com., 9709 (v).

——— M. to ref back to Com., 10225; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 94) 10252 (v).

——— (remarks) 9889, 10119 (v).

Deschambault Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction, Contractor, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5801 (iii).

——— (Ques.) 5464 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8116, 8138 (iv).

Dredging Works at Nicolet River, &c., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3896 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).

Dredging in Quebec Prov., Claims pending, &c. (Ques.) 7200 (iv).

Dredging in Vaudreuil Co., Supt.'s Salary, &c. (Ques.) 4587 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10763 (vi).

Fisheries Treaties, Boundaries with U. S. (remarks) 6632 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1397 (i); on M. for 2°, 2221 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4317 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, Consideration of Proposed Convention, (M.) for Sel. Com., 923 (i).

——— Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 12651 (vii).

——— Shipments from Canada, &c. (Ques.) 4763 (iii).

See 'Can. and France,' &c.

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3794 (ii).

Godfroi River Wharf, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 3423 (ii).

Govt. Vessels, Pay of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 10736 (vi).

Govt. Works, Emplymt. of Technical Students (prop. res.) 3288 (ii).

G.T.P. Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10772 (vi).

G.T.P., Winnipeg to Moncton, Number of Miles completed, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 6643 (iv).

House of Commons, Rules for Hours of Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr, Wright) 592 (i).

Hudson, Dredging,, Total Expenditure, 1907 (Ques.) 4587 (iii).

Hull Customs Imports, Amount for 1906-8 (Ques.) 11703 (vi).

Hull Post Office, Total Revenue for 1906-07 (Ques.) 11704 (vi).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Immigrants landed in Canada to June, 1907, Number deported, &c. (Ques.) 3839 (ii).

Immigrants reported by SS. 'Montreal,' Bonuses paid, &c. (Ques.) 6921 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B.135 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5658 (iii); in Com., 6436 (iv).

Immigration Agents in France, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9840 (v).

——— (notice of motion) 4769 (iii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of *re* Agents, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6663; Amt. neg. (Y. 42; N. 95) 7092 (iv).

Immigration Frauds at Halifax, Par. in Press (remarks) 4834 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6491, 6514 (iv).

I.C.R., Amqui Station, Cost of Construction (Ques.) 10012 (v).

——— Vote *re* Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 12774 (vii).

Italy, Commercial Treaty with (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10593 (vi).

Japanese and Oriental Immigration, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for copies of O.Cs., &c., 872 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Recent Entries into B. C. (remarks) 3751 (ii).

——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1605 (i).

——— from U. S., Deportation, &c. (remarks) 3900 (ii).

Lachine Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12097 (vii).

La Compagnie de Publication du Canada, Amount paid by Govt. (Ques.) 5082 (iii).

Lac Saumon Station, I.C.R., Amount expended (Ques.) 12652 (vii).

La Societe Canadienne d'Immigration, &c., Montreal, Pet. *re* Assistance, &c. (Ques.) 4244 (iii).

——— (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).

Lighthouses in Nicolet River and Fort St. Francois, &c. (Ques.) 3837 (ii).

Loans, Temporary, by Govt., Names of Lenders, Rates of Interest, &c. (M. for ret.*) 554 (i).

——— (Ques.) 314 (i).

Mail Service, Egypte and St. Ephrem d'Upton, Renewal of Contract (Ques.) 5257

Mail Service by Steamers via Coteau Landing, &c. (Ques.) 9277 (v).

Mail Service, Soulanges County, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 9277 (v).

Marine, Deptl. Officials, Suspension of *re* C. S. Report (remarks) 6004 (iii).

——— Deptl. Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3988 (ii).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4066 (ii).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Montreal Turnpike Roads, Claim of Govt., &c. (prop. res.) 3465 (ii).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c. (prop. res.) 3436; on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3452 (ii).

——— Amounts collected and expended, &c. (M. for ret.) 1688 (i).

——— Payment of Interest, &c. (Ques.)1931 (i), 2979 (ii).

——— Rep. of Auditor General (M. for copy*) 2983 (ii).

Nicolet County, Dredging, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4588 (iii).

Nicolet Post Office, Contract, Tender, Extras, &c. (Ques.) 3838 (ii).

Nicolet River Dredging, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 3840 (ii).

Nicolet River Protection Walls, Repairs, Expenditure *re* (M. for ret.*) 4588 (iii).

Nicolet River Wharf, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3478 (ii).

Order, Ques. of, *re* answering questions by Govt., 234 (i).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3974 (ii).

Pointe Aux Trembles Wharf, Date of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 9267 (v).

——— Number of Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1734 (i), 2394 (ii).

——— Tender of Messrs. Dusseault & Pageau, &c. (Ques.) 8838 (v).

Quebec Bridge Commission, on M. (Mr. Maclean) to ref. Rep., Evidence, &c., to Special Com., 10401 (vi).

——— Rep. of Sel. Com., on M. (Mr. Maclean) to conc. (amt.) 13363; Amt. neg. (Y. 52; N. 103) 13414 (vii).

Quebec Bridge Commission's Report, Distribution of Printed Copies (remarks) 8608 (v), 10302 (vi).

Quebec Bridge Co., Govt. Grants, Investigation *re* (M.) for Sel. Com., 2547 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Co., ref. to in debate on Address, 535 (i).

Quebec Bridge, Construction Materials, Customs Duties collected (Ques.) 5200, 5793 (iii).

Ques. of Priv., Par. in 'Le Soleil,' 7994 (iv).

Railway Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, 10688; (amt) 11603, neg. (Y. 36; N. 89) 11608 (vi).

Ry. Act (working hours) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. R. Smith)—(remarks) 10120 (v).

Railway Commissioners' Board, Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8513 (v).

Raquette River Dredging, Contract *re* (Ques.) 4587 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5658 (iii).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Rimouski County Public Works, Expenditures *re* (Ques.) 10013 (v).

St. Gabriel de Brandon, Post Office Savings Bank, Opening, Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 4589 (iii).

——— (Ques.) 4828 (iii).

St. Francois Port Wharf, Construction, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 3423 (ii).

Ste. Hyacinthe, 84th Regiment, Total Amount of Pay unpaid, &c. (Ques.) 844 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5541 (iii).

Sacred Heart Post Office, Establishment of six Offices, &c. (Ques.) 5472 (iii).

Sauve, Alfred, Rep. of Investigation *re* Charges, &c. (Ques.) 9278 (v).

Seven Islands, Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ques.) 2394 (ii).

Soulanges Canal, Commissioner Boyer, (Ques.) 12413 (vii).

——— Electric Power, Contract with Govt., &. (Ques.) 10011 (v).

——— Expenditure *re* Investigation by Messrs. Sauve and Boyer (Ques.) 10513 (vi).

——— Investigation, Rep. of Mr. Boyer, Inquiry for, 9890 (v).

——— Investigation, Rep. of Mr. Boyer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3805 (ii).

Suburban Mail Delivery (prop. res.) 3276 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10585 (vi).

Canals—Lachine (Richard, Jos., compensation) 13175 (vii).

Canals — Soulanges (investigation) 10304 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 9698 (v).

Immigration (agents, G.B.) 9840 (v).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 3988 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2943 (ii).

Post Office (boots for letter carriers) 8877 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12128 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11081 (vi).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10362 (vi).

Technical Students, Emplymt. on Govt. Works (prop. res.) 3288 (ii).

Temporary Govt. Loans, Rates of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 233 (i).

Tobacco Excise Taxes, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 566 (i).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., *re*

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Amt. to Inland Revenue Act, 904; on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 921 (i).

Toll Gates upon Island of Montreal, Abolition of (prop. res.) 3299 (ii).

Travelling Expenses of Minister of Marine, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6123 (iii).

Wharfage Dues in Soulanges County, Amounts received, &c. (Ques.) 9276 (v).

Wheat, frozen, Shipments from Man., &c., on M. (Mr. Blain) to adjn., 826 (i).

Whisky, Illegal Distribution at Thetford Mines (remarks) 9894 (v).

MORIN, Mr. J. B., *Dorchester.*

Bic Wharf, Material supplied, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ques.) 9713 (v).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry Service (remarks) on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 189 (i).

Butter and Cheese exported from Prov. of Quebec, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 2162 (ii).

Debates, French Edition, Delay, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10505 (vi).

Fortier, Mr. Eugene, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 8613 (v).

G.T.P., Contracts, Safeguard Clause, &c. (M. for copies*) 2398 (ii).

——— Medical Officer Parent, Payments to (Ques.) 8618 (v).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10493 (vi).

I.C.R., Connection with Quebec Central at Levis (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10179 (v).

——— Harlaka Junction, Ry. Connections (remarks) 189, 434, 1436 (i), 3317 (ii).

——— Riviere du Loup Station Master, &c. (Ques.) 7445 (iv).

Lake Francois Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).

Pulp Wood Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4813 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Disaster, Lifting of Ruins (remarks) 10303 (vi).

Quebec and N. B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

Riviere du Loup Wharf, Total Expenditure *re* Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 6462 (iv).

Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. Johns, Tenders *re* Supplies (Ques.) 5788 (iii).

Saguenay Dredging, Purchase of Coal *re*, &c. (Ques.) 8380 (v).

——— 'Storm King,' Tug, Employment of (Ques.) 8381 (v).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5414; on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5448 (iii).

MORIN, Mr. J. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents) 9875 (v).

Marine—(ice-breakers) 1913 (i).

Miscellaneous (charwomen) 10508 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (obstructions) 3213; (tidal service) 3216 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings — Ottawa (Museum) 1495 (i).

Public Works—Que. (Montreal post office) 7413; (Quebec, citadel) 7430; (Quebec, drill hall) 7431; (Levis) 7295 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (train service) 10179 (v).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B., *Hastings, E.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12476 (vii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4505 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., Cor. with G.T.Ry. Co. (M. for copies) 2796 (ii).

Crown Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 180) 1°*, 9330 (v).

Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1190 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1658 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1830; (amt.) 1839; neg. (Y. 50: N. 95) 1882 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11803 (vi).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6753 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13271 (vii).

Govt. Employees at Ottawa, Number of Permanent and Temporary, &c. (M. for ret.*) 558 (i).

G.T.P., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12323 (vii).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R. M. C., on M. for Sup., 1030 (i).

Marine and Fisheries, Book-keeping, Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4182 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7371 (iv).

——— Apptmt. of Mr. Perron (remarks) 6926 (iv).

——— Method of Procedure (remarks) 10743 (vi).

Militia and Marine Stationery Supplies, Purchases *re* Book-keeping (Ques.) 6233 (iv).

Niagara Camp, Transportation of Troops, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 2163 (ii).

P.E.I.Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* M. J. Haney's Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2750 (ii).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (Ry. Commission) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°,4659 (iii); in Com., 10647; on M. for 3° (amt.) 10777; on M. for 3°, 11598; Amt. neg. (Y. 36; N. 77) 11600 (vi).

Ross Rifle, Extravagance of Militia Dept., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 8994 (v).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5854 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (subsidies) 12263 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4182 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1923 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8526; Ont. (Glencoe) 7490 (iv).

Watson, Mr. G. H., Apptmt. as Counsel *re* West Elgin Election Frauds (remarks) 6848 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. Frank (Minister of the Interior) *Edmonton.*

Adams Lake, Construction of Dam, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 5798 (iii).

Alberta Closed Leases, Number granted, &c. (Ans.) 3037 (ii).

Badgley Island, Trespass by T. H. Jackman (Ans.) 1937 (i).

Belgian Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).

Blankets purchased by Militia and Indian Depts., Amounts, Price, &c. (Ans.) 4584 (iii).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12739 (vii).

Boundary Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9740 (v).

Boyle Concession, Memorial of Dawson Legislature (Ans.) 509, 562, 681 (i).

Britton, Mr. Justice, Payment *re* Treadgold Commission (Ans.) 5474 (iii).

Buchanan Townsite, Homestead Entry of Mr. Ramsland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10083 (v).

Buffalo Herd located at Elk Park (Ans.) 5208 (iii).

Buffalo Herd for Moose Mountain Reserve (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10102 (v).

Buffalo Herd for Parks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).

Buffalo imported for Game Preserve in Alberta, Payments *re* (Ans.) 847.

Buffalo purchased for Parks, Authority for Expenditure (Ans.) 896 (i).

Buffalo purchased for Elk Park, Name of Purchaser (Ans.) 5795 (iii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Calgary Town Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9776 (v).

Cameron, John, Homestead Inspector, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4769 (iii).

Canadian repatriated from U.S. (Ans.) 685 (i).

Chambly Common, Area, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 5652 (iii).

Chapel Point Ferry Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 513 (i).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. (B. 184) 1°*, 10008 (v); 2° m., and in Com., 10545, 10744, 11020 (vi).

Clearwater Lake, Half Breeds' Location, &c. (Ans.) 175 (i).

——— Squatters' Claims (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9995 (v).

Clement, W. H. P., Legal Adviser in Yukon, &c. (Ans.) 5650 (iii).

Coal Areas, Agents for Applicants, &c. (Ans.) 5469, 5790 (iii).

Coal and Govt. Lands in Possession of Govt., &c. (Ans.) 843 (i).

Coal Lands, Alberta and Sask., Total Area sold, &c. (Ans.) 9278 (v).

——— Royalty Dues, &c., Sale or Lease of (Ans.) 11019 (vi).

Coal Lands, Disposed of by Govt. (Ans.) 3480 (ii).

——— Leases, Applicants *re* (Ans.) 2395 (ii).

——— Leased by Govt., Original Grantees, &c. (Ans.) 3232 (ii).

——— Purchase Price on Sections 16, 20 and 21, &c. (Ans.) 10513 (vi).

——— Purchases on Sections 27, 28, 33 and 34, Payments *re* (Ans.) 10512 (vi).

——— Timber, &c., Dates of Regulations, O.Cs., &c. (Ans.) 12656 (vii).

Coal Mining Cos. in Sask. and Alberta, Returns made to Govt. (Ans.) 10258 (v).

Coal Mine Royalties, Sums received in Alberta (Ans.) 12391 (vii).

Colonization Lands, Alienations, on Inquiry for Ret., 4317 (iii).

Colonization Societies in Quebec, Amounts paid (Ans.) 684 (i).

Congdon, Mr. F. T., Stmnt. *re* Estates administered (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10111 (v).

——— Investigation *re* Trusts and Estates (Ans.) 12050, 12413 (vii).

——— (remarks) 13420, 13518 (vii).

Congdon vs. Mrs. Wiley, Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 565 (i).

See 'Yukon.'

Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).

——— (remarks) 10916 (vi).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Cypress Hills Reservation, Homestead Lands, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9992 (v).

——— Reserve, Preservation of, &c. (Ans.) 3842 (ii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1133 (i).

——— Examination of, by Members (remarks) 3853 (ii).

——— Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1636 (i).

Dodds, Mr. W., Information *re* Immigration Frauds (Ans.) 5655 (iii).
See 'Halifax.'

Dokis Indian Reserve, Consent of Chief *re* Sale of Timber (Ans.) 8175 (iv).

——— Commission to Mr. Ryan (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12732 (vii).

——— Name of Agent (Ans.) 5084 (iii).

——— Negotiations *re* Surrender (Ans.) 3849 (ii).

——— Protest *re* Sale of Timber (remarks) 10918 (vi).

——— Sale, Notice in Newspapers, &c. (Ans.) 7501 (iv).

——— Total Expenditure *re* Surrender (Ans.) 10512 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8659 (v).

Dom. Lands Survey (B. 9) 1° m., 231; 2°, and in Com., 754, 948 (i); on Senate Amts., 3755 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 181) 1° m., 9333 (v); 2° m., 11125; in Com., 11158, 11165, 11408, 11502, 11940; 3° m., 11970 (vi); on Mr. Lake's Amt., 12394; on Senate Amts., 13522 (vii).

Dom. Lands, Areas disposed of (Ans.) 3431 (ii).

——— Disposed of from 1896 to 1905, on M. (Mr. Lake) for Ret., 3852 (ii).

Dom. Land Grants to Rys. prior to 1896, Total Acreage, &c. (Ans.) 8183 (iv).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10806 (vi).

Doukhobors, Bonuses *re* Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9952 (v).

——— Condition of, Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (remarks) 2219 (ii).

——— Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5017 (iii).

——— Manner of Living (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).

——— at Yorkton, Violation of Laws, &c. (remarks) 7630 (iv).

Doyle, Mr. P., Superannuation, &c. (Ans.) 6923 (iv).

Eagle Lake Coal Lands, Surrender of (Ans.) 694 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Estevan Quarantine Lands, Disposal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10093 (v).

Fence Post Fees on Permits, &c. (Ans.) 10258 (v).

Fire Guardians, Number employed in Alberta, &c. (Ans.) 3433 (ii).

Foreign Purchases, Customs Collections *re* (Ans.) 5475 (iii).

French Immigration Agents, Names, Facilities, &c. (Ans.) 177 (i).

French Immigrants, Number and Expenditures, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).

Gaetz Brothers, Payments to (Ans.) 10514 (vi).

Girouard, J. E., Resignation from Yukon Council (Ans.) 11938 (vi).

Grain Inspection Act Amt. (B. 203) 1°*, 12594; in Com., 13048, 13208 (vii).

Grazing Lands leased to Brown, Bedingfield & Co., Number of Acres (Ans.) 13062 (vii).

Grazing Leases, Application of Messrs. Woods, Fleck and Finnie (Ans.) 238 (i).

——— Irrevocable for 21 Years, Applications for, &c. (Ans.) 1512 (i).

Grazing and Irrigation Lands reserved by Govt. (Ans.) 3479 (ii).

Grazing Lease of H. Riviere, Location, &c. (Ans.) 13060 (vii).

Grazing Ranches, Names of Lessees, &c. (Ans.) 7211 (iv).

Griffith Island, Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 1508 (i).

Halifax Frauds, Rep. of Mr. Robertson (remarks) 9127 (v).

——— Dismissal of Mr. Bernstein (remarks) 8605 (v).
See 'Dodds.'

Hindus Deportation from B.C., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (remarks) 5337 (iii).
See 'Immigration,' 'Japanese,' &c.

Hintz, Fred., Homestead Location, &c. (Ans.) 3235 (ii), 6238 (iv).

Holliday, Mr. P., Additional Living Allowance (Ans.) 5475 (iii).

Homestead Application of Mr. John C. Haddock (remarks) in Com. on B. 181, 11200 (vi).

Homestead Cancellations, Unfair Methods (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10090, 10101 (v).

Homestead Entries, Granted for Quarters 10-17-17 W. of 4th Meridian (Ans.) 9773 (v).

Homestead Entry for S.W. Quarter-Section 16-28-1, Issue of Patent, Duties performed, &c. (Ans.) 2167 (ii).

Homestead Entries in Quarter-Section No. 35, History of (Ans.) 4762 (iii).

Homestead Entries on Quarter Section 16, &c., Applications, Inspections, &c. (Ans.) 3432 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Homestead Entries, N.E. Quarter-Section 28, Permission *re* Grants (Ans.) 1941 (i).

Homestead Entries in Man., &c., Total Acreage, &c. (Ans.) 6921 (iv).

Homesteaders on Sections 15, 16 and 27, Issue of Patents, &c. (Ans.) 7503 (iv).

Homesteading in Section 18, Extension of Time Allowance, &c. (Ans.) 8382 (v).

Homestead Sale of Township 13 (Ans.) 7206 (iv).

Hough, Campbell and Ferguson, Sales of Lands, &c. (Ans.) 364 (i).

Hough, Mr. J. S., and Hough, Campbell and Ferguson (Ans.) 568 (i).

—— on Inquiry for Ret., 3319 (ii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6394 (iv).

—— Proposition *re* Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 5789 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. (B. 135) 1° m., 5657 (iii); in Com., 6429 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt., O.C. *re* (Ans.) 7500 (iv).

—— O.C. *re* B.C. (remarks) 8171 (iv).

—— on Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 8608, 9891 (v).

Immigration Agents in East Elgin, Number, &c. (Ans.) 693 (i).

—— G.B., Names, &c. (Ans.) 2169 (ii).

—— Italy, Number, &c. (Ans.) 4584 (iii).

—— Names of those paid Commissions in Europe, &c. (Ans.) 3845 (ii).

—— N.B., Apptmt. (Ans.) 843 (i).

—— Number of Special Agents, Addresses, &c. (Ans.) 180 (i).

—— Special Prizes, &c. (Ans.) 3484 (ii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolishing of, to Agents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1311 (i).

—— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6697 (iv).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 1298 (i).

Immigration, Central Board, London, Moneys paid to, &c. (Ans.) 2545 (ii).

Immigration, Co-operation with Govt. of N. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).

Immigration, Expenditure *re* Maintenance of Immigrants (Ans.) 5084 (iii).

Immigration, Expenditure for March, 1907-8 (Ans.) 5081 (iii).

Immigration Forms, Number received by Farmers, Agents, &c. (Ans.) 3847 (ii).

Immigration Frauds at Halifax, Investigation *re* (statement) 4963 (iii).

—— Further Information *re* (remarks) 5567 (iii).

—— Restitution *re* (remarks) 5659 (iii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Immigration Frauds at Halifax (remarks) 4835, 5567, 5659 (iii), 6465 (iv).
See 'Halifax.'

Immigration from U. S., Total Expenditure (Ans.) 5082 (iii).

Immigration Hall, East Selkirk, Furniture, &c., Disposal of (Ans.) 6403 (iv).

Immigration Officers, Waugh and Perrin, Payments to (Ans.) 514 (i).

Immigration Premiums, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 1287 (i).

Immigration Regulations *re* British Subjects, Deportations, &c. (Ans.) 9773 (v).

Immigration Regulations, O.C. *re* (remarks) 11019 (vi).

Immigration Relief to Gimli Galicians, Rep. of Mr. Walker (read) in Com. of Sup., 9979 (v).

Immigration Returns, on Inquiry for, 1108 (i).

Immigrant Bonuses, Increase to Agents, &c. (Ans.) 3429 (ii).

Immigrants, Bulgarians, Stranded in Toronto (remarks) 186, 242 (i).

Immigrants cared for in Toulon Sheds, 1906-7 (Ans.) 892 (i).

Immigrants at Chatham, Complaints *re* Deportation (Ans.) 6922 (iv).

Immigrants deported from Chatham, Names and Causes, &c. (Ans.) 5796 (iii).

Immigrants deported, Expenditure *re* Transportation (Ans.) 5080 (iii).

Immigrants deported, Number, &c. (Ans.) 177 (i).

Immigrants stranded at St. Thomas, Deportation of (Ans.) 567 (i).

Immigrant Detention Hospital, Amount expended (Ans.) 5082 (iii).

Immigrants entering Canada, Number, Bonuses paid on, &c. (Ans.) 5256 (iii).

—— Deportations, &c. (Ans.) 240 (i).

Immigrants from Europe, entering U.S., List furnished to Govt. (Ans.) 5082 (iii).

—— Restriction of (remarks) 5491 (iii).

Immigration from France and Belgium, Premiums paid to Agents (Ans.) 6923 (iv).

Immigrant Inspection of Ships, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 1289 (i).

Immigrants reported by SS. 'Montreal,' Bonuses paid, &c. (Ans.) 6921 (iv).

Immigrants landed in Canada to June, 1907, Number deported, &c. (Ans.) 3840 (ii).

Immigrant Passages to Canada, Number rejected by SS. Companies (Ans.) 5468 (iii).

Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

Indian Department, Extravagant Management, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11045 (vi).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Indian Lands, Acres sold, Total Receipts, &c., since 1896 (Ans.) 4586 (iii).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13122 (vii).

—— Withdrawal from Sale, &c. (Ans.) 2396 (ii).

Indian Lands and Islands owned, sold, &c., by Indians (Ans.) 5079 (iii).

Indian Lands, B.C., and Provincial Rights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 628 (i).

Indian Lands at New Westminster, B.C., Disposal of, &c. (Ans.) 3037, 3839 (ii).

Indian Lands, Sale of, on Inquiry for Ret., 4495 (iii).

Indians in Man. and Sask., Investigation by Mrs. Paget and Miss Ferguson, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 6919 (iv).

Indian Schools, Rep. of Dr. Bryce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).

Interior, Deptl. Rep., (presented) 7 (i).

Irrigation (B. 10) 1°*, 231; 2° m., 766; in Com., 767, 953 (i); (M.) to withdraw, 2974 (ii).

—— (B. 99) 1° m., 3315 (ii); in Com., 4671 (iii).

Irrigation in Western Provs., Investigations *re* Measurements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9990 (v).

Japanese and Oriental Immigrants in B. C., Number, &c. (Ans.) 692 (i).

Japanese entering B. C., Passports, &c. (Ans.) 4243 (iii).

Japanese Immigrants entering from U.S. into Canada, Deportation, &c. (remarks) 3900 (ii).

Japanese Syndicate purchasing Land in Alberta, &c. (Ans.) 2162 (ii).

Kananaski Falls Water Power, Granting of Rights, &c. (Ans.) 3036 (ii).

—— on Inquiry for, 6464 (iv).

La Compagnie de Publication du Canada, Amount paid by Govt. (Ans.) 5082 (iii).

Lands applied for by Mr. Alwyn under Irrigation Regulations (Ans.) 7209 (iv).

Land Entries of T. J. Oliver and Fred Hintz, Cancellation of, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 3235 (ii).

Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and N. W. Ters., Area reserved on July 1st, 1896 (Ans.) 13512 (vii).

Land Grants to Rys., Selections, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 4766 (iii), 6920 (iv).

Lands leased by Govt. in Section 11, Twp. 8, Original Grantee, &c. (Ans.) 3235 (ii).

Land Patent issued for E. ½ S.E. ¼ Section 2, Name, &c. (Ans.) 2169 (ii).

Land Patents for Section 8, Twp. 53, Present Owner, Occupation, &c. (Ans.) 3430 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Land Patents for Sections 10 and 17, Applicants for (Ans.) 9475 (v).

Land Patents, Section 36, &c., Issue of (Ans.) 3481 (ii).

Land Sales in N. W., Purchasers' Names, Prices paid, &c. (Ans.) 3835 (ii).

Lands, Section 2, 10, 14, &c., Disposal of (Ans.) 5083 (iii).

Land Subsidies to Rys., Areas granted from 1892-6 (Ans.) 8614 (v).

Land Titles Act Amt. (B. 113) 1° m., 4221 (iii); in Com., 6517 (iv).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund (B. 168) prop. Res., 7094 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8480 (v); 2° m., 10525; in Com., 10526 (vi).

Lands withdrawn for Settlement or Colonization Purposes, &c. (Ans.) 2393 (ii).

La Societe Canadienne d'Immigration, &c., Assistance *re* (Ans.) 4244 (iii).

Lennox Island Wharf, Contract *re* (Ans.) 8444 (v).

Livingstone, Wm. G., Sale of Sections 22, 28 and 32, &c. (Ans.) 9475 (v).

Lumber manufactured in N. W., Royalties, &c. (Ans.) 3835 (ii).

McDonald, Albert G., Commission paid *re* Immigrants (Ans.) 8617 (v).

McDougall, Rev. John, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 688 (i).

McInnes, Hon. W. B., Emplymt. in the Yukon, &c. (Ans.) 5794 (iii).

McKenzie, Mr. K. W., Apptmt. as Dom. Lands Agent, Edmonton (Ans.) 6981 (iv).

McLeod, Roderick, Date of Homestead Entry (Ans.) 6401 (iv).

Manchester, Dr., Misappropriation of moneys of Mr. Walter Dick (Ans.) 11937 (vi).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. (B. 188) 1°*, 10717 (iv); in Com., 12559, 13215 (vii).

Man. Lands owned by Govt., Number of Acres (Ans.) 1289 (i).

Menzies, Mr. James, Emplymt. by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 1349 (i).

Metlakatla Indian Reserve, Ret., on Inquiry for, 2381 (ii).

Mining Rights on Sections 20, 28 and 32, Original Grantees, Transfers, &c. (Ans.) 3238 (ii).

Mission Reserve, Conditions of Sale to G.T. P. Ry. Co. (Ans.) 5257 (iii).

Muskoday Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Sale (Ans.) 5083 (iii).

Newspapers, Payments to (Ans.) 1512 (i).

Nolan, Wm. Howard, Issue of Patents to (Ans.) 8182 (iv).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts paid, Claims, &c. (Ans.) 167 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses paid by Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 773 (i).
——— Ref. to Mr. Blair's Letter, &c. (Ans.) 2392 (ii).
Northwest Gold Dredging Co., Assignment of, &c. (Ans.) 11703 (vi).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12731 (vii).
Patterson, J. W., Govt. Lands in B. C., Sale to (Ans.) 6002 (iii).
Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., on M. (Mr. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 10408 (vi).
——— Surveys of Lands (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).
Peace River Exploratory Surveys, Rep. (presented) 3834 (ii).
Peace River Timber Limits, Granting of Leases, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Cor., 3851 (ii).
Peace River Land Co., Cancellation of Grant (remarks) 11018 (vi).
——— Terms and Regulations *re* Sale, &c. (Ans.) 1111 (i).
'Phœnix,' Saskatoon, Number ordered, paid, &c. (Ans.) 6920 (iv).
Piegan Reserve, Cattle Shipments, Weighing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).
Preston, W. T. R., Employmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 360 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Production of Original Documents, on Inquiry for, 4495 (iii).
Quarantine Lands, Sask., Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 3482 (ii).
Quarter Sections, 35, 31 6, &c., Public and Private Sale, &c. (Ans.) 8176 (iv).
Railway Land Grants in Man., Alberta, Sask., Total Acreage, &c. (Ans.) 6920 (iv).
Rama Indians Fund, Payments *re* (Ans.) 8611 (v).
Ramsland Homestead Entry, Improvements, &c. (Ans.) 5209 (iii).
See 'Buchanan,' &c.
Ranchvale Homestead Entries, Receipts, Number, &c. (Ans.) 5258 (iii).
——— Sub-Land Agency, Closing of (Ans.) 4830 (iii).
Rattenbury & Co., Purchasers of Seed Oats, Assignment, &c. (Ans.) 12392 (vii).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 2309, 2384, 3318 (ii).
——— Questions, &c., ordered by the House, Number, &c. (Ans.) 4243 (iii).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Applications *re* Homesteads (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9994 (v).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Entry for Homesteaders (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7654
——— Squatters' Rights, &c. (Ans.) 175 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Robbins Irrigation Co., Amount expended to Date (Ans.) 4763 (iii).
Roberts, Mr. J. M., Promotion in Interior Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9693 (v).
Rocky Mountain Park, Revenue, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
St. Peter's Reserve, Extinguishment of Title, Issue of Patents (Ans.) 1933 (i).
——— Instruction to Agents *re* Rights of Purchasers (Ans.) 2217 (ii).
——— Pet. *re* Election of Chief and Councillors (Ans.) 7990 (iv).
Salvation Army Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9973 (v).
——— Stmnt. of Genl. Booth (Ans.) 2391 (ii).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Conditions of Sale &c. (Ans.) 4761 (iii).
——— (stmnt.) 10402 (vi).
——— Information *re* (remarks) 9280 (v).
——— Sale of Homestead Lands, &c. (remarks) 9127 (v).
School Lands Exchange (B. 163) 1° m., 8086 (iv); 2° m., 8467; in Com., 8478 (v).
School Timber and Coal Lands, Average Price, &c. (Ans) 3431 (ii).
Scrip and Money received by Govt. *re* Lands, &c., on M. (Mr. Lake) for Cor., 3852 (ii).
Scrip received on Account of Lands, Mines, &c. (Ans.) 3431 (ii).
Section 32, Report *re* (Ans.) 8383 (v).
Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1377 (i).
——— Apptmt. of Mr. R. A. E. Leech (remarks) 3041 (ii).
——— Duties assigned to Mr. Leech (remarks) 3158 (ii).
——— Distribution of (Ans.) 692 (i).
——— O.C. amending Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 6981 (iv).
——— O.C. *re* Advances (remarks) 6634 (iv)
——— in N. W., Extension of time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2901 (ii).
——— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10121 (v).
——— Settlers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 277[illegible] (ii).
Seed Grain Distribution, Purchases from P.E.I. (remarks) 3158, 3752 (ii), 12392 (vii).
——— Corrected answer, 13066 (vii).
Seed Grain purchased, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ans.) 8185 (iv).
Selkirk, Lord, Land Register, State Papers and Register 'B,' Custody of, &c. (Ans.) 1685 (i).
Six Nations Indians, Refusal *re* Inspection of Memorials, &c. (Ans.) 6239 (iv).
Smith, O. B., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4765 (iii).
S. A. Veterans, Land Grants to, &c. (Ans.) 563 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

S. A. Volunteers Land Grant Bounty (B. 109) Res. prop., 3316, 3756 (ii); 11938 (vi); in Com. on Res., 3823 (ii) 12595; in Com., 13047; on Senate Amts., 13524 (vii).

Southern Alberta Land Co., Application *re* Change of Lands (Ans.) 7729 (iv).

Squatters on Turtle Mountain Forest Reserves (remarks) 4741 (iii).

Supply B. 96 (seed grain) in Com., 2784 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 623 (i); Interior (astronomical survey) 9737 (v); (salaries) 616 (i), 9693 (v).

Dom. Lands (agents) 10044; (forest rangers) 10049; (forest reserves) 10060; (homesteads) 10083; (salaries) 10038; (surveys) 9987 (v).

Immigration (agents, G. B.) 9840; (agents in U. S.) 9965; (deportations) 9882 (v); (general expenses) 5753 (iii); (hospitals) 9983; (literature) 9949; (relief to settlers) 9983 (v); (U. S. labourers) 13169 (vii).

Indians—B. C. (land sales) 12752 (vii).

Indians — Generally (destitute) 5762; (printing, &c.) 5762 (iii).

Indians—N. B. (salaries) 12736, 13170; (schools) 13170 (vii).

Indians—N.W.T. (Sioux) 5762 (iii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5755 (iii).

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2777 (ii).

N.W. Ter. (Govt. salaries) 10117; (school grants) 10117 (v).

Public Works—Telegraphs (towers) 13178 (vii).

Yukon—(Govt. salaries) 10107 (v).

Surveys of Public Lands: *See* 'Dom. Lands.'

Swamps Lands in Man. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10106 (v).

Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Acquisition of by Govt. (Ans.) 693 (i).

——— Sale (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).

——— Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).

Tanguay, Mr., Homestead Entry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10090 (v).

Temple, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Govt. in Yukon (Ans.) 1126 (i).

Timber Berth, East Saskatchewan, Conditions of Sale, &c. (Ans.) 3839 (ii).

Timber Berths granted in Man. and N.W. T., Retention by Original Grantees (Ans.) 2546 (ii).

Timber Berth, No. 1100, Area, &c. (Ans.) 364 (i).

——— No. 1168, Area, &c. (Ans.) 364 (i).

——— Nos. 1220, &c., on Order for Ret. (remarks) 849 (i).

Timber Cutting by Sawmill Owners, Applications, &. (Ans.) 2168 (ii).

Timber Lands, Sales to Messrs. Rutherford, &c. (Ans.) 1294 (i).

Timber Licenses cancelled from May, 1905, to Nov., 1907, &c. (Ans.) 181 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Timber Licenses, Conditions and Forms in force at present (Ans.) 359 (i).

Timber Licenses granted under Mackenzie Govt. (Ans.) 3038 (ii).

Timber Licenses issued in Man. and N.W.T. during 1896-7 (Ans.) 2396 (ii).

Timber Licenses and Renewals in N. W., Number of Miles, &c. (Ans.) 182, 691, 1127 (i).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2486 (ii).

——— Grants to Messrs. McLeod, Lundy, &c. (Ans.) 237 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 3581 (ii).

Timber Permits to Sawmill Owners, O.C. *re* (Ans.) 179 (i), 11496 (vi).

Torrens Land Title Fund, Information *re* (remarks) 10916 (vi).

Turtle Mountain Reserve, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4741 (iii), 7649 (iv).

Vacant Land Reservations, Instructions to Agents *re* (Ans.) 1935 (i).

Water Power Sales or Leases in Alberta, &c. (Ans.) 8378 (v).

Waugh, James, Immigration Agent, Refund to Govt. (Ans.) 4765 (iii).

Whitehorse Town Site, Portions sold and retained (Ans.) 11496 (vi).

Wood, Mr. David, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 568 (i).

Young, Mr. W. C., Inquiry *re* Charges as Mining Inspector, &c. (Ans.) 1127 (i).

Yukon Act Amt. (B. 169) 1° m., 8604 (v); 2° m., 10528; in Com., 10529; on Senate Amts., 11634 (vi).

Yukon, Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9616 (v).

——— Finnie-Perron Case, Investigation *re* (remarks) 4316 (iii).

——— Gold Co., Holdings by Guggenheims, &c. (Ans.) 7726 (iv).

——— Liquor Permits, Agents, &c., Corrected Answer, 5048 (iii).

——— Lithgow, Girouard and Congdon, Messrs., Apptmt. by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 5999 (iii).

See 'Congdon,' &c.

——— Officials, Re-arrangement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).

——— Placer Claims, Renewals by Gold Commissioner, Fees, &c. (Ans.) 4245 (iii).

——— Placer Mining Act Amt. (B. 150) 1°*, 6221 (iv); 2° m., 8481; in Com., 8483 (v), 10518 (vi).

——— Whiskey Permit Agents, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1127 (i).

——— Wiley *vs.* Congdon, Amt. *re* Return (remarks) 1691 (i).

OSLER, Mr. E. B., *Toronto W.*

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1800 (i).
Dry Docks, Construction, B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4687 (iii).
Goodwin Car Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 60) 1°*, 1283 (i).
I.C.R. Audit System (remarks) in Com. on Sup., 10214 (v).
Lead Bounties B. 91 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11238 (vi).
Montague Moore and T. J. Haskett Patent Relief (B. 61) 1°*, 1283 (i).
Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4908 (iii).
Seed Grain for Northest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1362 (i).

SUPPLY—
Railways—I.C.R. (supplies) 10209 (v).

OWEN, Mr. C. L., *Northumberland, E., Ont.*

Brighton Wharf, Rep. of Mr. Sing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
—— Repairs *re* (remarks) 5913 (iii).
Cambellford, Lake Ontario & Western Ry. Co., Exercise of Powers, &c. (Ques.) 236 (i).
Cattle Embargo in G B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12889 (vii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11820 (vi).
Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13469 (vii).
Fruit Inspection, *re* Apple Packing, Complaints *re* (remarks) 2761 (ii).
House of Commons Clerks, Changes, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).
—— Recommendations *re* Apptmts., &c. (Ques.) 3899 (ii).
Japanese Immigration, on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1611.
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7248 (iv).
Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9894 (v).
Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3930 (ii).
Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10640 (vi).
Shipping Rings, Combination *re* (remarks) 5915 (iii).

SUPPLY—
Canals—Trent (Buckhorn dam) 12227; (construction) 12226 (vii).
Justice—Supreme Court (registrar's uniform) 5507 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4087 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 5735 (iii).
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5533 (iii).

OWEN, Mr. C. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Vancouver) 10868; (Vernon) 10879; (Victoria Immigration) 10879 (vi).
Public Works — Buildings — Ont. (Owen Sound) 7823; (St. Mary's) 7827 (iv).
Public Works — Buildings — Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Brighton) 12133 (vii).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11078 (vi).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10697 (vi).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2507 (ii).
Trent Bridge Post Office, Re-opening of (remarks) 609 (i).
Woolen Industry, Specific Duty (remarks) 6988 (iv).

PAQUET, Mr. E., *L'Islet.*

Address, The, 505 (i).
Belgian Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).
Canadians repatriated from U. S. (Ques.) 684 (i).
Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3490 (ii).
Experimental Farm in Quebec District, Establishment of (Ques.) 2593 (ii).
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3545 (ii).
French Immigration Agents, Names, Facilities, &c. (Ques.) 176 (i).
French Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 176 (i).
Immigrants deported, Number, &c. (Ques.) 177 (i).
Immigrants, Number settled in Canada in 1905-6-7, &c. (M. for ret.*) 697 (i).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6945 (iv).
I.C.R., Cold Storage Cars for Dairy Produce, Number, &c. (Ques.) 1688 (i).
'Montcalm,' Str., Services as an Ice-breaker, in Com. of Sup., 2941 (ii).
Quebec Colonization Societies, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 684 (i).
Quebec Port Improvements, Expenditure, since Confederation (M. for ret.*) 697 (i).
—— Sums expended for Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 176 (i).

SUPPLY—
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4038, 4172 (ii); Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2941 (ii).

PARDEE, Mr. F. F., *Lambton W.*
Budget, The, 5364 (iii).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12859 (vii).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 67) 1°*, 1424 (i); on Senate Amts., 5955 (iii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5910 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11834 (vi).
Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett)—(remarks) 6749 (iv).
Erie, London & Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s (B. 51) 1°*, 1108 (i).
'Golspie,' Str., Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3020 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4137 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2955; (masters and mates) 2971 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12106 (vii); (Tiffin) 5711 (iii).

PARENT, Mr. G., *Montmorency.*
Quebec Bridge Rep., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc., 13411 (vii).

PARMELEE, Mr. C. H., *Shefford.*
Printing of Parliament, 5th Rep. of Com. (peresented) 10915 (vi).

PATERSON, Hon. W. (Minister of Customs) *Brant.*
Absinthe and Brandy imported, Total Amount, &c. (Ans.) 689 (i).
Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, (Ans.) 1112 (i).
American Cereal Co., Customs Refunds, &c. (Ans.) 3485 (ii).
Anthracite Coal, Quantitv imported from U. S. and other Countries (Ans.) 1511 (i).
'Arctic,' Str., Payments *re* Supplies (remarks) 4163 (ii).
Aylmer Customs Collector, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1506 (i).
Bernier, Capt., Customs Ports opened, &c. (Ans.) 5208 (iii).
Brass, Quantity and Quality, Importation into Can. (Ans.) 6232 (iv).
Budget. The, 5296 (iii).
Butter and Cheese exported from Prov. of Quebec, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.) 2163 (ii).
Butter Imports, Quantity, and Countries of Origin (Ans.) 1116 (i).
Canned Pease imported from France, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 3847 (ii).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Cattle, Exports and Imports from Canada to G. B. (Ans.) 6460 (iv).
Cattle exported to U. S. during Years 1900-07, Value &c. (Ans.) 1508 (i).
Cattle Registered, Importations from U. S. (Ans.) 6238 (iv).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10746 (iv).
Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9139 (v).
Coasting Trade *re* Norwegian Ships (Ans.) 6237 (iv).
Coasting Trade, O.Cs. *re* Foreign Vessels, &c. (Ans.) 4586 (iii).
Customs Act Amt. (B. 194) Res. prop., 11233, in Com. on Res., 11312, 1°*, of B., 11315; in Com., 11980 (vi).
Customs Brokers, Fees, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
Customs Defalcations in Huntingdon, B.C., Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9442 (v).
Customs Dept., Criticism by Civil Service Rep., 10448 (vi).
Customs Dept., Criticism, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10448 (vi).
Customs Duties on Militia Uniforms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).
Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Supply (remarks) 10133 (v).
Customs and Excise Revenue, Amount received from June 1 to 15, 1908 (Ans.) 10791 (vi).
Customs Frauds in Montreal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9563 (v).
Customs Inspectors, and Rep. of Civil Service Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9555 (v).
Customs Officers at Niagara Falls, Fort Erie, &c., Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 6980 (iv).
Customs Officers at Windsor, Age and Salary (Ans.) 12656 (vii).
Customs Outside Service, Ports, &c., 9220 (v).
Cotton, Raw, Imported from U. S. during 1905-7, &c. (Ans.) 1511 (i).
Customs, Receipts and Expenditures for 1907-8 (Ans.) 12655 (vii).
Customs Statistics, Duplicating with Trade and Commerce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
Detroit River Tunnel, Materials entered free of Duty (Ans.) 10254 (v).
—— Material imported, &c. (Ans.) 4583 (iii).
—— Duties on Construction Materials (Ans.) 1117 (i), 3841 (ii).
—— (statement) 13524 (vii).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Dillon, Michael, Emplymt. at Windsor Customs (Ans.) 7201 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12951 (vii).

Dredging Companies, Insinuations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).

Farm and Garden Produce at Sault Ste. Marie, Customs Duties, &c. (Ans.) 13061 (vii).

Fire Extinguishers File, Cor., &c., quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7792 (iv).

Fish Exportations from Man., to March, 1907, Value, &c. (Ans.) 4240 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com. on Res., 1257 (i); on M. for 1°, 3507, 3567; in Com. 3588 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Canadian Products, &c., on M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 852 (i).

Fraser, Donald, Customs Collector, Investigation *re* Defalcations (Ans.) 5200 (iii).

—— Dismissal from Customs Service (Ans.) 5474 (iii).

See 'Customs Defalcations.'

French Books, Reduction of Customs *re* French Treaty (Ans.) 2160 (ii).

German Goods imported under Preferential Tariff, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 689 (i).

Glucose, Quantity imported from G. B. (Ans.) 6980 (iv).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2249 (ii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 4226 (iii).

Honey Imports from 1898-1908, Amount, Value, &c. (Ans.) 8177 (iv).

Hoppins, Mr. Wm., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3842 (ii).

Horses and Cattle imported from U. S. as Thoroughbreds, Prevention of (Ans.) 6001 (iii).

Hull Customs Imports, Amount for 1906-8 (Ans.) 11703 (vi).

Imports and Exports, Sept. 30 and Oct. 30th, 1907 (Ans.) 350 (i).

—— Values from June to Dec., 1907 (Ans). 1113 (i).

Imports from France for last five years, &c. (Ans.) 1124 (i).

Imports for Home Consumption, Value, &c., for 1897-8 (Ans.) 13063 (vii).

Japanese Trade with Canada, Total Amount for 1905-6-7 (Ans.) 898 (i).

Literature distributed through Customs and Mails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9104 (v).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).

Massey-Harris Co., Rebate of Duty, &c. (Ans.) 8442 (v).

Mess Pork, Quantity imported from U. S. (Ans.) 5650 (iii).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4067 (ii).

Obstruction Tactics (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9220 (v).

Opium, Amount of Duty received, Pet. from B. C. *re* Prohibition (Ans.) 8614 (v).

Pacaud, Benj., Apptmt. to Customs at Windsor (Ans.) 5200 (iii).

Pepin, J. E., Emplymt. at Customs Office in Windsor (Ans.) 7202 (iv).

Pork, Fresh, Imported for Home Consumption (Ans.) 5650 (iii).

Port, South Bar, C. B., Number of Vessels entered for Customs, &c. (Ans.) 9271 (v).

Posters, Prohibition *re* Indecent Ones, Tariff *re* (Ans.) 6462 (iv).

Prince Rupert Customs Collector, Transfer of Mr. McDonald (Ans.) 6402 (iv).

Pulp Wood exported to U. S., Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.) 1511 (i).

Quebec Bridge Material, Total Amount of Customs Duties *re* (Ans.) 5200, 5793 (iii).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4977 (iii).

Sand, Cement or Clay Utensils imported from G. B. in 1904-5-6-7 (Ans.) 1506 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie Port, Quantity of Farm Produce entered, &c. (Ans.) 898 (i).

Seed Grain for Settlers in N. W., Extension of Time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2932 (ii).

Sugar Imports for 1898, Total Amount (Ans.) 13065 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 637 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9536; Miscellaneous (Guarantee Cos.) 9577; (cruisers) 9578; (legal expenses) 9578; (printing, &c.) 9577; Outside Service (salaries) 9226, 9442 (v).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2964 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8530 (v); Ont. (Brantford) 7465 (iv).

Trade and Nav. Returns (presented) 7 (i).

Unleavened Bread, Pet. *re* Customs Duties (Ans.) 8616 (v).

Venoit, Mr. P. G., Complaints *re* Interference in Politics (Ans.) 6406, 7730 (iv).

Wallace, Michael J., Employment in Customs at Windsor (Ans.) 7500 (iv).

Wheat Transportation from N.W. and Financial Aid, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2196 (ii).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada (Ans.) 5201 (iii).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H., *Argenteuil.*

Address, The, 449 (i).
Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3873 (ii).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12866 (vii).
Chicoutimi Boom, Payments from Pulp Co., &c. (Ques.) 8174 (iv).
Civil Service Commission's Report, Inquiry for, 90 (i).
Coal Lands, Purchases on Sections 27, 28, 33 and 34, &c., Payments *re* (Ques.) 10512 (vi).
Corry Building, Total Rental by Govt., Taxes, &c. (Ques.) 11938 (vi).
Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1818 (i).
Dokis Indian Reserve, Consent from Chief *re* Sale of Timber (Ques.) 8175 (iv).
——— Notice of Sale, Names of Newspapers, &c. (Ques.) 7500 (iv).
——— Sale of Timber, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7801 (iv).
——— Total Expenditure *re* Surrender (Ques.) 10512 (vi).
G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2256 (ii); in Com., 12073 (vii).
Mining Rights in Sections 17, 20, 21, &c., Applications, Leases, &c. (M. for copies*) 3851 (ii).
Mining Rights on Sections 20, 28 and 32, Original Grantees, Transfer, &c. (Ques.) 3238 (ii).
Postal Stamps, Special Issue (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).
Public Works Dept. Expenditures, on M. for Sup., 4868; (amt.) 4886; Neg. (Y.43; N. 99) 4959 (iii).
Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10637 (vi).
Saguenay Boom and Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Amounts paid Govt. *re* (Ques.) 183 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4140 (ii).
Post Office (inspection) 9115; (mail service) 9119 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg military) 10971 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—N. W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10978 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 11010 (vi); (mint) 1453 (i); (rents, &c.) 10999; (telephones) 11012 (vi).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

Timber Licenses in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Renewals, &c. (Ques.) 1127 (i).
Timber Limits, Leasing, Alienation, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2310 (ii).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c. (explanation) *re* Mr. McDonald's letter, 2679 (ii).

PICKUP, Mr. S. W. W., *Annapolis.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12874 (vii).
Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) on M. for 2°, 13507 (vii).
Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10559 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Annapolis) 11211; (Round Hill) 11283 (vi).

PORTER, Mr. E. G., *Hastings, W.*

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 4851 (iii).
Belleville City, Flood Investigation by Govt. (remarks) 3319 (ii).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4744 (iii).
Belleville Drill Hall, Negotiations for Site, &c. (Ques.) 1509 (i).
——— Payments to Mr. J. Hurley (Ques.) 1737 (i).
Belleville Harbour, Issue of Bonds, &c. (Ques.) 6237 (iv).
——— Revenue and Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2983 (ii).
——— Delay, &c. (remarks) 4408 (iii).
——— Total Revenue, for 1903-7, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 2592 (ii).
Belleville Hospital Lot, Purchase Price, &c. (Ques.) 4830 (iii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 5211 (iii).
Belleville Post Office, Excessive Postage, &c. (remarks) 7933 (iv).
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s (B. 20) 1°*, 430 (i); in Com., 7669 (iv), 8552, 8609, 9066 (v).
——— on Order being called for 2°, 681 (i).
Bell Rapids P. O. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8883 (v).
Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Connection (remarks) 1437 (i).
Buell, W. S., Emplymt. *re* Telephone Commission (Ques.) 10011 (v).
Commissions appointed between 1896 and 1908, Costs, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1295 (i).
——— Ret., Inquiry for, 6288, 7447 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. (amt.) 11892 (vi).
Fruit Marks Act Prosecutions, Violation *re* Apples, &c. (Ques.) 4830 (iii).
Hintz, Fred., Location of Homestead (Ques.) 3235 (ii), 6238 (iv).

PORTER, Mr. E. G.—*Con.*

Homestead Entries, Records of Payments, of Scale by Peter Luenson to F. Heintz, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1294 (i).

Inspection and Sale Act (milk) Amt. (B. 64) 1° m., 1283 (i); on Order for 2°, 5226 (iii).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4673 (iii).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R. M. C., on M. for Sup., 1031 (i).

Land Entries of T. J. Oliver and Fred. Hintz, Cancellation of, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

N.B. Cold Storage Plants, Bonuses by Govt. (Ques.) 9272 (v).

—— Ministerial Connection *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9372, 9390 (v).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4701 (iii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8862 (v).

Section 32, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 8383 (v).

SUPPLY—

Post Office (clerical assistance) 8883 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8525 (v); (Winnipeg hospital) 10967 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 7455 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11078 (vi).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11072 (vi).

Trent Valley Canal Contracts, Deposits, &c. (Ques.) 1734 (i).

POWER, Mr. W., *Quebec, W.*

Quebec Ry. Light and Power Co.'s (B. 73) 1°*, 1584 (i).

PRINGLE, Mr. R. A., *Stormont.*

Audit and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12658 (vii).

Bank Act Amendment (prop. res.) 4248 (iii).

Banking Systems, Par. in 'Financial Post,' Ques. of Priv., 4770 (iii).

—— Ques. of Privilege *re* Newspaper Reports, 2306 (ii).

See 'Wheat.'

Canadian Bank of Commerce, Letter of Mr. E. B. Walker, Ques. of Priv., 6005 (iii).

Civil Service Bill, Physical Fitness (remarks) 11017 (vi).

Cornwall Canal, Arrangements with Mfg. Cos. *re* Water Power (remarks) 13084 (vii).

—— Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. on Sup., 12201 (vii).

—— Opening (remarks) 12660 (vii).

—— Payment of Dues on Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii).

PRINGLE, Mr. R. A.—*Con.*

Deep Waterways Commission, Damming St. Lawrence River at Long Sault (remarks) 13146 (vii).

Dominion Guarantee Co.'s (B. 127) in Com., 6183 (iii), 6231 (iv); on Senate Amts., 12772 (vii).

—— (B. 211) M. to suspend Rule, 12836 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13270 (vii).

London and Lancashire Guarantee and Accident Co.'s incorp. (B. 129) 1°*, 5255 (iii).

'Montcalm,' Str., Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1899 (i).

Old Age Pension Scheme (M.) for Sel. Com., 2398 (ii).

—— Progress *re* (remarks) 12660 (vii).

—— (remarks) 7722 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Marine—(ice-breakers) 1899 (i).

Wheat Transportation from West, Financial Aid *re* (Ques.) 173 (i).

—— on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2204 (ii).

PROULX, Mr. E., *Prescott.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Chute à Blondeau) 12094 (vii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W. (Minister of Public Works) *St. John City and County.*

Actonvale Public Building, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6232 (iv).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4723 (iii).

Allan, Mr., Interference in Dom. Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 615 (i).

Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank incorp. B. 141 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Anse. St. Jean Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).

Architects on Public Works, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).

Becancour Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 2392, 3040 (ii).

Bell Memorial Association (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11207 (vi).

Bell River Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 685 (i).

Belleville Drill Hall, Negotiations for Site, &c. (Ans.) 1509 (i).

—— Payments to Mr. J. Hurley (Ans.) 1738 (i).

Belleville Hospital Lot, Purchase Price, &c. (Ans.) 4830 (iii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 8557, 9067 (v).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Bic Wharf, Materials supplied, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ans.) 9713 (v).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5943 (iii).

Booms in International Streams, Regulation (B. 105) 1° m., 3654 (ii).

Brighton Wharf, Repairs to (remarks) 5913 (iii).

Bronze Coat-of-Arms, Duty *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7151 (iv).

Buildings, Administrative, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).

Buildings, Construction of, Papers laid on Table, 12771 (vii).

Burlington Channel Repairs, Apptmt. of Foreman (Ans.) 4404 (iii).

Campbellton Wharf, Contract *re* Piling (Ans.) 8612 (v).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) on M. for 2°, 13507 (vii).

C.P.R., Plaster Rock Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).

Canadian Timber used in Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11208 (vi).

Caron and Thiberge, Messrs., Employmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 10517 (vi).

Cement Testing Laboratory, Cost. &c. (statement) in Com. of Sup., 11250 (vi).

—— Purposes of Vote (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11206 (vi).

'Challenge,' Dredge, Quantity of Material removed (Ans.) 12651 (vii).

Charlemagne and Terrebonne Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 686 (i).

Charlotte County Wharf, Pet. *re* Erection (Ans.) 5202 (iii).

Chase's Point, N.B., Pet. *re* Construction (Ans.) 7937 (iv).

Chicoutimi Boom and Pulp Co.'s Payments, &c. (Ans.) 8175 (iv).

Chicoutimi Dredging Contract, Tenders *re*, &c. (Ans.) 7203 (iv).

Chicoutimi Public Expenditure, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Taylor) 13204 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5895 (iii).

Clarke City, Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ans.) 2394 (ii).

Clerk of Works *re* Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).

Clifton Breakwater, N.B., Amount of Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 695 (i).

Clinton Wharf Repairs, Extension of Contract, &c. (Ans.) 4832 (iii).

Cloutier, J. E., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 8380 (v).

Cobourg Harbour, Amount expended *re* Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 359 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Colchester Point, Pier, Essex County, Amt. expended (Ans.) 12652 (vii).

Corry Building, Total Annual Rental, Taxes, &c. (Ans.) 11938 (vi).

Coteau Landing Wharf, Repairs to (Ans.) 9277 (v).

Côté, Boivin & Co., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ans.) 12650 (vii).

Dauphin Public Building, Valuation of Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi).

Deep Waterways Commission, on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) *re* Progress (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).

Deputy Ministers, Payments for Special Services, &c. (Ans.) 1736 (i).

Deschambault Wharf, Tenders, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 5465 (iii).

Documents, Production of Originals, Announcement *re* (remarks) 1426 (i).

—— Production in Committees, 1428 (i).

—— Taken from Public Accounts Com. (remarks) 2308 (ii).

Dorval, Dredging at St. Lawrence Yacht Club (Ans.) 13060 (vii).

Dredges, registered in Canada (Ans.) 11497 (vi).

Dredging at Becancour, Blanche, &c., during 1907 (Ans.) 2392, 3040 (ii).

Dredging at Fort William, Amount paid to Great Lakes Dredging Co. (Ans.) 8839 (v).

Dredging at Port Arthur and Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 8618 (v).

Dredging Contract, O.C. *re*, on Inquiry for, 6927 (iv).

Dredging Contracts at Midland, &c., Advertisements for Tenders (remarks) 7195 (iv).

Dredging Contracts, Basis of Payments (Ans) 9711 (v).

—— O.C. *re* (remarks) 6853 (iv).

—— O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6745-6816 (iv).

Dredging Contracts, Payments to Great Lakes Dredging Co. (Ans.) 1737 (i).

Dredging Contracts (remarks) 7105 (iv).

—— Renewals without Tenders (remarks) 6633 (iv).

—— Tenders *re* (remarks) 9773 (v).

Dredging in Ont. and Que., for 1907-8, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 10008 (v).

Dredging in Quebec Prov., Claims Pending, &c. (Ans.) 7200 (iv).

Dredging Instructions to Inspectors, Circular (read) in Com. of Sup., 12043 (vi).

Dredging Tenders, on Inquiry for Ret., 8696 (v).

Dredging Work at Nicolet River, &c. (Ans.) 3897 (ii).

Drill Halls, Number constructed since 1896, Location, &c. (Ans.) 178 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Drill Halls, Ret., on Inquiry for, 4834, 5659 (iii), 6222 (iv).

Eclipse Co. of Ottawa, Payments to (Ans.) 6461 (iv).

—— Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7468 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13279

Fair Wages Schedule on Dredging Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 7200 (iv).

Farnham Post Office, Vote *re* Improvements (Ans.) 6399 (iv).

'Fielding,' Dredge, Number of Days working (Ans.) 7199 (iv).

Fire Extinguishers, Purchase by Govt., Number, &c. (Ans.) 1510 (i).

—— Explanation *re* Purchases, 5658 (iii).

—— Ret., on Inquiry for, 4833 (iii).

—— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7643 (iv).

Floods at Chatham and Belleville (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4745 (iii).

Fortier, Mr. Eugene, Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 8613 (v).

Foster, Frederick, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12652 (vii).

Garthby, Govt. Wharf, Inspection by Midraud, &c. (Ans.) 3844 (ii).

Gatineau Point Bridge, Amount contributed by Govt. (Ans.) 355 (i).

Gelinas, Mr., Repayment of Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 654 (i).

Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction (remarks) on Conc., 13568 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal, Report *re* Estimated Cost (remarks) 12053 (vii).

—— Rep. *re* (remarks) 12836 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Survey, Final Report, &c. (Ans.) 240 (i), 5465 (iii).

—— on Inquiry for, 1740 (i).

—— Papers laid on Table, 8378 (v).

—— Rep. of Surveys, on Inquiry for (Mr. White) 11827 (vi).

Godfroi River Wharf, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3423 (ii).

Govt. Employees, and Provincial Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10989 (vi).

Grand Bend Pier, Final Estimate *re* (Ans.) 8891 (v).

—— Ret., Delays, &c. (remarks) 4408 (iii).

Grand Manan Telegraph System, Application *re* Leasing (Ans.) 6463 (iv).

Grand River Wharf, Tenders, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 8382 (v).

Grandes Piles Dam, Amount voted, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 13059 (vii).

G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale (B. 89) M. for Com. on Res., 2221; 1°*, 2260 (ii); in Com., 12060 (vii).

See 'Major's Hill Park.'

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8130, 8745, 9462 (iv).

—— Ques. of Order *re* 'Imputing Motives,' 8134 (iv).

G.T.P., Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13301 (vii).

Gravenhurst Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).

Hackett Dock, Purchase of (Ans.) 7730 (iv).

Halifax Customs House, Name of Contractor (Ans.) 7212 (iv).

Higgin's Shore Wharf, Pet. *re* Extension (Ans.) 695 (i).

Hillsborough Bridge Return, on Inquiry for, 6160 (iii).

Hillsborough Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7188 (iv).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10198 (vi).

—— Allotment of Rooms in New Wing (remarks) 5729 (iii).

—— Ventilation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10978 (vi), 13340 (vii).

See 'Postal,' 'Restaurent.'

Howard's Cape, Wharf, Pet. *re* Investigation (Ans.) 11702 (vi).

Hudson, Dredging, 1907, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4587 (iii).

Hunter, Mr. J. B., Apptmt. as Dep. Min. of Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1459 (i), 5698 (iii).

Indian Lands, B.C., Provincial Rights, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 631 (i).

Inspectors of Public Works, Apptmts. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5678 (iii).

Inverness Harbour, Purchase of McIsaac's Pond (Ans.) 5792 (iii).

Inverness Public Building, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 5998 (iii).

I.C.R., Branch Lines (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13489 (vii).

—— Hard Pine Tenders, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3233 (ii).

—— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4451 (iii).

Interprovincial Ry. Bridge Co., N.B., Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

Jesus River, Dredging, Payments to Mr. Morgan (Ans.) 6980 (iv).

Juvenile Delinquents, B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12406 (vii).

'King Edward,' Dredge, Emplymt. in Lunenburg Harbour (Ans.) 13063 (vii).

Lacas, Mr., Payments to by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1038 (i).

Lachine Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12098 (vii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Ladysmith Wharf, B.C., Cost of (Ans.) 8176 (iv).

Lafferty, Thos., Payment for Removal of Snags in St. John River (Ans.) 8379 (v).

Lake Francois Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12139 (vii).

Lake Megantic, Public Works, Total Cost to date, &c. (Ans.) 11299 (vi).

Leonardville Wharf, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost (Ans.) 6463 (iv).

Loggieville, Dredging, Payments *re* (Ans.) 9472 (v).

'Lord Kitchener,' Tug Boat, Payments *re* Services (Ans.) 7198 (iv).

Major's Hill Park and G.T.Ry. Co.'s Hotel, Sale (B. 89) prop. Res., 1584 (i).
See 'G.T.R.'

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12799 (vii).

Matchedash Bay, Dredging done at Fesserton, &c. (Ans.) 566 (i).

Medicine Hat, Building, Contract *re* Heating System (Ans.) 10791 (vi).

Midland and Tiffin Dredging, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 3428 (ii).

—— Expenditure *re* Dredging, 1907 (Ans.) 8181 (iv).

Midland Harbour, Tenders for Dredging (Ans.) 8893 (v).

Milford Haven Wharf, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 13060 (vii).

'Montague,' Dredge, Amounts paid for Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 182 (i), 8172 (iv).

Montmagny and Cap St. Ignace Wharfs, Construction of, &c. (Ans.) 1288 (i).

Montmorency Falls, Walls, Length, &c. (Ans.) 12410 (vii).

Montreal 'Gazette,' Building, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 3900 (ii).

Montreal Harbour and St. Lawrence River, Dredging and Elevator Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1683 (i).

Montreal Post Office Addition, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 6922 (iv).

Monuments to McGee and Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13352 (vii).

N. B. Cold Storage Co., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9376 (v).

N. B. Inland Water Wharfs, Construction Policy (Ans.) 5465 (iii).

N. B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3663 (ii).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7134 (iv).

Nicolet County, Govt. Expenditures from 1896-1908 (Ans.) 12775 (vii).

—— Dredging, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4588 (iii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Nicolet Post Office, Contracts, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3838 (ii).

Nicolet River Dredging, Emplymt. of Narcisse Jutras (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

—— Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3840 (ii).

Nicolet River Wharf, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3479 (ii).

North East Harbour Wharf, Total Length (Ans.) 11019 (vi).

Notre Dame du Portage Wharf, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 6400 (iv).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 131 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 7725 (iv).

Office Specialty Co., Quantity of Goods supplied Govt. (Ans.) 3039 (ii).

Ont. and Quebec Dredging, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 9276 (v).

Order, Ques. of, Withdrawal of word 'grafter,' 10994 (vi).

Oromocto Shoals, Contract *re* Dredging (Ans.) 11496 (vi).

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. at Nicolet Post Office (Ans.) 11702 (vi).

Ottawa Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 3842 (ii).

Owen Sound Public Building, Contract *re* Extension (Ans.) 3039 (ii).

—— Inspector, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 3039 (ii).

—— Sub-letting of Contract by Leslie (Ans.) 3039 (ii).

Owen Sound Dredging Co., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 2792 (ii).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6231 (iv).

Pelican Lake Channel, Opening of (Ans.) 1940 (i).

Petawawa Dock, Tenders *re* Improvements (Ans.) 685 (i).

Petit Rocher Breakwater, Return (remarks) 7108 (iv).

—— Incomplete Return (remarks) 5725 (iii).

—— on Inquiry for, 6464 (iv).

—— Papers laid on Table, 10402 (vi).

—— Statement as to Missing Letters (remarks) 9716 (v).

Pictou Post Office, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost (Ans.) 10518 (vi).

Pinette Harbour, Pets. *re* Dredging (Ans.) 685 (i).

Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Construction, &c. (Ans.) 3898 (ii).

Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Contract of Messrs. Dusseault & Pageau (Ans.) 8839 (v).

—— Date of Contract (Ans.) 9268 (v).

—— Tenders, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1734 (i)

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Number of Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 2394 (ii).

Port Arthur Dredging, Contracts, Securities, &c. (Ans.) 697 (i).

Port Bruce Harbour, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2389 (ii).

Port Colborne, Total Expenditure *re* Improvements (Ans.) 4403 (iii).

Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 10513 (vi).

Port Dufferin Dredging, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4828 (iii).

Port Hood Harbours, Closing of Northern Entrance (Ans.) 10255 (v).

Port St. Francois Wharf, Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3424 (ii).

Port Stanley Breakwater, Contractors, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 240 (i).

Port Vernon Bridge, Completion of Works, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 4404 (iii).

Postal Service in House of Com. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).

Presbyterian College, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7669 (iv).

P.E.I., Public Works, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1686 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Ret., 2172 (ii).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 8696, 9893 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).

P.E.I., Souris Breakwater, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 1685 (i).

Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7192 (iv).

Public Works, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

Public Works Dept., New Apptmts. (Ans.) 13061 (vii).

——— Employees at Hamilton, Delay in Pay (remarks) 10016, 10119 (v).

——— Estimates, Discussions *re* (remarks) 5661 (iii).

——— Ret., on Inquiry for, 6223 (iv).

Quebec County, Govt. Expenditures, on M. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4896 (iii).

Quebec County, Govt. Expenditures, on M. (Mr. Robitaille) for Ret., 3853 (ii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6226 (iv).

Quebec and N. B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13291 (vii).

Quebec Port, Sums expended for Improvements, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10649 (vi).

Raquette River Dredging, Contract *re* (Ans.) 4588 (iii).

——— correcting answer, 5658 (iii).

Red Head Wharf, N.S., Total Expenditure (Ans.) 11019 (vi).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Reinhardt, Paul, Emplymt. in Provincial Elections, Hull (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10988 (vi).

Representation from the Mar. Provs., Ques. of Priv., 9892 (v).

Restaurant of House of Com. and Senate, Joint Com. (M.) 13224 (vii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 2385, 3581 (ii).

Rhindress, Dr. Horace, Salary as Port Physician (Ans.) 6000 (iii), 6232 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12000 (vi).

Rideau Hall Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 5467 (iii).

Rimouski Dredging, &c., *re* Landing of 'Lady Evelyn' (Ans.) 7727 (iv).

Rimouski Public Works, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 10013 (v).

Rivard, Mr. S., Apptmt. as Supt. of Nicolet Post Office (Ans.) 11702 (vi).

Rivière à la Graisse, Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 686 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 3689 (ii).

Rivière du Loup Post Office, Improvement to Grounds (Ans.) 6399 (iv).

——— Wharf, Total Amount of Dredging (Ans.) 6462 (iv).

Ruscomb River Works, Estimate of Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1122 (i).

St. Andrews Rapids Improvement Co., Land Grant to Great Falls Power Co. (Ans.) 238 (i).

St. Anicet Wharf, Expenditure by Public Works Dept. (Ans.) 3479 (ii).

St. Boniface Public Building, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ans.) 5999 (iii).

St. Francis River, Melbourne Pier, Removal of Rock, &c. (Ans.) 6918 (iv).

——— Richmond Pier, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 6641, 6919 (iv).

St. Fulgence Pier, Signatures on Pay List, &c. (Ans.) 1116 (i).

St. John, N.B., Contracts with Dom. Dredging Co. (Ans.) 11700 (vi).

St. John Port, Dredging Contracts, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 11497 (vi).

St. John River, Snags, Removal of, Tender *re* (Ans.) 3478 (ii).

St. Joseph's Wharf, Payments to *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 8890 (v).

St. Laurent Wharf, Expenditure *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 896, 1121 (i).

St. Laurent Wharf, Lake Manitoba (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).

St. Mary's Post Office, Total Cost (Ans.) 11019 (vi).

——— Items *re* Expenditure of $658.03 (Ans.) 11937 (vi).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Saguenay and Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Amounts paid for Use of Boom, &c. (Ans.) 183 (i).

Saguenay Dredging, Purchase of Coal, &c. (Ans.) 8380 (v).

——— 'Storm King,' Tug, Emplymt. of (Ans.) 8381 (v).

See 'Chicoutimi.'

Sandwich Post Office Site, Price, &c. (Ans.) 7201 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7675, 7722 (iv), 8563, 9068 (v).

Scotch Town Wharf, Application (Ans.) 7202 (iv).

Seal Cove Dredging, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost (Ans.) 6463 (iv).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5425, 5520 (iii).

'Sir Wilfrid Laurier,' Dredge, Completion, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 5207 (iii).

Skinner's Cove, Boat Channel, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 10012 (v).

Snag Boat, Red River, Construction of, &c. (Ans.) 567, 891 (i).

Souris Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 1939 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12599 (vii).

Spanish River Dredging, Amount expended (Ans.) 4764 (iii).

'Speedy,' Str., Purchase, Commission, &c. (Ans.) 565 (i), 3844 (ii).

Spry Bay Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, (Ans.) 2392 (ii).

Stoney Lake Dock, Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 5564, 5787 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries) 638 (i), 12917 (vii).

Indians—N. B. (salaries) 12737; (schools) 13172 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5766 (iii).

Post Office (inspectors) 13153 (vii).

Public Works—(Ass't. Dep. Minister) 5698 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Chilliwack) 13338 (vii); (Cranbrook) 10864 (vi), 13338 (vii); (Cumberland) 10864 (vi); (Fernie) 5706 (iii), 10866 (vi); (Grand Forks) 13338; (Greenwood) 13338 (vii); (Ladysmith) 10866 (vi), 13338 (vii); (Quesnel) 10867 (vi); (Revelstoke) 13339 (vii); (Vancouver) 10868 (v), 13339 (vii); (Vernon) 10870 (vi), 13339 (vii); (Victoria) 10883; (Victoria, immigration) 10874; (William's Head) 10883 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886; (cattle quarantine stations) 11008; (experimental farms, repairs) 10904 (vi), 13339 (vii); (furniture) 11007; (immigration, repairs) 11008; (post office fittings) 11007; (quarantine stations) 11008; (rents, &c.) 10981; List read, 10998; (repairs) 10886 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 8517 (v), 10953, 10974; (Dauphin) 8519 (v); (Elmwood) 13335 (vii); Emerson) 8534 (v), 13335 (vii); (Neepawa) 8536 (v), 13336; (Portage la Prairie) 13336 (vii); (St. Boniface) 8566; (Selkirk) 8547 (v); (Souris) 13336; (Winnipeg) 13336 (vii); (Winnipeg hospital) 10955 (vi); (Winnipeg immigration) 8573 (v); (Winnipeg military) 10969 (vi); (Winnipeg P. O.) 8575; (Winnipeg warehouse) 8566 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fairville) 13328; (Fredericton) 13328; (Grand Falls) 13328; (Hillsborough) 13328; (Moncton) 13328 (vii); (quarantine, steam sterilizer) 7187; (quarantine, water service) 7186; (St. John) 7186 (iv), 13329 (vii); (St. John, military) 7186 (iv); (St. John, quarantine station) 5703 (iii); (Tracadie Lazaretto) 7187 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10975 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Antigonish) 7110; (Bridgewater) 7135; (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax) 7140; (Halifax, customs) 7144; (Halifax, immigration) 7143; (Halifax, military) 7143; (Halifax, quarantine) 7171; (Inverness) 7172 (iv); (Lunenburg) 13326; (Parrsboro) 13327 (vii); (Shelburne) 7173; (Westville) 7179 (iv); (Wolfville) 13327 (vii); (Yarmouth) 7180 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Arnprior) 7454; (Belleville) 7678; (Belleville armoury) 7455; (Brantford) 7455; (Dom. renewals) 7467; (Glencoe) 7473 (iv), 13331; (Guelph) 13331 (vii); (Guelph, armoury) 7678; (Hamilton, drill hall) 7692; (Hamilton, post office) 7696 (iv); (Harriston) 13331 (vii); (Kincardine) 7698; (Kingston) 7814; (Kingston, artillery park) 7701; (Kingston, gun shed) 7700; (Kingston, hospital) 7702 (iv); (Kingston, magazine) 10907; (Kingston, militia stores) 10907 (vi); (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7702 (iv), 10907 (vi); (Leamington) 7705, 7815 (iv), 13331; (Listowel) 13331 (vii); (London, magazine) 7705; (London, military) 7706; (Markham) 7709 (iv), 13331; (Mitchell) 13332; (Mount Forest) 13331; (Niagara) 13332 (vii); (North Bay) 7712, 7810 (iv), 13332 (vii); (Owen Sound) 7817 (iv); (Park Hill) 13332 (vii); (Peterborough) 13332 (vii); (Port Arthur) 7825 (iv), 13332 (vii); (Renfrew) 7825 (iv); (St. Mary's) 7826 (iv); (Sarnia) 7829 (iv), 13333; (Seaforth) 13332 (vii); (Simcoe) 7830 (iv), 13333; (Sudbury) 13333 (vii); (Tilsonburg) 13333 (vii); (Uxbridge) 13333 (vii); (Walkerville) 13333 (vii); (Waterloo) 13333 (vii); (Welland) 7830 (iv); (Whitby) 7833 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives) 5700 (iii); (deptl. buildings) 1505 (i), (eastern block) 1504 (i); (elevator attendants) 11011 (vi); (grounds) 11012 (vi); (heating, &c.) 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii); (House of Commons, addition) 1486 (i); (improvements, &c.) 5707 (iii); (lighting) 11011 (vi); (Major's Hill park) 11015 (vi); (mint) 1451, 1474 (i);

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

(museum) 1489 (i), 13477 (vii); (new deptl. building) 5701 (iii); (observatory) 1450, 1485 (i); (post office) 5705 (iii); (printing bureau, motors) 7817 (iv); (rents, &c.) 5706 (iii); (repairs, furniture, &c.) 10981 (vi); (Rideau Hall) 11005 (vi); (skylights) 7816 (iv); (telephones) 11012 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Georgetown) 7183 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaskaville) 13329 (vii); (Chicoutimi) 7279 (iv); (Cookshire) 7281 (iv); (Dominion, renewals) 7286 (iv); (Dundee) 7286 (iv); (Farnham) 7287 (iv); (Grand Mere) 13329 (vii); (Grosse Isle) 7289, 7290 (iv); (Joliette) 13329 (vii); (Knowlton) 7290 (iv), 13329 (vii); (Lachute) 7293 (iv), 13329 (vii); (Lake Megantic) 7294 (iv); (Levis) 7294 (iv), 13329 (vii); (Longueuil) 7304 (iv); (Magog) 7306 (iv); 13329 (vii); (Marieville) 7306 (iv); (Megantic) 13330 (vii); (Montreal, barracks) 7407 (iv); (Montreal, examining warehouse) 7423 (iv); (Montreal, military) 7418 (iv); (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5703 (iii); (Montreal, postal station) 7418 (iv); (Montreal, post office) 7410 (iv); (Montreal, station C) 7419 (iv); (Nicolet) 7428 (iv); (Plessisville) 7430 (iv), 13330 (vii); (Point St. Charles) 7419 (iv), 13330 (vii); (Quebec Citadel) 7430 (iv); (Que. Dominion arsenal) 7435 (iv); (Quebec, drill hall) 7431 (iv); (Quebec, hospital) 7433 (iv); (Quebec, immigrants) 7432 (iv); (Quebec, warehouse) 7432 (iv); (Roberval) 13330 (vii); (St. Henri) 7439 (iv); (St. Hyacinthe) 7440 (iv); (St. John's, military) 7440 (iv); (St. John's, post office) 7444 (iv); (St. Rochs) 7438 (iv); (St. Therese) 13330 (vii); (Shawenegan) 13330 (vii); (Sherbrooke) 13330 (vii); (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 7439 (iv); (Three Rivers) 13330 (vii); (Westmount) 13331 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 8576 (v); (Calgary) 8578 (v); (Edmonton) 5706 (iii), 8579 (v), 13336 (vii); (Estevan) 8581 (v), 13336 (vii); (Humboldt) 8582 (v); (Lethbridge) 13336 (vii); (Maple Creek) 8600 (v), 13337 (vii); (Medicine Hat) 8601 (v); (Moose Jaw) 13336 (vii); (Prince Albert) 13337 (vii); (Prince Albert, penitentiary) 8601 (v); (Regina) 8602 (v); (Saskatoon) 8602 (v), 13337 (i); (Strathcona) 13338 (vii); (Wetaskiwin) 13338 (vii); (Yorkton) 8603)v).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's residence) 10883 (vi); (Dawson) 13339 (vii); (maintenance) 11005 (vi).

Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (North Thompson river) 13352 (vii); Mar. Provs. (new plant) 12143 (vii); Ont. and Que. (generally) 13351 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Spillumcheen) 13351 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs, &c.) 11694, 12032 (vi); (graving docks) 5731 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Grand Marais) 12140 (vii); (Lake Dauphin) 12141 (vii); (St. Andrew's rapids) 5701 (iii), 12145 (v); Winnipegosis Lake) 12141 (vii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 12028 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Beaver) 13344 (vii); (Buctouche) 11679 (vi); (Campbellton) 13344 (vii); (Campbellton wharf) 11685 (vi); (Caraquet) 11685 (vi); (Dorchester) 13344 (vii); (Dover wharf) 11692 (vi); (Harvey) 13344 (vii); (Leonardsville) 13344 (vii); (Lorneville) 13344 (vii); (Lower Newcastle) 11696 (vi); (Madawaska) 11696 (vi), 13344; (Miscou) 13344 (vii); (Moncton) 11696 (vi); (New Mills) 13345 (vii); (Richibucto) 11698 (vi); (St. Andrews) 12011 (vi); (St. John) 11698 (vi); (St. John, harbour) 12011 (vi); (St. John, improvements) 5708 (iii); (St. John, surveys) 13346 (vii); (St. John, tidal waters) 12000 (vi); (St. John, wharfs) 13345 (vii); (Shippegan) 12027 (vi); (Tracadie) 13349 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11207 (vi); (Baddeck) 11219 (vi); (Barachois) 11224 (vi); (Bay St. Lawrence) 11224 (vi); (Big Lorraine) 11224 (vi); (Breton Cove) 11224 (vi); (Cape St. Mary) 11224 (vi); (Caribou Island causeway) 11224 (vi); (Charlos cove) 11225 (vi); (Church Point) 11225 (vi); (Cow Bay) 11225 (vi); (Digby) 11226 (vi); (dredging) 13340 (vii); (Glace Bay) 11228 (vi); (Hall's Harbour) 11228 (vi); (McPherson's cove) 11229 (vi); (Margaree) 11229 (vi); (Middle River) 11230 (vi); (New Glasgow) 11257 (vi); (Oyster Pond) 11258 (vi); (Parker's Cove) 11258 (vi); (Parrsborough) 11259 (vi); (Pointerville pier) 11260 (v); (Porter's Lake) 11260 (vi); (Port Hastings) 11265 (vi); (Port Hilford) 11267 (vi); (Port Hood) 11268 (vi); (Port Joli West) 11279 (vi); (Port Royal) 11278 (vi); (Portuguese cove) 11279 (vi); (Pugwash wharf) 11280 (vi); (Round Hill) 11282 (vi); (Skinner's cove) 11290 (vi); (Sydney wharf) 11230 (vi); (Tancook island) 11230 (vi); (Tatamagouche) 11291 (vi); (Yarmouth) 11291 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Beaverton) 12090 (vii); (Belle River) 12090 (vii); (Blanche River) 12090 (vii); (Blind River) 12091 (vii); (Bronte) 12092 (vii); (Bronte, dredging) 5708 (iii); (Burlington) 12092 (vii); (Chute a Blondeau) 12092 (vii); (Cobourg) 12095 (vii); (Colborne) 12095 (vii); (Collingwood) 12096 (vii); (Georgian Bay surveys) 13326 (vii); (Goderich) 12101 (vii); (Goderich, breakwater) 13350 (vii); (Gore's Landing) 12101 (vii); (Juniper Island) 13350 (vii); (Lakefield) 13350 (vii); (Little Current) 13350 (vii); (McGregor's Creek) 12103 (vii); (Magnetawan) 13350 (vii); (Meaford) 12103 (vii); (Michipicoten) 13350 (vii); (Midland and Tiffin) 12105 (vii); (Petawawa) 12133 (vii); (Peterborough) 12133 (vii); (Point Edward) 5713 (iii); (Port Arthur, &c.) 12144 (vii); (Port Burwell) 12135 (vii); (Port Colborne) 12146 (vii); (Port Credit) 12102 (vii); (Port Hope) 12135 (vii); (Port Stanley) 12136 (vii); (Rainy River) 12136 (vii); (Roche's Point) 12136 (vii); (Ron-

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

deau) 12137 (vii); (Rossport) 12137 (vii); (Sault Ste. Marie) 12137 (vii); (Severn) 12137 (vii); (Smeeth and McGillicuddy) 13350 (vii); (Southampton) 12137 (vii); (Stanley Island pier) 5720 (iii); (Temiskaming Lake) 13350 (vii); (Tiffin) 13351 (vii); (Tiffin, dredging) 5709 (iii); (Tobermory) 13351 (vii); (Toronto) 12137 (vii); (Victoria) 12137 (vii); (Winnipeg River) 12138 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (McPherson's cove) 11292 (vi); (New London) 11292 (vi); (repairs) 11292 (vi); (Rustico) 11293 (vi); (Souris) 13341 (vii); (Summerside) 13343 (vii).

Public Works Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse a la Barbe) 12028 (vi); (Anse a l'Ilot) 12029 (vi); (Baie St. Paul) 12029 (vi); (Barachois de Malbaie) 12029 (vi); (Batiscan) 12029 (vi); (Batiscan, river) 12036 (vi); (Berthier) 12029 (vi); (Bic wharf) 12030 (vi); (Bonaventure) 12036 (vi); (Cap St. Ignace) 12030 (vi); (Chateauguay) 12030 (vi); (Chicoutimi) 12030 (vi); (Clarke City) 12031 (vi); (East Templeton) 12031 (vi); (Escoumains) 12031 (vi); (Father Point) 12031 (vi); (Grand Mechins) 12031 (vi); (Grande Riviere) 12031 (vi); (Lake Aylmer) 12032 (vi); (Lake Megantic) 12032 (vi); (Lake St. Francis) 12033 (vi); (Lake St. John) 12033 (vi); (Lavaltrie) 12033 (vi); (Les Eboulements) 12033 (vi); (Lotbiniere) 12033 (vi); (Magdalen Islands) 12034 (vi); (Malbay) 12034 (vi); (Matane) 12034 (vi); (Montmagny) 12034 (vi); (Nicolet) 12034 (vi); (Notre Dame de Portage) 12034 (vi); (Peribonka) 12035 (vi); (Petite Decharge) 12034 (vi); (Piche Point) 12035 (vi); (Pointe aux Trembles) 12035 (vi); (Quebec, harbour) 12144 (vii); (Richelieu) 12037 (vi); (Rimouski) 12035 (vi); (Riviere du Lievre) 12037 (vi); (Riviere du Loup) 12036 (vi); (Riviere Maskinonge) 12037 (vi); (Riviere Ouelle) 12037 (vi); (St. Alphonse) 12041 (vi); (Ste. Anne des Monts) 12042 (vi); (St. Francis) 12041 (vi); (St. Francois) 12042 (vi); (St. Ignace de Loyola) 12042 (vi); (St. Jacques) 12041 (vi); (St. Jean des Chaillons) 12042 (vi); (St. Jean Orleans) 12042 (vi); (St. Laurent) 12042 (vi); (St. Louis) 12040 (vi); (St. Maurice River) 12041 (vi); (St. Omer) 12042 (vi); (St. Pierre les Becquets) 12042 (vi); (St. Simeon) 12042 (vi); (Saguenay) 12040 (vi); (Sorel) 12042 (vi); (Three Rivers, deep water wharf) 13349 (vii); (Varennes) 12042 (vi); (Yamaska, dredging) 12043 (vi); (Yamaska, lock) 12041 (vi); (Yamaska, river) 5708 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (Lesser Slave Lake) 5719 (iii); (Lesser Slave) 13351 (vii); (Old Man's River) 12142 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (architects' branch) 11096 (vi); (cement testing) 11078 (vi); (clerical assistance) 11099 (vi); (Deep Waterways Commission) 11101 (vi); (engineering branch) 11093 (vi); (gratuities) 5730 (iii); (International Commission *re* Red River) 11118 (vi); (monuments) 11118 (vi); (technical books) 11100 (vi); (telegraph branch) 11097 (vi); (unprovided items) 11119 (vi).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Shellmouth) 12143 (vii).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys, &c.) 11071 (vi).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines (Ashcroft-Dawson) 5731 (iii); (B. C. Cape Beale Lines) 5732 (iii); (cable service) 5731 (iii); (Chicoutimi) 13179 (vii); (Marconi) 12143 (vii); (operating) 13178 (vii); (Yukon) 13179 (vii).

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay surveys) 12146 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (St. John accommodation) 12257 (vii).

Sussex St. Property Purchase, Payments to Jos. Riopelle (Ans.) 3844 (ii).

Tache, J. C., Emplymt. in Public Works Dept. (Ans.) 8180 (iv).

Tatamagouche Dredging, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 11701 (vi).

Tenders, Lists of Papers *re* Advertisements (read) in Com. of Sup., 7476 (iv).

Tiffin, Tenders *re* Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 8893 (v).

Tignish Breakwater, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 3229 (ii).

Tignish Harbour, Pet. *re* Extension (Ans.) 682 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).

Tilbury, Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vii).

Toney River Boat Harbour, Contract Price, Extras, &c. (Ans.) 9712 (v).

Toronto Harbour (eastern gap), Amount of Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 354 (i).

——— Construction of Entrance (Ans.) 355 (i).

——— Murray & Cleveland's Contract, Date, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1507 (i).

Toronto Harbour (western entrance) Contract Price, &c. (Ans.) 518 (i), 4587 (iii), 10014 (v).

——— Entrance, Delay in Contract (remarks) 5915 (iii).

Toronto Island Tunnel, Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 5564 (iii).

Town Site Property, Section 32, Public Works *re* (Ans.) 1125 (i).

Tracadie Harbour Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction (Ans.) 5472 (iii).

Transportation: *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.

Trueman, Mr., and N. B. Cold Storage Co., Ques. of Priv., 9343 (v).

Truro Armoury, Estimate for Heating and Electric Wiring (Ans.) 3429 (ii).

Uniforms and Customs Duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9571 (v).

Vaudreuil County, Dredging, Supt.'s Salary, &c. (Ans.) 4587 (iii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Vautelet, Mr., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 642 (i).

Ventilation of H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vii).

See 'House of Commons,' &c.

Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I., Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 5471 (iii).

Victoria Beach Pier, Amounts expended, &c. (Ans.) 237 (i).

Victoria Harbour, Tenders *re* Dredging (Ans.) 8893 (v).

Welchpool Wharf, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 7935 (iv).

Western Block Extension, Total Expenditure, Area, &c. (Ans.) 512 (i).

Westville Public Building, Total Cost (Ans.) 9475 (v).

Wharfs, Piers and Harbours, Expenditure *re*, on M. (Mr. Blain) for Cor., 5476 (iii).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 4867 (iii).

Winfield Basin Dredging, Tenders, Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 6461 (iv).

White Head Wharf, Report *re* Cost (Ans.) 6463 (iv).

Wiarton Dredging, 1907, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 6236 (iv).

——— Payments to Mr. Bowman, &c. (Ans.) 6407 (iv).

Yarmouth, Dredging Contracts, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 11500 (vi).

Yukon Telegraphs, Receipts and Expenses (Ans.) 512 (i).

——— Service to Prince Rupert, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 1934 (i).

REID, Mr. J. D., *Grenville.*

Acetylene Gas Works at Prescott, Emplymt. of Political Officers (remarks) in deb. on Technical Education, 3292 (ii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4504 (iii).

Beauharnois Canal, Lease of Water Power (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).

Belleville—Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 8553 (v).

Blue Books, Distribution of (remarks) 432 (i).

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2993 (ii).

Boneless Meat, Frozen, Imported into G.B., Par. in English Newspapers, &c. (Ques.) 3230 (ii).

Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Service (remarks) on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 188 (i).

Canada Shipping Act Amt., B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12853, 13052 (vii).

Canned Foods Inspection Act, Enforcement of (Ques.) 3846 (ii).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6871 (iv).

Catharine C., Incomplete Return (remarks) 5727 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11566 (vi).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5891 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5627 (iii).

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).

Cypress Hills, Timber Reserve, Preservation of, &c. (Ques.) 3841 (ii).

Deep Waterways Commission, St. Lawrence River Dam (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).

——— Damming of St. Lawrence at Long Sault (remarks) 13151 (vii).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1638 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1875 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12941 (vii).

Doukhobors, Religious Fanatics, Par. in Newspapers (remarks) 12161 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13270 (vii).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13297 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3798 (ii).

Gilmore, Edith May Relief (B. 164) 1°*, 8377; 2°*, 8610 (v).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6269 (iv).

Govt. Works, Emplymt. of Technical Students, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3292 (ii).

G.T.Ry., Connections at Prescott (remarks) 433 (i).

Halliday Bros., Supplies to Lighthouses, Rates, &c. (Ques.) 6236 (iv).

Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Claims of M. J. Haney, Arbitration *re* (remarks) 1739 (i).

Indian Lands at New Westminster, Sale of (Ques.) 3037, 3839 (ii).

I.C.R., Delays to Maritime Express, &c. (Ques.) 8614 (v).

——— Number of Tons of Steel Rails, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6240 (iv).

——— Rolling Stock in Service on Sundays, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6240 (iv).

——— Rolling Stock, Purchase of, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6240 (iv).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Trains breaking down, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6240 (iv).
——— Train Service, Explanations *re* Delays, &c. (M. for ret.) 6242 (iv).
——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4469 (iii).
Kananaski Falls Water Power, Granting of Rights, &c. (Ques.) 3036 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 3850 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 5491 (iii), 6464 (iv).
Lake Francois Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12139 (vii).
Lighting Buoys on Rideau Canal, Contract *re* (Ques.) 9476 (v).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl., Book-keeping, &c., ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4004 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel (remarks) 7327 (iv).
——— Officers under Suspension (remarks) 6847 (iv).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3018 (ii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6894, 7247 (iv).
Medicine Hat Building, Contract *re* Heating System (Ques.) 10791 (vi).
'Montcalm,' Collision with C.P.R. Steamer, Par. in 'Montreal Gazette' (remarks) 8086 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Contract *re* Cement, &c. (Ques.) 7199, 7499 (iv).
North Grove Post Office, Letters, Pets. *re* Establishment of (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).
——— Return Inquiry for, 5490 (iii).
Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4107 (ii).
Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6227 (iv).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution of (remarks) 609 (i).
Patterson, J. W., Govt. Lands in B.C., Sale to (Ques.) 6002 (iii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).
Petition. (M.) to introduce, 1682 (i).
Plains of Abraham, Lease to Ross Rifle Co., &c. (Ques.) 1348 (i).
Postal Arrangements between U. S. and Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3894 (ii).
P.E.I., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1739 (i), 2740 (ii).
Public Accounts Committee, Meetings, &c., Adjournments, &c. (remarks) 1439 (i).
——— Production of Original Documents (remarks) 4495 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3084 (i).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

Public Works Dept., Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4890 (iii).
Quebec and N.B. Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6225 (iv).
Quebec and N. B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13291 (vii).
Quebec Troops, Food supplied (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).
Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3929 (ii).
Ry. Passenger Ticket Act Amt. (B. 90) 1° m., 2466 (ii); 2° m., 5244 (iii).
——— (remarks) 3404 (ii).
Rideau Canal, Buoys between Merrickville and Edmond Rapids, Contract *re* Lighting (Ques.) 8613 (v).
Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4666 (iii).
See 'Documents.'
Returns unopposed, *re* I. C. R. (remarks) 5914 (iii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 8516 (v).
St. Lawrence Power and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., &c., 3009 (ii).
See 'Deep Waterways.'
Salmon Licenses, Leases &c., in B.C. (Ques.) 5652 (iii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 5801 (iii).
Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8560, 8610 (v).
Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5458 (iii).
S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12598 (vii).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 3°, 1929 (i).
Spain, Commander, Travelling Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1012 (i).

SUPPLY—
Agriculture (seed grain) 5500 (iii).
Canals—Galops (Upper entrance) 5671 (iii).
Canals—Lachine (slope walls) 5664 (iii).
Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 12223 (vii).
Canals—Soulanges (Manning & Macdonald's claims) 5669 (iii).
Canals—Welland (dredging slide) 5673 (iii); (electric lighting) 12197; (Port Colborne) 12216 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5681 (iii); (widening) 12211 (vii).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (Dep. Minister) 12878 (vii); Interior (salaries, &c.) 616 (i); Marine and Fisheries (ass't. dep. min.) 12915; Sec. of State (C. S. examiners) 12917 (vii).
Marine (ice-breakers) 1909 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 5735 (iii); (customs dues) 12155; (Dom. arsenal) 12154; (properties) 12148; (provisions) 12150;

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

(R. M. College) 12153; (warlike stores) 12149 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2942, 2950; (life-saving awards) 2972; (masters and mates) 2969 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5522 (iii).

Post Office (inspectors) 13253 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 8517 (v), 10953 (vi); (Neepawa) 8544; (St. Boniface) 8566; (Selkirk) 8547 (v); (Winnipeg, hospital) 10955 (vi); (Winnipeg, warehouse) 8567 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Antigonish) 7111 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brantford) 7463; (Dom. renewals) 7479; (Glencoe) 7497 (iv); (Kingston) 10913 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 1450; (deptl. buildings) 1505; (House of Com., additions) 1486; (mint) 1451, 1474; (museum) 1490; (observatory) 1485 (i); (skylights) 7816 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Farnham) 7288; (Grosse Isle) 7289; (Knowlton) 7292; (Lavis) 7294 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8582 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Dauphin) 12141; (St. Andrew's Rapids) 12145 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Digby) 11226; (Porter's Lake) 11260 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Brighton) 12134; (Chute à Blondeau) 12092; (Colborne) 12095; (Midland and Tiffin) 12125; (Petewawa) 12133 (vii); (Point Edward) 5713 (iii); (Port Colborne) 12146; (Roche's Point) 12186 (vii); (Stanley Island wharf) 5720 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. Quebec harbour) 12144 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11090; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11116; (engineering branch) 11094 (vi); (gratuities) 5730 (iii).

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay survey) 12146 (vii).

Railways—I. C. R. (Campbellton) 12258; (Moncton car shops) 12250 (vii); (Pictou) 5561; (rolling stock) 5549 (iii); (St. John, increased accommodation) 12257 (vii); (train service) 10223; (Windsor Branch) 10146 (v).

Railways—Miscellaneous (litigation) 10357; (Ry. Commission) 10361 (vi).

Tenders, Advertising, *re* Govt. Works, Supplies, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4702, neg. (Y. 50; N. 95) 4735 (iii).

Timber Lands, Sale of to Messrs. Rutherford, &c. (Ques.) 1293 (i).

Travelling Expenses of Ministers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).

'Victor,' Tug, Repairs by Govt., Ques. of Priv., 9774 (v).

RIVET, Mr. L. A. A., *Hochelaga.*

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., &c., on M. to adjn. House, 5905 (iii).

RIVET, Mr. L. A. A.—*Con.*

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3463 (ii).

ROBITAILLE, Mr. L., *Quebec County.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3866 (ii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4514 (iii).

Corby Distillery, Deficits in Spirit Production (Ques.) 12410 (vii).

Experimental Farm, Pet. from Quebec Board of Trade *re* Establishment, &c. (Ques.) 8182 (iv).

French Language, Par. in 'Le Soleil,' on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1212 (i).

Gooderham & Worts Distillery, Deficit in Spirit Production (Ques.) 12411 (vii).

Grandes Piles Dam, Amount voted, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 13059 (vii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6976, 6989 (iv).

——— Par. in 'Canadian Gazette' (remarks) 7453 (iv).

Meat and Canned Food Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7237 (iv).

Militia Dept., Quebec, Hours for Masons, &c. (Ques.) 10790 (vi).

Montmorency Falls Retaining Walls, Width, &c. (Ques.) 12410 (vii).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3450 (ii).

Montreal and Quebec Ports, Expenditures for the last fifty years (Ques.) 3482 (ii).

Printing Supt., Apptmnt. of a Frenchman (Ques.) 12411 (vii).

Provincial Elections, and Federal Ministers' Speeches (remarks) 8850 (v).

Public Works Dept., New Apptmts., &c. (Ques.) 13061 (vii).

Quebec Bridge Disaster, Apptmt. of Engineer Hoare (Ques.) 8173 (iv).

——— Names of Jurymen, &c. (Ques.) 7991 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc., 13389 (vii).

Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s B. 217 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 13491 (vii).

Quebec County Expenditures by Govt. (Ques.) 3847 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.) 3853 (ii).

Ques. of Priv., Deputy Minister of Public Works *re* French Canadians, 8465 (v).

Revised Statutes, Completion of French Edition (Ques.) 6983 (iv).

ROBITAILLE, Mr. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10606 (vi).
Excise (methylated spirits) 821 (i).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., 909 (i).

ROCHE, Mr. W., *Halifax.*

Address, The, 267 (i).
All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12453 (vii).
Bank Act Amendments, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4285 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8691 (iv); on M. for 3°, 13257 (vii).
Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1719 (i).
G.T.P., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12323 (vii).
I.C.R., &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4486 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries Accounts, Payments to Mr. Falconer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4120 (ii).
Prisons and Reformatories Act (Halifax) Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10693 (vi).
Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).
Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5847 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical survey) 9737 (v).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4046 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1068 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Porter's Lake) 11264 (vi).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*

Address, The, 485 (i).
Buffalo purchased for Elk Park, Name of Purchaser, &c. (Ques.) 5795 (iii).
Canadian Associated Press, Govt. Subvention, &c. (Ques.) 5080 (iii).
Clearwater Lake, Half-breeds' Rights, &c. (Ques.) 175 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9995 (v).
Customs Collectors in Man., Additional Fees charged, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).
Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1183 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8012 (iv), 11762 (vi); in Com., 15005 (vii).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 759 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11168, 11422 (vi).
Doukhobors bonused as Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9953 (v).
Doukhobors at Yorkton, Violation of Laws, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7633 (iv).
Fish Exportations from Man., five years to March, 1907, Value, &c. (Ques.) 4240 (iii).
Garthby Wharf, Inspection by Midraud, &c. (Ques.) 3844 (ii).
Grain Inspection and Sale Act, Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13211 (vii).
G.T.P., Engineers and Assistant Engineers, Names, &c., Date of Apptmt., Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5802 (iii).
—— Medical Attendance, O.C. regulating Deductions (Ques.) 1937 (i).
Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6347 (iv).
—— Proposition *re* Construction by Govt. (Ques.) 5789 (iii).
Immigration, Salvation Army Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9973 (v).
Indian Schools, Prosecutions *re* Riots (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 626 (i).
Internal Economy Board, H. of C., Minutes, &c. (M. for copies*) 2795 (ii).
Land Sales in N. W., Purchasers' Names, Price paid, &c. (Ques.) 3835 (ii).
Leech, Mr. R. A. E., Apptmt. of (notice of motion) 3477 (ii).
See 'Seed Grain.'
Mail Matter delayed in Transmission by C. P. R. Accident (remarks) 9724 (v).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12803 (vii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension (remarks) 6222 (iv).
—— Legislation *re* (remarks) 7506 (iv).
Manitoba Election Frauds, Investigation Com., ref. to in debate on Address, 495 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13222 (vii).
Man. Voters Lists, Polling Divisions, made by Judges (remarks) 13141 (vii).
Massey-Harris Co., Rebate of Duty from 1905-8 (Ques.) 8441 (v).
Military Stores of Rural Battalions, Care of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5737 (iii).
Minnedosa Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10889 (vi).
'Montague,' Dredge, Expenditure *re* Repairs (Ques.) 8172 (iv).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9188 (v).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11991 (vi).

Ranchvale Homestead Entries, Number, Total Receipts, Applications, &c. (Ques.) 5258 (iii).

——— Sub-Land Agency, Closing of (Ques.) 4829 (iii).

Riding Mountain Reserve, Applications for Homesteads, Letter from Mr. Seaman (read) in Com. of Sup., 9992 (v).

——— Entry by Homesteaders (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7653 (iv).

——— Timber Reserves, Squatters' Claims, &c. (Ques.) 175 (i).

St. Boniface Public Building, Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 4246 (iii).

——— Purchase of Land, &c. (Ques.) 5999 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Instruction to Agents *re* Rights of Purchasers (Ques.) 2217 (ii).

——— Pet. *re* Election of Chief and Councillors (Ques.) 7990 (iv).

——— Title, Extinguish of, Issue of Patents, &c. (Ques.) 1932 (i).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 9167 (v).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Land Grants, Patents, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5801 (iii).

Sawmill Owners, Applications refused *re* Timber Cutting (M. for ret.*) 557 (i).

Seed Grain in N. W., Distribution of, Apptmt. of Mr. R. E. A. Leeh (remarks) 3040 (ii).

——— Duties assigned to Mr. Leech (remarks) 3158 (ii).

Seed Grain for N.W., Charges by Mr. Macdonell, M.P. (remarks) 1442 (i).

Seed Grain for Settlers in N.W., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2909 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1373 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2775 (ii).

Selkirk, Lord, Land Registers and State Papers, Register 'B' *re* Hudson Bay Co., Custody of, &c. (Ques.) 1684 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3815 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9769 (v).

Customs—Miscellaneous (guarantees) 9577; Inspectors (salaries) 9550 (v).

Dom. Lands (agents) 10046; (forest rangers) 10049; (surveys) 9989 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9860; (deportations) 9883 (v); (general expenses) 5754 (iii); (hospitals) 9982; (literature, &c.) 9952 (v).

Legislation (provincial voters' lists) 10508 (vi).

Militia (annual drill) 5737 (iii); (rifle and artillery grants) 12152 (vii).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2775 (ii).

N.W. Ters. (school grants) 10118 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10889 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon, drill hall) 8518; (Dauphin) 8519; (Neepawa) 8536; (Selkirk) 8547 (v); (Winnipeg, hospital) 10962 (vi); (Winnipeg, immigration) 8574; (Winnipeg, P.O.) 8575 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 7713 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8582; (Saskatoon) 8603; (Yorkton) 8603 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Shellmouth) 12143 (vii).

Timber Berths granted in Man. and N.W.T., Retention by Original Grantees (Ques.) 2546 (ii).

Timber Cutting by Saw-mill Owners, Applications *re* (Ques.) 2168 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2614 (ii).

Timber Permits to Saw-mill Owners, O.C. *re*, &c. (Ques.) 179 (i).

Town Site, Section 32, Man., Erection of Public Buildings, &c. (Ques.) 1125, 1348 (i).

Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7653 (iv).

Western Rifle Association, Pet. *re* Grant (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).

ROSS, Mr. A. C., *Cape Breton, N., and Victoria.*

Cement, Sydney, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11227 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Baddeck) 11219; (Digby) 11226 (vi).

ROSS, Mr. D., *Yale-Cariboo.*

Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Ry. Co.'s (B. 58) 1°*, 1283 (i).

Bank Act Amt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) M. to adjn. debate, 4312 (iii).

Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) 1°*, 606 (i).

B.C. Revenue contributed from 1872-3 to 1905 (M. for ret.) 3435 (ii).

Canadian Naturalization, on M. (Mr. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order 12089 (vii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10747 (vi).

Criminal Code Amendments, Ques. of Order, 9282 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Sup. (remarks) 10138 (v).

ROSS, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Customs Outside Service, in Com. of Sup., Members remarks checked, 9451 (v).

Dillon, Gerald P., Apptmt. to N. W. M. Police Force (Ques.) 6001 (iii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1172 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1632, 1653 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8185 (iv); in Com., 11877, 11932 (vi); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 13252 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11176 (vi).

Edmonton, Dunvegan and B. C. Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 754 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4578 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry. Co., Application for Portion of Metlakatla Indian Reserve, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1512 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 768 (i).

Immigration Bonuses, Ques. of Order, *re* Discussion of former Speech, 1298 (i).

Indian Lands, B.C., Provincial Rights, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 630 (i).

Indian Schools, Dr. Bryce's Report (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 625 (i).

I.C.R. Employees Provident Fund Amt. B. 117 (Mr Graham) in Com., 4995 (iii).

Japanese Immigration Restriction, B.C. Legislation, on M. for Sup., 1744 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2066 (ii).

——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1602 (i).

Japanese and Oriental Immigration, O.Cs., &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies, 855, 877 (i).

——— on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 732 (i).

Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Ry. Co.'s (B. 39) 1°*, 754 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11244 (vi).

Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9916 (v).

——— Ques. of Order, 10023, 'Bourinot' quoted, 10030 (v).

Obstruction Tactics, &c., Ques. of Order, 9222 (v).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 131) 1°*, 5337 (iii); in Com., 7724 (iv).

Order, Points of, 'Bourinot' *re* Discussions on, 4103 (ii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4955 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Rep., Ques. of Order, 13401 (vii).

ROSS, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4986 (iii).

——— (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118, Ques. of Order, 10663 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13286 (vii).

Resignation as Member *re* Chinese Question (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11106 (vi).

Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Co.'s (B. 49) 1°*, 891 (i); in Com., 5409, 5519 (iii).

S.A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3773 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 625 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9244; Ques. of Order, 9222 (v).

Legislation (voters' lists) 10508 (vi).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4099 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12126 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Knowlton) 7293 (iv).

Timber Berths, Leasing of, &c., Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2287 (ii).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. *re* Amts., 908 (i).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L., *Souris.*

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4520 (iii).

Berins Fish Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn Supply (Ques.) 3240 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8200 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11132; in Com., 11170, 11458, 11521; (amt.) 11943; (amt.) on M. for 3°, 11970; Neg. (Y. 28; N. 58) 11974 (vi).

Fisheries in Lake Winnipeg, Legislation *re* Closing (Ques.) 2389 (ii).

Fish Hatchery, Lake Winnipeg, Failure *re* Spawn, &c. (Ques.) 1683 (i).

Grain Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13210 (vii).

Homestead Entries granted for Quarters 10-17-17 W. of 4th Meridian, &c. (Ques.) 9773 (v).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10492 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction of, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6306 (iv).

Immigrants, Amounts paid for Maintenance, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5476 (iii).

——— (Ques.) 5084 (iii).

Immigrants from Europe, entering U.S., List furnished to Govt. (Ques.) 5082 (iii).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*

Immigration from U. S., Total Amount expended (Ques.) 5082 (iii).

'Lady of the Lake,' Str., Purchase by Govt., Staff, &c. (Ques.) 3434 (ii).

Land Patents for Sections 10, and 17, Applicants *re* (Ques.) 9475 (v).

Lumber Combine Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 2977 (ii).

Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Papers, Memorials, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 852 (i).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12565, 13220 (vii).

Man. Lands owned by Govt., Number of Acres, &c. (Ques.) 1288 (i).

Montreal Harbour, Expenditure *re* Docks and Elevators (M. for ret.*) 2170 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 1683 (i).

'Neptune,' Cruise in Hudson Bay, on order for Copy of Rep. (wthdn.) 850 (i).

Nolan, Wm. Howard, Issue of Patents to (Ques.) 8182 (iv).

Pelican Lake Channel, Opening of (Ques.) 1940 (i).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4976 (iii).

——— (demurrage) B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3366 (ii).

Railway Building to Fort Churchill, &c., Cor., Documents, &c. (M. for copies*) 1689 (i).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1367 (i).

Selkirk Fish Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn Supply (Ques.) 3240 (ii).

Squatters on Forest Reserves in Turtle Mountain (remarks) 4739 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Dom. Lands (coal lands) 10074; (surveys) 10007 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9866; (deportations) 9882 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8519; (Emerson) 8534; (Neepawa) 8540; (St. Boniface) 8566; (Selkirk) 8547 (v); (Winnipeg, hospital) 10964 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7490 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8582 (v).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2655 (ii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10696 (vi).

Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7647 (iv).

SCHELL, Mr. J. T., *Glengarry.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11389 (vi).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).

SCHELL, Mr. J. T.—*Con.*

Dredging Contracts, Supplies, &c. (remarks) 7106 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13264 (vii).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13298 (vii).

G.T.P., Construction Tenders, Total Amounts, &c. (M. for ret.) 600 (i).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12677 (vii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12364 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4997 (iii).

Quebec and Lake St. John (branch lines) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).

Quebec and N. B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com on Res., 13291 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Welland (electric lighting) 12198; (Port Colborne) 12221 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12126 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (piping) 10195 (v).

Transportation Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12221 (vii).

Wheat Transportation from N.W., Financial Aid by Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2188 (ii).

SCHELL, Mr. M. S., *Oxford S.*

Budget, The, 5616, 5957 (iii).

Canada Weather Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 37) 1°*, 753 (i); in Com., 5174 (iii).

Co-Operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 4563; in Com., 4564 (iii).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10835 (vi).

Fruit Marks Act Inspection Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10560 (vi).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1550 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12598 (vii).

SIFTON, Hon. C., *Brandon.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12439 (vii).

Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Connections, Charges against Ry. Commission (remarks) 1435 (i).

Budget, The, 5338 (iii).

Imperial Pulp Co., Denial re Managing Directorship, Par. in Montreal 'Star,' Ques. of Priv., 3578 (ii).

SIFTON, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, Govt. Aid (M.) to adjn., 1349 (i).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2595 (ii).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H., *Guysborough.*
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv).
Budget, The, 6615 (iv).
Can. Ensign: *See* 'Red,' &c.
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12854 (vii).
Coasting Privileges, prop. Res. (Mr. Black) withdrawn, 2795 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11986 (vi).
Debates of the House, Average Cost per Column (Ques.) 3479 (ii).
Fisheries Act (trials) Amt. Bill, on M. to introduce, 508 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 31) 1°*, 562 (i); in Com., 5248 (iii).
Fisheries Com., Sel. Standing, Apptmt. of (prop. res.) 1691 (i).
Fisheries in Mar. Provs., Violation of Act (M. for ret.*) 1513 (i).
Fishery Officers Jurisdiction, Convictions, Fines, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).
Fisheries Regulations, Violations of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5781 (iii).
I.C.R., Hanlon's Crossing Accident, Investigation *re* (M. for papers*) 5800 (iii).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3027 (ii).
N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) 3680 (ii).
Northwest and Gold Dredging Co., Leases, assigned, &c. (Ques.) 11702 (vi).
Postal Revenue, One Cent Rate (Ques.) 8381 (v).
Presbyterian College, Halifax (B. 154) in Com., 7667 (iv).
Red Ensign, Flying on Merchant Vessels, Authority *re* (uQes.) 12775 (vii).
Shipping, Statistics *re* Tons Registered, &c. (Ques.) 2790 (ii).
SUPPLY—
House of Commons (contingencies) 10503 (vi).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4758 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4016, 4169 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 10298 (v).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2957; (masters and mates) 2971 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton, additional line) 12761 (vii).

SLOAN, Mr. W., *Comox-Atlin.*
British Columbia Bank incorp. (B. 59) 2° m., 1469 (i).

SLOAN, Mr. W.—*Con.*
'Carlotta G. Cox,' Schr., Seizure, &c.: *See* 'Pelagic Sealing.'
Deep Sea Fisheries on Pacific Coast, Cruiser, &c. (Ques.) 1934 (i).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s (B. 15) 1°*, 350 (i).
Japanese Immigration, on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1611 (i).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration into B.C., Restriction of, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 726 (i).
Lighthouse Keepers on Pacific Coast, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1934 (i).
Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, Seizure of Schr. 'Carlotta G. Cox,' on M. for Sup., 3934 (ii).
—— (notice of motion) *re* Discussion, 3156 (ii).
Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 87) 1°*, 2160 (ii); in Com., 4545; on Senate Amts., 6189 (iii).
Western Rivers Improvement Co.'s incorp. (B. 55) 1°*, 1103 (i).
Yukon Concession Cases, Appeal from Supreme Court (Ques.) 10301 (vi).
Yukon Telegraph Service to Prince Rupert, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 1934 (i).

SMITH, Mr. E. D., *Wentworth.*
Adulteration of Food, Number of Firms penalized, &c. (Ques.) 4402 (iii).
Budget, The, 5375, 5388 (iii).
Burlington Channel Lighthouse, Damages to, &c. (Ques.) 5467 (iii).
Burlington Channel Repairs, Apptmt. of Foreman, &c. (Ques.) 4403 (iii).
Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6203 (iii).
Cold Storage Plants, Construction of, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 236 (i).
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3523; in Com., 3595, 3645 (ii).
Franco-Canadian Treaty, Maximum and Minimum Rate, &c. (Ques.) 178 (i).
Fruit Inspection, in Closed Packages, &c. (Ques.) 2981 (ii).
Militia Food Supply, Inquiry for Ret., 3042 (ii).
Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3346 (ii).
Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4979 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Excise (travelling expenses) 815 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5774 (iii).
Militia (stores, &c.) 5739 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1477; (museum) 1498 (i).

SMITH, Mr. G., *Oxford, N.*

Address, The, 407 (i).
Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1555 (i).
Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 2866 (ii).

SMITH, Mr. R., *Nanaimo.*

Brantford Stove Works Strike, Arrest *re* Picketing (remarks) 9027 (v).
Canada-Australia SS. Service, Yearly Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 1289 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10548, 10745 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11373 (vi).
Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9192 (v).
Coal Land Leases, Applicants *re* (Ques.) 2395 (ii).
Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4685 (iii).
Dunsmuir, Hon. Mr., Lt. Gov. of B.C., Assent to Natal Act, Dom. Interference (remarks) 1738 (i).
Esquimalt and Halifax Garrison, Equipment, &c. (Ques.) 1293 (i).
—— Transfer to Canada (Ques.) 1293 (i).
Fisheries, B.C., Negotiations *re* with Mr. Bastedo, Reports *re* (remarks) 6849 (iv).
G.T.P. Workmen Accidents, &c. (remarks) 10624 (vi).
Immigrant Inspection on Ships, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 1289 (i).
Immigrants stranded at St. Thomas, Deportation of (Ques.) 567 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6449 (iv).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6729, 7007 (iv).
Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11029 (vi).
Japanese Colony in the West, C.P.R. Application *re* (Ques.) 7196 (iv).
Japanese Immigration Act, Disallowance of *re* B.C. (Ques.) 6642 (iv).
—— Natal Act, Cor., &c., with Lt. Gov., B.C. (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration into B.C., Restriction of (prop. Res.) 699 (i).
—— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2081 (i).
—— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for O.Cs., &c., 874 (i).
Labour Disputes Bill, Applications, &c., *re* Settlement (M. for ret.*) 605 (i).
Mail Service in B.C., Better Arrangements *re* (remarks) 3754 (ii).

SMITH, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4691 (iii); on M. for 3° (M.) to ref. back to Com., 12053 (vii).
Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2419 (ii).
Railway Act (working hours) Amt. (B. 157) 1° m., 6843 (iv).
Shipping Companies on Pacific Coast, Amounts of Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 6919 (iv).
Spratte, Hattie, Relief (B. 182) 1°*, 9889 (v).
SUPPLY—
Dom. Lands (coal lands) 10066 (v).
Militia (annual drill) 5740 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Ladysmith) 10867; (Quesnel) 10868 (vi).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. R. F. Sutherland), *Essex, N.*

Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. Barker) Remarks, 530 (i).
Adjournment of the House, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4495 (iii).
Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) Irrelevancy of Debate, 4730 (iii).
Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) Members addressing Hse. from their Seats without rising (remarks) 10922 (vi).
Banking System, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) Members remarks checked, 2307 (ii).
Battlefields of Canada B. 111, on M. for 3°, 4530 (iii).
Belleville City Floods, Investigation *re*, Members remarks checked, 3319 (ii).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry., &c., on Qes. of Order (Mr. German) 2809; (ruling) 2810 (ii).
Bills, Royal Assent, Mess. from His Ex., 2974, 2995 (ii), 5135, 6157 (iii), 6526 (iv), 10656 (vi).
—— Mess. from Senate, 13587 (vii).
Brantford Stove Works Strike (remarks) 9027 (v).
Cigarette Restraint B. (Mr. Aylesworth) on Senate Amts., 13045 (vii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11363, 11535, 11645 (vi).
Civil Service Commission Report, Discussion *re*, Ques. of Order (ruling) 5627-8 (iii).
Colchester Electoral District, Certificate (notification) 680 (i).
Criminal Code Amendments, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 9282 (v).
Cyr, Mr., Letter from, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) (ruling) 8461 (v).
Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8896 (v).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, Members remarks checked, 1195 (i), 2305 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 115) on Senate Amts., 13579 (vii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster)—(ruling) 11717 (vi).

——— on M. for 3°, Ques. of Order, 13247 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3° (ruling) 11977 (vi), 12394 (vii).

Dredging Contracts, O.C., Rule *re* Producing, 6927 (iv).

——— Ref. to Matters before Committee (ruling) 6749 (iv).

Easter Adjournment (remarks) 6843 (iv).

Eclipse Mfg. Co., Irrelevancy of Debate (ruling) 7470 (iv).

Electoral Districts, Certificates of Election (notification) 890 (i).

Electoral District of Nicolet, Certificate of Election (notification) 1283 (i).

Electoral District, Vacancies, Issue of Writs (notifications) 2 (i).

Election, New Members, Certificates of Election (notification) 2 (i).

Election Petitions, Supreme Court Judgments (presented) 1 (i).

Fire Extinguishers Ret., Members remarks checked, 4833 (iii).

——— Irrelevancy of debate, 7776 (iv).

French Language, Pet. *re*, Ques of Order, 8886 (v).

Govt. Grounds, Conditions *re*, Members remarks checked, 1741 (ii).

G.T. Ry. Co.'s B. 89, Members remarks checked, 2254 (ii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley)—(ruling) 8136 (iv).

G.T.P. Supplies via American Routes, Member's remarks checked, 9026 (v).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25, in Com., on Ruling to ref. back to Com., 3362 (ii).

——— on M. for 3°, 4542 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10491 (vi).

Huron, South Riding, Certificate of Election (notification) 2541 (ii).

——— Vacancy, &c. (notification) 890 (i).

Immigration Bonuses, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 1299 (i).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) Member's remarks checked, 13137 (vii).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Indian Lands in Algoma, *re* Mr. Sifton's Telegram (remarks) 13532 (vii).

Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 8 (i).

Japanese Immigration, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) *re* Attacks on Prov. Govt. (ruling) 1763 (i).

Library of Parlt., Joint Rep. (presented) 6 (i).

Man. Voters' Lists, Affidavits quoted by Member (ruling) *re* Laying on Table, 7948 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries Dept., Misconduct of Officials, Member's remarks checked, 6633

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr .Fisher) on M. for 3°, Member's remarks checked, 7217 (iv).

——— on M. (Mr. Blain) to ref. back to Com., 7227 (iv).

Members introduced, 3 (i).

Mess. from His Ex. (read) 5134 (iii).

——— Suppl. Estimates (read) 12503 (vii).

Moir, Private, Shooting, &c., Member's remarks checked, 7322 (iv).

Montmagny, Electoral District (Notification) Vacancy, 9263 (v).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher), Appeal to the Speaker, 4070; (ruling) 4071; Agreed to (Y. 59; N. 23) 4071 (ii).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on Amts. (ruling) 9503 (v).

Motions, Unopposed, and Business of the Hse. (remarks) 8896 (v).

Obstruction *re* Supply, &c., on Ques. of Order (ruling) 9925 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 10024 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) to Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross)—(ruling) 10025, 10031 (v).

Opening of Parliament, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1 (i).

Order Paper, French and English Editions (remarks) 6741 (iv).

Order, Ques. of, re answering Questions by Govt. (ruling) 234 (i).

Peace Interparliamentary Union, Meeting in Ottawa, Com. from Senate (read) 13581 (vii).

Petit Rocher Wharf, Discussion *re* (ruling) 9717 (v).

Petition, on M. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to introduce, 1682 (i).

Postal Arrangements between Can. and U. S., Member's remarks checked, 3164 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry. Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Hughes) 12629 (vii).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Removal of Steamers from Georgetown Route, Discussion of (remarks) 1109 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Member's remarks checked, 4496 (iii).

Priv., Ques. of (Mr. A. Lavergne) Member's remarks checked, 7993 (iv).

Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 13580 (vii).

——— Mess. from Senate, 13587 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Investigations, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 3085 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Johnston) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 9890 (v).

Public Works, Dep. Minister and French Canadians, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Robitaille) 8465 (v).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) Member's remarks checked, 4910 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Talbot) 4958 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Rep., on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 13401 (vii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Talbot) 13402 (vii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13403 (vii).

Quebec County Expenditures (remarks) *re* Question, 3847 (ii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Joint Meeting of Members and Senators (remarks) 6061 (iii).

Ques. of Order, *re* Accepting Minister's Stmnt. (ruling) 9352 (v).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) Member's remarks checked, 2382 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) (ruling) 2383 (ii).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Reid)—(remarks) 9771 (v).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Daniel) *re* Representation of Mar. Provs. (remarks) 9892 (v).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 118, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden)—(ruling) 11618 (vi).

——— on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 11602 (vi).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) ref. to deb. in Senate (ruling) 577 (i).

Railway Commissioners' Board Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8511 (v).

Ry. Connections at Brockville, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) Remarks checked, 9 (i).

Returns, Retention of by Members, on Ques. of Priv., Member's remarks checked, 4667 (iii).

Seed Grain Distribution, Member's remarks checked, 6635 (iv).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Seed Grain Distribution, Apptmt. of Mr. R. A. E. Leech, Discussion ruled out of Order, 3041 (ii).

Speech from the Throne (read) 3 (i).

Supplies purchased for Govt., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 5830, (ruling) 5831 (iii).

——— Member's remarks checked, 5837 (iii).

SUPPLY—

House of Commons (Clerk of Crown in Chancery) 10508; (contingencies) 10502; (salaries) 10491, 10501 (vi); (salary, increases) 13562 (vii); (Sergeant-at-Arms) 10503 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) Member's remarks checked, 1064 (i).

Senate (salaries, &c.) 10489 (vi).

Timber Berths, on M. for Original Documents (remarks) 2984 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order, *re* Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turrig)—(ruling) 11304 (vi).

Tobacco Prohibition, Resolution *re* Moral Reform Associations, Member's remarks checked, 11302 (vi).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on Ques. of Order *re* Amt. (Mr. Barker) (ruling) 923 (i).

Vacancies in Electoral District (notification) 2 (i).

Vacancy in Stanstead, Issue of Writ (notification) 569 (i).

York, Centre, Electoral District. Certificate of Election (notification) 1018 (i).

SPEAKER, DEP. (Mr. C. Marcil) *Bonaventure.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11828 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, Member's remarks checked, 5025 (iii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 151, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) ref. to Speaker, 8135 (iv).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3717 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers, N.S., Member's remarks checked, 11290 (vi).

Lord's Day Act, Violations *re* Horse Racing, Member's remarks checked, 3753 (ii).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4066 (ii).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt., Discussion *re* M. to adjn., 3656 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5076 (iii).

Ocean and River Service, Irrelevancy of debate, 2943 (ii).

Order, Ques. of, Irrelevancy of Debate (ruling) 10393 (vi).

SPEAKER, DEP.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch Ry. B. 202, Member's remarks checked, 12632 (vii).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Talbot) *re* Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' Member's remarks checked, 4222 (iii).

Restaurant Com., Joint, 1st Rep. (presented) 13510 (vii).

Royal Mint, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup. (ruling) 1461 (i).

School Statutes, Saskatchewan Prov. (remarks) 6854 (iv).

Tobacco, Violation of Act, in Com. of Sup. (ruling) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Talbot) 9250 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S., *Grey, E.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3855, 3880 (ii).

Anglo-American Treaties, Inquiry for Cor., 10120 (v).

Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5379 (iii).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 134 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°. 5763 (iii).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13307 (vii).

Bait Freezer at North Sydney, Govt. Assistance *re* Construction (Ques.) 3848 (ii).

Banking Act Amts., on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4272 (iii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 10923; in Com., 10933 (vi).

Banking Systems, Criticisms of Newspaper Report, Ques. of Privilege, 2308 (ii).

Battlefields of Quebec, Tercentenary at Quebec B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 3902 (ii); on M. for 2°, 4388; in Com., 4415, 4511; on M. for 3°, 4532 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G.T. Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2810 (ii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv), 8552 (v).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6521 (iv).

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2994 (ii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5950 (iii).

Bonusing System, on Notice of Motion (remarks) 6290 (iv).

Boundary Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9740 (v).

Budget, The, 6595 (iv).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6171, 6173 (iii); in Com., 6408 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4231 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. Pardee) on Senate Amts., 5955 (iii).

C.P.R., Papineauville Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

C.P.R., Saskatchewan Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13305 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6872 (iv).

Catholics and Public Offices, Ref. to Speech in the Senate, Ques. of Priv., 5047 (iii).
See 'Employees.'

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11251 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10749, 11021 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5114 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10721; in Com., 11366, 11536, 11635 (vi), 12184 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Number distributed (remarks) 6060 (iii).

—— Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5901 (iii).

—— Report (remarks) 5628, 5633 (iii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9162 (v).

Colonization Lands, Alienation of, Inquiry for Ret., 3752 (ii), 4317 (iii).

Co-Operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 4556 (iii).

Criminal Code (ry. mortgages) Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Aylesworth) on Senate Amts., 13317

Criminal Code (trade restraint) Amt. B. 96 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 1°, 2976 (ii).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 9736 (v).

Cyr, Mr., Letter from *re* Statement of Members, Ruling *re*, 8462 (v).

Detroit River Tunnel, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10487 (vi).

Documents in Depts., Access to Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1147, 1194 (i).

—— Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1782 (i).

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 50 (Mr. Copp) in Com., 4231 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 3°, 13244; (amt.) to M. for 3°. 13255 (vii).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 755 (i).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11466 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10815, 10820 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5027 (iii).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Violation of Laws (remarks) 7639 (iv).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6755 (iv).

——— (remarks) 6633 (iv).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6912 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13266; in Com. on Res., 13278 (vii).

Employees of Parliament and Printing Bureau, Names, Salaries, Religions, &c. (Ques.) 5206 (iii).

——— (M. for ret.) 5479 (iii).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13297 (vii).

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13470 (vii).

Fire Extinguishers, Purchase by Govt., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7664 (iv).

——— Cor. quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7774 (iv).

Fisheries Treaty, Boundaries with U. S., Information *re* (remarks) 6632, 6739 (iv).

Fishing Rights in Matane River, &c. (Ques.) 7446 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, Apptmt. to Hague Tribunal (remarks) 8294 (v).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3618, 3636 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on Preparation of Stmnt. *re* Duty Units (remarks) 945 (i).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10554 (vi).

Fruit Inspection (apples) Complaints *re* (remarks) 2754 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3623, 3794 (ii), 4230 (iii).

Gold and Silver Marking B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12556 (vii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays (remarks) 6287 (iv).

——— Precedence *re* Motion for Want of Confidence (remarks) 6917 (iv).

Govt. Officials and Municipal Elections, Interference *re*, on M. for Sup., 2890 (ii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8552, 8744, 9461 (v).

G.T.P. Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 8836 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

G.T.P., Investigation *re* Charges of Major Hodgins, on 1st Rep. of Com., 8515 (v).

——— Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13301 (vii).

——— Policy *re* Police Patrol (remarks) 7997 (iv).

G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2241 (ii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 4224; on M. for 3°, 4536 (iii).

'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9131 (v).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Neglect of Duty as Inspector at Halifax (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6647 (iv).

Hindus in B. C., Protests *re* Treatment (remarks) 5490 (iii).

Hogs saughtered, Compensations paid, &c. (remarks) 13094 (vii).

Horses and Cattle, Imports to U. S. as Thoroughbreds, Prevention of (Ques.) 6000 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10492 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) 6302 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6434 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 1299 (i).

Immigration from England, Statements of Mr. Walker and Mr. Smith (remarks) 5491 (iii).

Immigants stranded in Toronto (remarks) 429 (i).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6475, 6482 (iv).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6901 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 1743 (i).

I.C.R., Employees, Circular from Genl. Manager *re* Municipal Politics (read) 2304 (ii).

——— Employees and Municipal Councils (remarks) 2309 (ii).

——— Employees and Municipal Elections, Circular *re* (remarks) 2884 (ii).

——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4484 (iii).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 768, 953 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2133 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Japanese Immigration, B. C. Legislation, on M. for Sup., 1759 (i).
Lands set apart for Settlement since 1896, (M. for ret.*) 2796 (ii).
Lands Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res. 8481 (v).
Lands Titles Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6518 (iv).
Lands withdrawn for Settlement or Colonization Purposes, &c. (Ques.) 2393 (ii).
Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 10953 (vi).
MacIlreith, Mr., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7177 (iv).
Mackenzie, Mr. Wm., Par. in 'Globe' *re* Apptmt. (remarks) 6985 (iv).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12571 (vii).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries Book-keeping, &c., ref. to Com. of Sup., 4007 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
——— Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn. House, 8454 (v).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3020; in Com., 3035 (ii).
Meaford Harbour B. 158 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8510 (v).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6895, 7238; on M. for 3°, 7218 (iv).
Meat and Food Inspection Act, Names and Number of Establishments, &c. (Ques.) 1505 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 1690 (i).
Militia Dept., and Civil Service Commissioners' Rep. (remarks) 12546 (vii).
Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4065 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3451 (ii).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9477 (v).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9495 (v)
Niagara, St Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5067 (iii); on Senate Amts., 10511 (vi).
Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13289 (vii).
Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4091 (iii); in Com., 12054 (vii).
Orangemen and Quebec Provincial Elections, Ministerial Speeches (remarks) 10126 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Orange Order and Quebec Prov. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10355 (vi).
Order Paper, Differences in English and French Editions (remarks) 6740, 6850 (iv).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 138 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 9070 (v).
Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2837 (ii).
Patent and Proprietary Medicines, B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 2°, 10552 (vi).
Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 10412 (vi).
Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3979 (ii).
Petit Rocher Wharf, Inquiry for missing Papers (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9722 (v).
Pork, Fresh, Quantity imported for Home Consumption (Ques.) 5650 (iii).
Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re* (remarks) 10513 (vi).
Presbyterian Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Funds, B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2788 (ii).
Prescott Lighthouse Station, Presentation to Dr. W. C. Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3097 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3084 (ii).
Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7191 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Dom. Govt. Guarantee, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 2394 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Rep., on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13403 (vii).
Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co., Bridge Construction Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Militia (remarks) 8696 (v).
Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3376 (ii).
Railway Commission (asst. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3903 (ii); in Com., 8512 (v).
——— on M. to introduce, 3751 (ii).
——— B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on Amt. (Mr R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 11630 (vi)
Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13285 (vii).
Ry. Subsidies, Bridge Subsidies (remarks) in Com., 13309 (vii).
Rhindress, Dr. Horace, Salary, &c. (Ques) 6000 (iii). 6232 (iv).
Rules of the House, Amendments to, on prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2988 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7677 (iv), 8562, 9068 (v).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. McIntyre) in Com., 4232 (iii).

School Lands Exchange B 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 8470; in Com., 8478 (v).

Seed Grain Bill, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2781 (ii).

Seed Grain for Settlers in Man., &c., in Com. of Sup., 2773 (ii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2922 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adn., 1361 (i).

Seed Grain Distribution, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10122 (v).

——— (remarks) *re* Purchases, 3158 (ii).

Seed Wheat, Delegation *re* (remarks) 1740 (i).

Sharbot Lake and Bathurst Station, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

Shipping Rings, Combination *re*, Cor., &c. (read) 5916 (iii).

Shortt, Prof., Amounts paid *re* Industrial Disputes (Ques.) 4765 (iii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5416 (iii).

Smith, Mr. W. Maxwell, Dom. Fruit Inspector Salary, &c. (Ques.) 2393 (ii), 5085 (iii).

——— (M. for copies) 2398 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3761, 3832 (ii), 12595 (vii).

Stanstead Election Papers, Disappearance of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 8849 (v).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5865 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Agriculture (exhibitions) 10569, 10597 (vi); (seed branch) 5502 (iii).

Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5673; (slope walls) 5664 (iii).

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 12217; (surveys) 12210 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical survey) 9740 (v).

Excise (methylated spirits) 820; (travelling expenses) 815 (i).

Experimental Farms (salaries) 12549 (vii).

House of Commons (Library of Parlt.) 10503 (vi); (salary increases) 13562 (vii).

Immigration (agents) 13169 (vii).

Indians—N.B. (schools) 13171 (vii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5757 (iii).

Justice (Exchequer Court) 5505 (iii).

Legislation (provincial voters' lists) 10508

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5773; (Thunder Bay ice-breaker) 5043 (iii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 3986 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 5741 (iii), 10290 (v); (pay and allowance) 12546 (vii).

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2773 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 3220 (ii); (Govt. steamers) 5765 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2948, 2949; (naval schools) 3222; (obstructions) 3214; (tidal service) 3215; (wrecks) 3184, 3195; (wrecking plant subsidies) 3221 (ii).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5510 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings — Dom. (rents, &c.) 10981 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8519; (Emerson) 8535; (Neepawa) 8541; (Selkirk) 8550; (Winnipeg, immigration) 8574; (Winnipeg, warehouse) 8567 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax customs) 7168; (Shelburne) 7177; (Yarmouth) 7180 (iv).

Public Works—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 7455; (Guelph armoury) 7678; (Hamilton drill hall) 7692; (Kincardine) 7698; (Kingston, artillery park) 7702; (Kingston, gun shed) 7700; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7704; (Leamington) 7705; (London, military) 7707; (Markham) 7709; (North Bay) 7715 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Major's Hill Park) 11015; (rents, &c.) 10983; (repairs, furniture, &c.) 10981 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings — Que. (Cookshire) 7281; (dominion arsenal) 7435; (Farnham) 7288; (Montreal barracks) 7407; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 7423; (Montreal, post office) 7410; (Montreal, station C) 7422; (Quebec, drill hall) 7431; (St. John's military) 7440; (St. Rochs) 7439 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta. (Humboldt) 8586; (Maple Creek) 8601; (Medicine Hat) 8601; (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8601, 8602; (Regina) 8602 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (maintenance) 11005 (vi).

Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (new plant) 12142 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12114 (vii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13322 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11079 (vi).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11076 (vi).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines (Marconi) 12143 (vii).

Quarantine (Public health) 5505 (iii).

Railways—Generally (extra clerks) 10342 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (supplies) 10188; (Windsor branch) 10145 (v).

Railways—Miscellaneous (litigation) 10358 (vi).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10362; (maintenance, &c.) 10385 (vi).

Senate—(salaries, &c.) 10489 (vi).

Supply, Conc., 5499 (iii).

Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 2864 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10701 (vi).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5387 (iii).

Travelling Expenses of Minister of Marine, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i).

Torrens Land Title Fund, (remarks) 10917 (vi).

Trent Canal, Newmarket (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10315 (vi).

Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 87 (Mr. Sloan) in Com., 4545 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) 6122 (iii).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., Financial Aid by Govt., Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for copies, 2177 (ii).

Yukon Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10536 (vi).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9655 (v).

——— Clements, W. H. P., Apptmt. as Legal Adviser, O.Cs., Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 5801 (iii).

——— (Ques.) 5659 (iii).

Yukon—Moral Reform, Letter of Rev. Dr. Shearer, Inquiry for, 10623, 10689, 11016 (vi).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8483 (v).

STANFIELD, Mr. J., *Colchester.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12647 (vii).

Canso Medical Officer, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 6646 (iv).

——— Successor to Dr. Brine, &c. (Ques.) 1735 (i).

Coasting Trade *re* Norwegian Ships (Ques.) 6237 (iv).

——— O.Cs. *re* Foreign Vessels, &c. (Ques.) 4586 (iii).

'D. H. Thomas,' Tug, Dom. Subsidy Grant (Ques.) 8184 (iv).

Doyle, P., Immigration Agents, Superannuation of (Ques.) 6923 (iv).

Govt. Steamers, Captains' Residences, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3241 (ii).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6649 (iv).

Hunter, Henry C., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1292 (i), 3236 (ii).

I.C.R., Compensation *re* Horses Killed at Truro (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).

I.C.R., Employees, Increased Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 2981 (ii).

——— Ice Contract (Ques.) 5259 (iii).

——— Ice supplied by J. A. McDonald, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 7446 (iv).

STANFIELD, Mr. J.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Oxford and Pictou Branch, Total Expenditure *re* Construction (Ques.) 10733 (vi).

——— Pictou Branch, Transfer from Halifax to Sydney Division, &c. (Ques.) 12773 (vii).

——— Pictou Branch, Answer to Question (remarks) 12661 (vii).

——— Pictou to Copper Crown Co., Total Expenditure *re*, &c. (Ques.) 10733 (vi).

——— Pictou Station, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost of Construction (Ques.) 10789 (vi).

——— Revenue from Terminals, &c. (Ques.) 5471 (iii).

——— Stellarton to Pictou, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 10734 (vi).

——— Tatamagouche, Delay of Trains, &c. (Ques.) 1292 (i).

——— Ties delivered, Change *re* Inspection (Ques.) 12052 (vii).

——— Truro Buildings, Name of Tenderers, &c. (Ques.) 6233 (iv).

——— Truro Engine House, Contract to Rhodes & Co. (Ques.) 1936 (i).

——— Truro Ry. Station, Sanitary Condition, &c. (Ques.) 7211 (iv).

Legal Agents in Mar. Provs., Names, &c. (Ques.) 4768 (iii).

Londonderry and Bass River Mail Service, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 2980 (ii).

Louisburg Bait Freezer, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4406 (iii).

Mail from Canada to Europe, Quantity arrived, &c. (Ques.) 12653 (vii).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12813 (vii).

'Midland Times,' Truro, Amounts paid for Advertisements, &c. (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

Militia, Apptmts. of Generals, Names and Qualifications (Ques.) 5086 (iii).

Newspaper Mail Regulations, Complaints *re* Delivery, &c. (Ques.) 11298 (vi).

Pictou P. O. Building, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 10518 (vi).

Port Mulgrave, N.S., Wharfs, Preventing Boats landing Cargoes (Ques.) 9274 (v).

Port au Pique Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3232 (ii).

Port South Bar, C.B., Vessels entered for Customs, &c. (Ques.) 9271 (v).

Ry. Surveys, Colchester County, Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 2980 (ii).

Skinner's Cove Boat Channel, Expenditures *re* (Ques.) 10012 (v).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12599 (vii).

Southvale, N.S., Removal of Post Office, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 4829 (iii).

STANFIELD, Mr. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (Richard, Jos., compensation) 13174 (vii).

Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9577 (v).

Dom. Lands (Rocky Mountain Park) 9991 (v).

Marine (ice-breakers) 1908 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7117; (Halifax, customs) 7161; (Shelburne) 7173 (iv); (Tatamagouche) 11291 (vi); (Westville) 7179 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Henri) 7439; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 7439 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (Pictou) 5559; (rolling stock) 5551 (iii); (salaries) 10180 (v); (Truro) 12231 (vii).

Sydney to Sydney Mines Branch Ry., Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 7201 (iv).

Tatamagouche, Dredging, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 11701 (vi).

Tenders, Advertisements for (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7477 (iv).

Toney River Boat Harbour, Amount of Contract, Extras, &c. (Ques.) 9711 (v).

Trap-Net Licenses issued to John A. Webster, Payments *re* (Ques.) 7204 (iv).

Truro Armoury, Estimate for Heating and Electric Wiring (Ques.) 3429 (ii).

Truro, N.S., Tax Bill, &c. (Ques.) 3480 (ii).

Westport, N.S., Installation of Marine Alarms, &c. (Ques.) 9274 (v).

Westville, N.S., Public Buildings, Total Amount of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 9474 (v).

Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada (Ques.) 5201 (iii).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D., *Macdonald.*

Address, The, 383 (i).

Bank Act Amendments, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4297 (iii).

Brass, Quantity and Quality of Imports into Can. (Ques.) 6232 (iv).

Buffalo Herd, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10104 (v).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12881 (vii).

Cattle exported to U. S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2769 (ii).

Cypress Hills Homestead Lands, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8387 (v).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11143; in Com., 11183, 11489, 11531 (vi).

Doukohobors Homestead Lands, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9958 (v).

Fence Post Fees, Memorial from Union of Man. Municipalities, &c. (Ques.) 10258 (v).

Grain Commission, Emplymt. of Members, Distribution of Evidence, &c. (Ques.) 3486 (ii).

——— Report (Ques.) 180 (i).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*

Grain Commission Report, Inqiury for, 609 (i).

Grain Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13048, 13209 (vii).

G.T.P. Ry., Medical Fees, Deductions *re* (Ques.) 9473 (v).

Heath Point, Purchase of Cement from A. E. Walberg, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).

Homestead Entries in Section 27, Cor., Tels., &c. (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10495 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6379 (iv).

Immigration Hall, East Selkirk, Furniture, &c., Disposal of (Ques.) 6402 (iv).

Judges in Man. and Ont., Salaries B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13050 (vii).

'Lady of the Lake,' Str., Crew during Winter, &c. (Ques.) 6403 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12811 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12559, 13215 (vii).

Obstructions *re* Supply, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 9932 (v).

Playgreen Lake, Conditions *re* Lease, &c. (Ques.) 6403 (iv).

St. Francois Xavier Post Office, Apptmt. of Postmistress, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 5797 (iii).

St. Laurent Harbour, Lake Manitoba (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).

Seed Grain for Man. Settlers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2771 (ii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1357 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2930 (ii).

Smith, O. B., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4765 (iii).

Snag Boat, Red River, Construction of, &c (Ques.) 567, 891 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12597 (vii)

Supply (seed grain) B. 96, in Com., 2783 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10575 (vi), 12890; (fumigating stations) 12881; (seeds) 12891 (vii); (seed branch) 5503 (iii).

Customs — Miscellaneous (printing, &c.) 9577; (salaries) 9571 (v).

Dom. Lands (forest rangers) 10051 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9880; (agents in U. S.) 9964; (deportations) 9882; (hospitals, Winnipeg) 9982; (literature, &c.) 9950 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (administration) 12729 (vii).

Interior — Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5760 (iii).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4212 (ii).
Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2771 (ii).
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5529 (iii).
Post Office (inspectors) 13153 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8521; (Emerson) 8534; (Neepawa) 8539; (Selkirk) 8547 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 11011; (rents, &c.) 10983 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Grand Marais) 12140; (Lake Dauphin) 12141; (Winnipegosis Lake) 12141 (vii).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys, &c.) 11071 (vi).
Railways—I.C.R. (supplies) 10199 (v).

Swamp Lands in Manitoba, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10105 (v).
Swan Lake, Indian Reserve, Acquisition of by Govt. (Ques.) 693 (i).
—— Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).
—— Settlement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).
Teulon Immigration Sheds, Number cared for, 1906-7 (Ques.) 892 (i).
Timber Berths, Opening of Tenders, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Turriff) 11307 (vi).
——on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2691 (ii).
Wallberg, Mr. E. A., Contract *re* Cement, Patent, &c. (Ques.) 3230 (ii).
—— Contracts with Marine Dept. (Ques.) 3843 (ii).
Wood, Mr. David, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 568 (i).

STEWART, Mr. R., *Ottawa.*

Alexander, Mrs. Mary, Relief (B. 177) 1°*, 9126 (v).
Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey (remarks) on Conc., 13572 (vii).
Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to, *re* Govt. Inspections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5944 (iii).
British-Yukon Ry. Co.'s (B. 21) 1°*, 430 (i); in Com., 3621 (ii).
Cannon, Mrs. Catherine Ann, Relief (B. 175) 1°*, 9126 (v).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5125 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10728; on M. for 2°, 11350; in Com., 11354, 11567 (vi), 12189 (vii).
Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Stewart) 6813 (iv).
General Chemical Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 174) 1°*, 9126 (v).

STEWART, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction (remarks) on Conc., 13568 (vii).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s (B. 47) 1°*, 891; 2° m., 1059 (i); in Com., 3622, 3794 (ii), 4230 (iii).
G.T.R. Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12070 (vii).
Paulding, Mrs. Ada Katurah Stewart, Relief (B. 176) 1°*, 9126 (v).

TALBOT, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*

Alberta Northwestern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 44) 1°*, 891 (i).
All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12481 (vii).
Campaign Literature (French) sent by Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10353 (vi).
Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6191 (iii).
Civil Service Commission Report, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Ques. of Order, 7598 (iv).
Civil Service System, Ques. of Order, Member reading speech, 9175 (v).
Documents quoted by Ministers, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7763 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 4575 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 13255 (vii).
Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5023 (iii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13266 (vii).
Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5480 (iii).
Franco-Canadian Treaty, Delay *re* Approval, and Imp. Treaty (Ques.) 12655 (vii).
French Language Pet. *re*, Ques. of Order, 8887 (v).
German Development Co., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10580 (vi).
Govt. Grounds, Condition of (remarks) 1741 (i).
G.T.P. Construction, Accidents *re* (remarks) 6850 (iv).
Harlaka Junction, Ry. Connections (remarks) 1437 (i).
I.C.R., Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4459 (iii).
Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12401 (vii).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1022 (i).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolishing of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3446 (ii).

TALBOT, Mr. O. E.—*Con.*

Obstruction Tactics, Ques. of Order, 9223 (v).
Orange Order and Quebec Prov. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10355 (vi).
Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' *re* Attack on French Canadian Ministers, 4221 (iii).
Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iv).
Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order, 4958 (iii).
Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc. in Rep., 13366 (vii).
——— Rep., Ques. of Order, 13402 (vii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Rural Corps, &c. (remarks) 8385 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10579 (vi).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4042 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1902 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1090 (i).
Public Works—Generally (armouries) 10899; Ont. (Kingston) 10912 (vi); Ottawa (museum) 1502 (i); Que. (Knowlton) 7293; (Levis) 7296; (Montreal, post office) 7413 (iv).
Timber Limits, Applications, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (ques. of priv.) 3578 (ii).
Tobacco, Violation of Act, in Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order, 9250 (v).

TAYLOR, Mr. G., *Leeds.*

Accounts, Sums, &c., remaining unpaid by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 352 (i).
'Arctic,' Str., History of Northern Cruise, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4009 (ii).
Bate & Co. and W. C. Edwards & Co., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 3234 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 3435 (ii).
Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4390; in Com., 4519 (iii).
Beauchemin, A., Emplymt. at Sorel (Ques.) 5467 (iii).
Boiler Inspections, Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act by Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5941 (iii).
Brockville and Ottawa, Ry. Service, Connections, &c. (M.) to adjn. Hse., 186 (i).
——— (remarks) 432 (i).
——— Charges against Ry. Commission, 1429 (i).
See 'G.T.R.'
Campaign Literature franked by Depts. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10351 (vi).
Canadian Associated Press B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12644 (vii).
Caron and Thiberge, Messrs, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 10517 (vi).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vii).
Chicoutimi Public Expenditures, Ques. of Order, 13203 (vii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5127 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11367, 11558 (vi), 12184 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5909 (iii).
——— (remarks) 5626 (iii).
Cornwall Canal, Accident *re* Ry. Bridge (remarks) 11120 (vi).
Cowie, F. W., Salary, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 5649 (iii).
See 'Govt. Steamers,' &c.
Customs and Excise Revenue, Amount received from June 1, 1908 (Ques.) 10791 (vii).
Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8900 (v).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11882 (vi).
Doukhobors, Letter *re* Manner of Living at Yorkton (read) 5751 (iii).
Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6794 (iv).
——— Quebec Harbour (remarks) 7100, 7104 (iv).
Drysdale, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of accepting Apptmt. (Ques.) 4768 (iii).
——— Date of Communication of Apptmt. (Ques.) 5084 (iii).
——— (M. for papers*) 5086 (iii).
Falconer, Mr. K., Payments to *re* Bookkeeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3999 (iii).
Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13468 (vii).
Fire Extinguishers, Purchase by Govt., Number, Price, &c. (Ques.) 1510 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 1690 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7639 (iv).
——— File, Cor., &c., quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7782 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 4832 (iii).
——— (remarks) 5659 (iii).
Forbes, Mr. Justice, Personal Status, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 899 (i).
——— (Ques.) 2390, 3840 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 1860 (i).
Gananoque Lights and Buoys, Apptmt. of Keeper, &c. (Ques.) 8383 (v).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3630 (ii).
Govt. Business (remarks) 13207 (vii).
Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6266 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance and Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Govt. Steamers, Trips of Mr. Cowie, &c. (Ques.) 5467 (iii).
See 'Cowie.'

G. T. Ry., Connections at Brockville (Ques. of Privilege) 9 (i).
See 'Brockville.'

G.T.R. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2222 (ii).

G.T.P. Ry., Eastern Division, Recent Estimates *re* Cost (Ques.) 5259 (iii).

——— Ties purchased in U. S. (remarks) 1448 (i).

——— Town and Development Co., Location of Lands, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5087 (iii).

——— Winnipeg and Moncton Branch, Tenders *re* Contracts, Signatures, &c. (M. for ret.*) 935 (i).

Halifax Garrison, Retraction of Remarks by Fin. Min., 5784 (iii).

House of Commons, Ventilation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10978 (vi).

——— Rules for Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wright) 594 (i).
See 'Postal.'

'Hurona'-'Mongolian' Collision, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 358 (i).

Kingston Military Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12148 (vii).

Lacas, E., Payments to by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 979, 1039 (i).

Langevin Block Basement, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 3483 (ii).

Magee, Hon. Mr. Justice, Judgments undelivered, Action of Govt., &c. (Ques.) 2594 (ii).

Medicine Hat Building, Contract *re* Heating System (remarks) 10791 (vi).

Menzies, Mr. James, Emplymt. by Govt. in Geodetic Survey (Ques.) 1349 (i).

Merwin, Geo. T., Payments to by Marine Dept. (Ques.) 11701 (vi).

Midland Dredging Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5716 (iii).

'Montcalm' Ice-breaker, Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1897 (i).

——— Purchase Price, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 8441 (v).
See 'Govt. Steamers.'

Montreal 'Gazette' Building, Amount paid for, &c. (Ques.) 3900 (ii).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4066 (ii).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9499 (v).

Obstructions to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9919 (v).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10333 (vi).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Orangemen and Quebec Provincial Elections, Speech of Hon. Mr. Brodeur at Montreal (remarks) 10123 (v).

Orangeville Post Office Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7482 (iv).

Order, Ques. of, Appeal to the Chair *re* Chairman's Ruling, Agreed to (Y. 84; N. 1) 4188 (ii).

Petit Rocher Breakwater, Contracts, &c., O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1294 (i).

——— Incomplete Return (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5723 (iii), 9716 (v).

——— Inquiry for, 6464, 7107 (iv).

Postal Service, H. of C., Delays, &c. (Ques.) 570 (i).

Prescott Light Station, Presentation to Dr W. C. Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 983 (i).

P.E.I. Ry., Harmony and Elmira Branch Line (B. 202) in Com. on Res., 12409 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3122 (ii).

Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iv).

Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3387 (ii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3905 (ii).

Ry. Connections: *See* 'Brockville,' &c.

Reinhardt, Mr. Paul, Emplymt. by Public Works Dept. (Ques.) 10301 (vi).

——— Emplymt. in Quebec Provincial Elections, Cor., &c. (read) in Com. of Su., 10986 (vi).

Returns, Inquiry for, 2738 (ii).

Riviere du Loup Wharf Dredging, &c. (remarks) 6462 (iv).

Ross Rifles, Number in Use in Canada, Total &c. (Ques.) 5786 (iii).

——— Provisions *re* Bayonets, &c. (Ques.) 3483 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Co. and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., &c., 3010 (ii)

St. Louis, Mr., Payments to by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).

Seed Grain for Settlers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2780 (ii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2904, 2920 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1366 (i).

Senate, Cost of, Outside of Indemnities (M. for ret.*) 5087 (iii).

Sorel Irregularities, Final Rep. (remarks) 10795 (vi).

S. A. School Teachers, Recognition of Services (Ques.) 2791 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3782 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Spain, Commander, Travelling Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).

—— Expenditure *re* Wreck Investigations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3150 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Agriculture, &c. (dairying, &c.) 10397; (exhibitions) 10570; (Imperial Institute) 10623 (vi).

Canals—Chambly (tow paths) 12226 (vii).

Canals—Murray (houses) 12226 (vii).

Canals—Quebec (steam road roller) 12225 (vii).

Canals—Rideau (improvements) 12227 (vii).

Canals—Soulanges (improvements) 12225 (vii).

Canals (statistical branch) 10320 (vi).

Canals—Trent (construction) 12225; (improvements) 12227 (vii).

Canals—Welland (Port Maitland piers) 5674 (iii).

Changes in Procedure (remarks) 1885 (i).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 621 (i); Marine and Fisheries (ass't. dep. min.) 12915 (vii); (salaries) 978; Printing and Stationery (salaries, &c.) 613 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9223, 9253; Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9540 (v).

Fisheries (inspectors, &c.) 12261 (vii).

Immigration (general expenses) 5751 (iii).

Justice (Penitentiaries) 12265 (vii).

Labour Dept. ('Gazette') 12261 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5773, 5780 (iii); (pensions) 13324 (vii); (salaries) 4755 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (subsidies) 12263 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (dredging plant) 4754 (iii); (Hudson Bay patrol) 4131 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1894 (i); (Lake St. Peter piers) 4752 (iii); (observatories) 12262 (vii); (patrol boats) 4750 (iii).

Militia (pay and allowance) 12147; (properties) 12148; (Quebec cliffs) 12148; (salaries and wages) 12147; (warlike stores) 12148 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Civil Service Commission) 13168 (vii); (Japanese riots, B.C.) 5783 (iii); (seed grain) 2780 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 1049 (i), 5764 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2968; (wrecks) 3150 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5530; (maintenance) 5512 (iii).

Public Works (ass't. dep. min.) 5698 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10891; (experimental farms, repairs, &c.) 10904 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7116; (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax, customs) 7166; (Shelburne) 7174; (Yarmouth) 7182 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brantford) 7465; (Dom. renewals) 7482; (Glencoe) 7487 (iv); (Kingston, militia stores) 10907 (vi); (Renfrew) 7826 (iv); (R.M.C. Barracks) 10907 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives) 5700 (iii); (heating, &c.) 11009 (vi); (mint) 1451; (observatory) 1450 (i); (rents, &c.) 10986 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Cookshire) 7282; (Farnham) 7288; (Knowlton) 7291; (Lachute) 7293; (Lake Megantic) 7294; (Longueuil) 7304 (iv); (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Caraquet wharf) 11689 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Breton Cove) 11224; (Cape St. Mary) 11224; (Caribou Island) 11225; (Digby) 11227; (Glace Bay) 11228; (Hall's breakwater) 11228; (Oyster Pond) 11258; (Port Hood) 11278; (Port Joli West) 11279; (Tancook island) 11230 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Stanley Island wharf) 5720; (Tiffin) 5741 (iii); (Toronto) 12137 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Rustico) 11293 (vi).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13322 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (monuments) 11118 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (inspection) 10391 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (double tracking) 12238 (vii); (private car of N.T.R.) 10186; (supplies) 10195 (v); (Truro) 12232 (vii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10389 (vi).

Steamboat Inspection (fog alarms) 12262 (vii).

Timber Limits, Application of Mr. Gentles, &c. (remarks) 7100 (iv).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2664 (ii).

Travelling Expenses, Marine Dept., Minister's, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).

—— *re* Col. Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3996 (ii).

U.S. Training Ships through St. Lawrence Canals, Number, &c. (Ques.) 5788 (iii).

—— (M. for copies) 5800 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6135 (iii).

Wednesday Evening Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11232 (vi).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., Financial Aid, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2191 (ii).

Willson, T. L., Payments *re* Ottawa Carbide Co. (Ques.) 11498 (vi).

TELFORD, Mr. W. P., *Grey, N.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5102 (iii).

I.C.R. Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2459 (ii).

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Co.'s (B. 83) 1°*, 1732 (i).

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Registrar of Grey County, 11302 (vi).

Returning Officers in Elections, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).

TELFORD, Mr. W. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12109 (vii).

Tobacco Prohibition, Resolutions from Moral Reform Associations (remarks) 11302 (vi).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W. (Minister of Inland Revenue) *Victoria City, B.C.*

Adulteration of Food, Number of Firms penalized (Ans.) 4402 (iii).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3868 (ii).

Assay Office, Vancouver, Results, &c. (remarks) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

Barlow, Dr. A. E., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ans.) 5205 (iii).

——— Survey *re* Temagami District (Ans.) 5473 (iii).

——— Payments *re* Temagami District (Ans.) 5787 (iii).

Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey (remarks) on Conc., 13569 (vii).

Brock, Mr., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ans.) 5205 (iii).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6213 (iii).

Chilvers, Francis W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 10515 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10750 (vi).

Cigar Stamps, Use of Black Ones (Ans.) 12390 (vii).

Cirkel, Franz., Remuneration *re* Report of Geological Survey *re* Graphites (Ans.) 7935 (iv).

——— Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 7202 (iv).

See 'Graphite,' &c.

Coal Deposits in P.E.I., Boring for, &c. (Ans.) 515 (i).

Corby Distillery, Deficits in Spirit Production (Ans.) 12410 (vii).

Cosgrove, Mr. J. J., Total Cost of Investigation (Ans.) 5797 (iii).

Daley, Mr. R., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ans.) 5204, 5473 (iii).

Dowling, Dr., Leave of Absence from Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10581 (vi).

——— Emplymt. by German Development Co. (Ans.) 5564 (iii).

——— Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ans.) 5206 (iii).

Electric and Gas Power Licenses, granted under Statute, c. 16, &c. (Ans.) 360 (i).

Excise Revenue, Amount received from June 1 to 15, 1908 (Ans.) 10792 (vi).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Geological Survey Dept., Total Expenditure from 1896 to 1908 (Ans.) 6402 (iv).

——— Technical Officers (remarks) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

Geological Survey Yacht, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 11232 (vi).

Gooderham & Worts, Distiller, Deficit in Spirit Production (Ans.) 12411 (vii).

'Graphite,' Cost of Publication, Total Value, &c. (Ans.) 5081 (iii).

See 'Cirkel,' &c.

Harbottle, N. F., Emplymt. by Excise Dept (Ans.) 7731 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. (B. 143) 1°*, 6142 (iii); in Com., 6466; 3°*, 6517 (iv).

Inland Revenue, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 6 (i).

———Seizures in Cornwall, Toronto, &c. (Ans.) 3847 (ii).

——— Violations, on Inquiry for Ret., 4964 (iii).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11238 (vi).

Maple Syrup and Sugar Adulteration, Penalties *re* (Ans.) 6639 (iv).

Marcoun, Mr. Frank, Commission *re* Settlement of Claims (Ans.) 1122 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Accountants, Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4109 (ii).

Medicine Patent Bill, *re* Apptmts. to Com. (remarks) 10689 (vi).

Niagara Falls, Rep. of Dr. Spencer, Criticism of, in Press (Ans.) 6056 (iii).

Patent Medicines Inspection (B. 146) Res. prop., 4963 (iii); in Com. on Res., 6215; 1°*, 6218 (iii); 2° m., 10551; (M.) to ref. to Special Com., 10553 (vi); in Com., 12622 (vii).

Patent Medicines Bill, Govtl Legislation *re* (Ans.) 356, 608 (i), 2594 (ii).

——— Committee of Inquiry *re* (Ans.) 3900 (ii).

Peat Deposits in Canada, Development of (Ans.) 515 (i).

——— Emplymt. of Mr. Erik Nystrom, &c. (Ans.) 1122 (i).

Port Hope Inland Rev. Collectorship, Apptmnt. of (Ans.) 895 (i).

Sugar Manufacture, Saccharine Standards, &c. (Ans.) 351 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Excise (inspectors' salaries) 813; Inland Revenue (salaries) 645, 646; Mines (salaries) 646 (i).

Excise (customs duty) 817; (distilleries) 814; (methylated spirits) 820; (provisional allowances) 818; (tobacco stamps) 816; (travelling expenses, rent, &c.) 814 (i).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Geological Survey (maps, &c.) 12260; (oil borings) 13162; (specimens) 12261; (technical officers) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4109 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (wrecks) 3189 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10874; (Victoria, immigration) 10874 (vi).

Technical Students, Emplymt. on Govt. Works, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3298 (ii)

Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for 1908 (Ans.) 13064 (vii).

Tobacco Excise Taxes, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 566 (i).

Tobacco, Foreign, Total Amount of Refund, &c. (Ans.) 4402 (iii).

Tobacco Industry, Amts. to Inland Revenue Act (Ans.) 179 (i).

—— Infractions of Inland Revenue Act, on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 9523 (v).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9240 (v).

Tobacco Manufactures, Total Amount of Fines and Penalties, &c. (Ans.) 363 (i).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., 920 (i).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6120 (iii).

Whale Fishing Cos. in B. C., Licenses granted, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10277 (v).

Windsor Ferry, Expiration of Franchise (Ans.) 1940 (i).

THOMPSON, Mr. A., *Yukon Territory.*

Bank Act Amendments, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4281 (iii).

Budget, The, 5405 (iii).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 757 (i).

Imperial Treaties, Status of Canada *re* Negotiations, &c. (Ques.) 1939 (i).

Mint, Gold Coins, &c. (Ques.) 2593 (ii).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3954 (ii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3919 (ii).

Treaty-Making Power, Status of Canada, Notice of Discussion, 3172 (ii).

Yukon—Finnie-Perron Case, Information *re* (remarks) 4316 (iii).

—— (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

Yukon, Freight Rates, Rep. of Ry. Commission *re* (Ques.) 894 (i).

—— Mail Service, Complaints *re*, 2022 (ii).

—— Mail Service, Nontransmissable, &c. (remarks) 5136 (iii).

—— Money Transmission, Rates *re* (Ques.) 2979 (ii).

THOMPSON, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Yukon, Morality, Correspondence, &c. (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

TISDALE, Hon. D., *Norfolk.*

Crown Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 180) in Com., 9962 (v).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4577 (iii).

G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6658 (iv).

I.C.R., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4444 (iii).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1027 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12792 (vii).

Presbyterian Widows' and Orphans' Funds, B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2789 (ii).

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. Blain) in Com., 4580 (iii).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4581 (iii).

TOBIN, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

Pulp Wood, Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4821 (iii).

TURCOTTE, Mr. G. A., *Nicolet.*

Nicolet, Govt. Expenditure, for 1878-1896; 1896-1908 (Ques.) 12775 (vii).

TURGEON, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 134) 1°*, 5649 (iii).

Blackhall, Mrs. Claims *re* Caraquet Wharf Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11686 (vi).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1730 (i).

Petit Rocher Breakwater (remarks) 7110 (iv).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4920 (iii).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9795 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Tracadie Lazaretto) 7187 (iv); Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Caraquet wharf) 11686 (vi); (Tracadie) 13349 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Petit Rocher spur) 12759 (vii).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G., *Assiniboia, E.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11357 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11170, 11418, 11533, 11947 (vi).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 68) 1°*, 1424 (i); in Com., 4239, 4545, 4577 (iii).

Fog Signal Co., Payments to (Ques.) 11497 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6373 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 7046 (iv).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13135 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12571 (vii).

Personal Explanation *re* Land Deals, 1927 (i).

Ry. Act (construction) Amt. (B. 4) 1° m., 91 (i); Discussion *re*, 3404; 2° m., 3406 (ii).

——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3359 (ii).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Timber Leases, Denial of Stmnt. of Mr. Ames, 8697 (v).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4233 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, Extension of Time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2922 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3765, 3831 (ii); in Com., 12605 (vii).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 3°, 1930 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N. W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10977 (vi); Sask. (Humboldt) 8595 (v).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2290 (ii).

——— Opening of Tenders, Ques. of Priv. *re* Speech of Mr. Foster, 11303 (vi).

——— Papers used in Debate, on Inquiry for, 2386 (ii).

——— Par. in 'Toronto News,' Ques of Priv., 5077 (iii).

VERVILLE, Mr. A., *Maisonneuve.*

Convict Labour, Control of, Sale of Articles, &c. (Ques.) 238 (i).

Co-operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 4562 (iii).

Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3491 (ii).

Fair Wages Schedule on Dredging Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 7200 (iv).

Immigration Agents in Italy, Number, &c. (Ques.) 4584 (iii).

VERVILLE, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6816 (iv).

Immigration Central Board, London, Moneys paid to, &c. (Ques.) 2545 (ii).

Montreal P. O. Building, Settlement of Strike (remarks) 8608 (v).

North Atlantic Trading Co., and Bonuses, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 803 (i).

Post Office Buildings built since 1904, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 4761 (iii).

Public Works, Hours of Labour (B. 97) 1° m., 3157 (ii).

WALSH, Mr. J. C., *Montreal, St. Anne's.*

Architects Institute of Canada incorp. (B. 88) 1°*, 2214 (ii); in Com., 5379, 5408, 5785, 5953 (iii).

Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3490 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3537 (ii).

WALSH, Mr. R. N., *Huntingdon.*

Beauharnois Canal, Lease to Robert Co., Emplymt. of Mr. Deschene, &c. (Ques.) 8443 (v).

Brockville Cold Storage Plant, Disposal of (Ques.) 3234 (ii).

Currie, W. D., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 7731 (iv).

Desaulniers, Mr. Gonsalve, Emplymt. as Translator, &c. (Ques.) 1121, 1290 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 219 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13272 (vii).

Gaudette, Mr. Victor, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1120 (i).

International Boundary Line, Representations *re* Buildings on (Ques.) 356 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4933 (iii).

Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc., 13381 (vii).

St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe, Waterway from Lake St. Francis, Letters, Plans, Surveys, &c. (M. for copies*) 1690 (i).

——— Damages *re* Floods (remarks) 6987 (iv).

——— Rep. of Engineer (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7808 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock) 12898 (vii); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dundee) 7286 (iv).

Tuberculin Tests, Results of (Ques.) 9270 (v).

WARD, Mr. H. A., *Durham.*

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copy) 3466 (ii).

WARD, Mr. H. A.—*Con.*

Blunden, Frederick (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 5211 (iii).

Cobourg Harbour, Amount expended *re* Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 359 (i).

Gillis, Release from Penitentiary (Ques.) 510 (i).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 960 (i).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1028 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission (remarks) 7387 (iv).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10330 (vi).

Port Hope Inland Revenue Office, Apptmt. of Collector, &c. (Ques.) 895 (i).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8860 (v).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3832 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Trent (damages) 10308 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 9704 (v).

Militia (customs dues) 12156; (pay and allowance) 12147; (provisions) 12151; (R. M. College) 12153 (vii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5524 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon, drill hall) 8518; (Dauphin) 8529 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Hope) 12135 (vii).

Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10330 (vi).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2520, 2652 (ii).

WATSON, Mr. R. J., *Parry Sound.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. (amt.) 11890 (vi).

Georgian Bay Canal, Plans, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for copies, 1982 (i).

WHITE, Mr. G. V., *Renfrew, N.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. (amt.) 11890 (vi).

Georgian Bay Canal Survey, Final Report *re* (Ques.) 240 (i), 5465 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. McCool) for copies, 1970 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10314 (vi).

——— Rep. *re* Surveys (remarks) 11827 (vi).

G.T.P., Supplies, Contract *re* District No. 3, &c. (Ques.) 1120 (i).

McInnes, W. B., Inquiry for Ret., 6061 (iii).

Mattawa Postmaster, Place of Residence (Ques.) 7199 (iv).

Petawawa Camp, Arrangements *re* Training of Troops (Ques.) 5791 (iii).

——— Payment *re* Painting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12147 (vii).

WHITE, Mr. G. V.—*Con.*

Petawawa Dock, Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 685 (i).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10716 (vi).

Stevenson, Mr. A. W., Chartered Accountant, Amounts paid to by Marine Dept., &c. (Ques.) 3233 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4205 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 5742 (iii); (salaries and wages) 12147 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (masters and mates) 2969 (ii).

Post Office (inspectors) 13154 (vii).

Public Works — Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10901 (vi); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Petawawa) 12134 (vii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 1031, &c., on Order for Ret. (amt.) 850 (i).

———Tenders, Original Documents (M for ret.) 2983 (ii).

WILMOT, Mr. R. D., *Sunbury and Queen's.*

Brass, Mr. Albert, Postmaster at Rusagornis, Charges *re* Political Activity (Ques.) 6642 (iv).

Chase's Point, N.B., Pet. *re* Wharf (Ques.) 7937 (iv).

G.T.P., Nationality of Messrs. Foley, Welsh & Stewart, Discrimination against Canadians (Ques.) 7936 (iv).

Immigration Agents in N. B., Apptmt. (Ques.) 843 (i).

Live Stock, N. B., Figures *re* Census, Methods of Obtaining, &c. (Ques.) 1506 (i).

Mill Settlement and Newcastle Creek Post Office, Establishment of, Pets., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2982 (ii).

N.B. Inland Waters, Wharfs, Construction Policy, &c. (Ques.) 5465 (iii).

Scotch Town, N.B., Wharf, Application (Ques.) 7202 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. N. F., *Russell.*

Budget, The, 6610 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. U., *Lennox and Addington.*

Australian Mission of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2218 (ii).

Australian Representative from Canada in 1901, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2168 (ii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4500 (iii).

British Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3621 (ii).

Budget, The, 6082 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4231 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11353; in Com., 11365, 11661; (amt.) 11930 (vi).

WILSON, Mr. U.—*Con.*

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5016 (iii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co. B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13260; in Com. on Res., 13280 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3625 (ii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5496 (iii).

Governor General's Expenditure since 1892 (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3581 (ii).

Haycock, Mr. J. L., Interference in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).

Immigrants deported, Expenditure *re* Transportation, &c. (Ques.) 5080 (iii).

Immigrant Detention Hospitals, Amount expended (Ques.) 5081 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6434 (iv).

Immigration Agent M. C. Dunne, Number of Immigrants located by him in Lennox and Addington County (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

Immigration Agent Miller, Number of Immigrants located by him in Lennox and Addington (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

Immigration Agents, Names, Addresses (Ques.) 180 (i).

Immigrant Agents in G. B., Names, Salary, Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 2169 (ii).

——— Reps. received from (M. for copies*) 557 (i).

Immigration Agents, Names of those paid Commissions to in Europe, &c. (Ques.) 3844 (ii).

——— Agents in Ont., &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 3178 (ii).

——— Special Agents in G. B., Salaries, Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2398 (ii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 3300 (ii).

Immigration and Commercial Agents, Rets., Inquiry for, 1108 (i).

Immigration, O.Cs. and Circulars issued *re* (M. for copies*) 2171 (ii).

I.C.R., Dartmouth Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

Iron and Steel Bounties, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 4244 (iii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11240; in Com., 11247 (vi).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

WILSON, Mr. U.—*Con.*

North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 806 (i).

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10709 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13286 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Patent Record) 672 (i).

Canals—Generally (repairs) 10312 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 635; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 984; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5755 (iii).

Post Office (boots for letter carriers) 8880 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10878; (Victoria, immigration) 10878 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, immigration) 8573 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rents) 10983; (Rideau Hall) 11007 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11083 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10379 (vi).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6186 (iii).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N., *Sherbrooke.*

Cavalry Brigade Eastern Townships, Camp at Quebec, &c. (Ques.) 9273 (v).

Church of England Woman's Auxiliary to the Missionary Society, incorp. (B. 75) 1°*, 1584 (i).

Customs Duty on Militia Uniforms, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2584 (ii).

Dom. Arsenal, Cor. with Ross Rifle Co. *re* Building (Ques.) 7991 (iv).

Dominion Camp Equipment Co., Incorporation, &c. (Ques.) 3238 (ii).

Drill Halls, Number constructed since 1896, Location, &c. (Ques.) 177 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 556 (i).

——— Inquiry for, 4834 (iii), 6222 (iv).

Eastman Rifle Match, Accident, Inquiry *re* (Ques.) 1125 (i).

Fortifications, Construction of, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 6646 (iv).

Garrison Artillery, 5th Regiment, B.C., Complaints *re* (Ques.) 5792 (iii).

Lee-Enfield Rifles, Number purchased, Dates, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 6644 (iv).

Militia Allowances, Arrears of (Ques.) 8442 9273 (v).

Military Camp in Eastern Townships, Proposed Arrangements, &c. (Ques.) 3842 (ii).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*

Militia Promotions, Names and Records, &c. (Ques.) 352 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 559 (i).

Militia Supplies at Halifax, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 6405 (iv).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and U. S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3167 (ii).

Quebec Bridge, Accident, Material on Hand, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 1290 (i).

Quebec Tercentenary, Protests from Regiments *re* Attendance (Ques.) 7992 (iv).

Returns, Inquiry for, 2024 (ii).

Rifles, Purchase of from other Cos. (Ques.) 1123 (i).

Ross Rifle Co., Advances *re* Contracts, Cor. with Bank of Montreal (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).

Ross Rifle Bayonets, Adoption of by Govt. (Ques.) 5786 (iii).

——— Contracts *re* Bayonets, &c. (Ques.) 6235, 8176 (iv), 8442 (v).

——— (M. for copy*) 5476 (iii).

Ross Rifle, Bonus Loans, Service of Govt. Employees, &c. (M. for ret.*) 559 (i).

——— Consignment to N. W. Mounted Police, Manufacture, &c. (Ques.) 5259 (iii).

——— Contracts *re* Supply of Rifles, &c. (M. for copy*) 557 (i).

——— Contract Price, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 8174 (iv).

——— Disposition of Manufactured Rifles, Number, &c. (Ques.) 3237 (ii).

——— Evidence before Pub. Accounts, Inquiry for Rep., 5914 (iii).

——— Imp. Govt., Cor. with *re* Defects, &c. (M. for cor.*) 5210 (iii).

——— Inefficiency and Extravagance of Dept. of Militia, 8902; (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 8953; Amt. neg. (Y. 18; N. 55) 9090 (v).

——— Inter-changeable parts with Lee-Enfield Rifles, Cor. with Imp. Govt., &c. (Ques.) 3898 (ii).

——— Military Associations, &c., Rep. from, *re* Efficiency (M. for ret.*) 557 (i).

——— Negotiations with Vickers Maxim Co., &c. (Ques.) 178 (i).

——— Number reported unfit for Use (Ques.) 3841 (ii).

——— Payments for since Jan. 1, 1908 (Ques.) 7209 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9333 (v).

——— Rep. of Col. Gaudet, &c. (Ques.) 9713 (v).

——— Sealed Pattern, Discovery of (Ques.) 3237 (ii).

——— Services of Govt. Officials, Names, Rank, &c. (Ques.) 365 (i).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*

Ross Rifle, Target Practice, Suspension by N.W.M. Police (Ques.) 3847 (ii).

——— Tests in England, Reps. *re* (remarks) 8170 (iv).

Sherbrooke Militia Corps, Establishment of (Ques.) 9273 (v).

Sutherland Rifle Sight, Contract *re* Additional Number (Ques.) 5257 (iii).

——— Number, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 569 (i).

——— Contracts, &c. (M. for copies*) 5476 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9567 (v); Marine (ice-breakers) 1897 (i).

Vickers Maxim Co., Purchases from by Govt. (Ques.) 356 (i).

WRIGHT, Mr. A. A., *Renfrew, S.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res (Mr. Blain) 5131 (iii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3794 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, on M. (Mr. McCool) for Plans, &c., 5228 (iii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. J. Hughes) 6270 (iv).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10494 (vi).

——— Rules *re* Hours of Adjournment (prop. Res.) 584 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4646 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5527 (iii); Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11083 (vi).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10695 (vi).

WRIGHT, Mr. W., *Muskoka.*

Address, The, 396 (i).

'Arctic,' Str., Payments *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4175 (ii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5108 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8271 (iv), 11716; in Com., 11869 (vi), 12935 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4239 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3613 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for Copies, 2018 (i).

Gravenhurst Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).

WRIGHT, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Hoppins, Mr. Wm., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3842 (ii).

Indian Department, Extravagant Management, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11057 (vi).

Indians in Man. and Sask., Investigation of Mrs. A. M. Paget and Miss Ferguson, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 6919 (iv).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12571 (vii).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11991 (vi).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10849 (vi).

Ottawa Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 3842 (ii).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4232 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Patent Record) 672 (i).

Civil Govt.—Railways (Butler, M. J.) 12756 (vii).

Indians—B.C. (land sales) 12753; N.B. (salaries) 12738; Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12735 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4175 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10875; (Victoria, immigration) 10875 (vi); Ont. (Glencoe) 7491 (iv).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2188 (ii).

ZIMMERMAN, Mr. A., *Hamilton, W.*

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4386 (iii).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6179 (iii).

Coal Duties, Refunds *re* Coke, &c. (Ques.) 6924 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3612 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4333 (iii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5497 (iii).

—— B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12558 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3745 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7228; on M. for 3°, 7216 (iv).

Militia Uniforms, and Customs Duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9569 (v).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) in Com., 5066 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Trade and Commerce (salaries) 664 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9569 (v).

Marine (ice-breakers) 1901 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 5745 (iii), 10294 (v).

Ocean and River Service (masters and mates) 2971 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10902 (vi); Man. (Dauphin) 8528 (v); Ont. (Owen Sound) 7818 (iv); Ottawa (mint) 1472 (i).

INDEX—SUBJECTS.

Absinthe and Brandy Importations, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).

Accounts and Claims against Govt., Total Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 362 (i).

——— remaining unpaid by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 352 (i).

Accountants, Payments to by Dept. of Justice: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3233 (ii).

Acetylene Gas Works at Prescott, Employmt. of Political Officials: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3292 (ii).

Actonvale Public Building, Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6232 (iv).

Adams Lake, Construction of Dam, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5798 (iii).

Address The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech from Throne: moved (Mr. Hall) 9; seconded (Mr. Lanctot) 17.

Debate:—(Mr. R. L. Borden) 23; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 40; (Mr. Foster) 66; (Mr. Fielding) 94; (Mr. Cockshutt) 123, (amt.) 147; Neg. (Y. 95; N. 56)274; (Mr. Miller) 148; (Mr. Clements) 194; (Mr. Fisher) 213; (Mr. Lewis) 242; (Mr. Clarke) 254; (Mr. T. Chisholm) 263; (Mr. W. Roche) 267; (Mr. Barr) 276; (Mr. Lalor) 292; (Mr. Elson) 304; (Mr. Crawford) 316; (Mr. Armstrong) 335, 366, (amt.) 380; (Neg. Y. 54; N. 103) 505; (Mr.. J. J. Hughes) 380; (Mr. Staples) 383; (Mr. Wm. Wright) 396; (Mr. Geo. Smith) 407; (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 412; (Mr. A. A. McLean) 420; (Mr. Kemp) 434; (Mr. W. McIntyre) 445; (Mr. Perley) 449; (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 455; (Mr. Lake) 459; (Mr. A. Lavergne) 476; (Mr. W. J. Roche) 485; (Mr. Paquet) 505; (Mr. Barker) 519, (amt.) 530; (Neg. Y. 50; N. 96) 552; (Mr. Fielding) 531; (Mr. Monk) 535; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 544; (Mr. Haggart) 548 (d).

——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to present, 554 (i).

Administrative Buildings, Erection of: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).

Admiralty Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 122.'

Adulteration of Food, Number of Firms penalized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 4402 (iii).

Advertisements in Newspapers, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 509 (i).

Advertising in Mar. Prov. Newspapers, Amts. paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 936 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders *re* Govt. Works, Supplies, &c.: Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4702; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 95) 4735 (iii).

See 'Tenders,' &c.

Agricultural Committee, 2nd Rep.: M. (Mr. Mackenzie) to conc., 12409 (vii).

Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).

AGRICULTURE.

Agriculture, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 7 (i).

——— Dep. Minister O'Halloran's Salary: in Com. of Sup., 12878 (vii).

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 645, 671 (i), 10569 (vi), 12879 (vii).

Anglo-French Exhibition, Canadian Representative: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8611 (v).

——— Goods purchased from T. Lindsay Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8615 (v).

——— Purchase of Goods, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8443 (v).

——— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8443 (v).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., Removal of, Action by Govt. since 1896: Ques. Mr. Armstrong) 2167 (ii).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 2795 (ii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 6223 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G. B.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).

——— Cable *re* Removal by G. B.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13228 (vii).

Cattle exported to U. S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 2767 (ii).

Cattle Exports and Imports from Canada to G. B.: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 6460 (iv).

Cattle Registered, Importation from U. S., from 1904-7: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 6238 (iv).

Cattle Inspection *re* Ocean Service: in Com. of Sup., 3220 (ii).

Cattle sold from Experimental Farm: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 2389 (ii).

Cold Storage, Assistance *re* East Elgin Establishment: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 351 (i).

Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner's Report: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2786 (ii).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*
Dairying and Fruit Industry: in Com. of Sup., 10397 (vi).
Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 10569 (vi), 12889 (vii).
——— Amount of Subsidies paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4406 (iii).
Exhibitions outside of Canada, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4584 (iii).
Experimental Farm, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 1018 (i).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 12549 (vii).
Experimental Farm (Central) Amounts paid for Seeds, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 556 (i).
——— Sale of Cattle, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 2795 (ii).
Experimental Farms, Establishment of, Names of Provs.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 7990 (iv).
——— in Quebec District, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2593 (ii).
——— Pet. from Quebec Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 8182 (iv).
Experimental Farms, Number controlled by Dom. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 3897 (ii).
——— Total Receipts from Sales, Expenditure, &c: (Mr. Armstrong) 4585 (iii).
Fumigation Stations: in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).
Hog Cholera in Essex, Number of Animals slaughtered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 9280 (v).
Hogs slaughtered, Compensation paid, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 13085 (vii).
Horses and Cattle, Imports to U. S. as Thoroughbreds, Prevention of: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 6000 (iii).
Imperial Institute: in Com. of Sup., 10623 (vi).
Jamestown Exhibition, Canadian Exhibits, Permission *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5079 (iii).
Live Stock, N.B., Figures *re* Census, Methods of Obtaining, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 1506 (i).
Piggeries at Experimental Farm: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vii).
Seeds Inspection Act: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vii).
Sheep Quarantine by U. S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 13064 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Christie) 13537 (vii).
Tuberculin Tests, Results of: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 9270 (v).
Aids to Navigation, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5040 (iii).
Aids to Navigation, Construction of Lighthouses: in Com. of Sup., 5773 (iii).
See 'Marine.'.
Alberta and B. C. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 192'
Alberta Development Co., Control of Coal Lands: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 6241 (iv).
Alberta Closed Leases, Number granted, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3037 (ii).
Alberta Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 45.'
Alberton Fire Damage Claims: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. A. Lefurgey) 1209 (i).
Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry: prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3853 (ii).
Alexander, Mary, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 177.'
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Subsidies, Reports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 892 (i).
Algoma Steel Co., Orders from Govt. for Steel, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8606 (v).
See 'I. C. R.'
Alien Act: *See* B. No. 130.'
Alien Labour, Protection to Canadians: Pet. (Mr. Boyce) read in Com. of Sup., 12156 (vii).
See 'Immigration,' &c.
Allan, Mr., Interference in Dom. Elections: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).
All-Red Line: prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12414; Agreed to (Y. 109; N. 47) 12501; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Neg. (Y. 108; N. 48) 12499 (vii).
——— Irish Route, Opposition by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10253 (v).
——— Negotiations, Canadian Representative in England, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 353 (i).
——— Omission of, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 28 (i).
——— Route, Letter to Mr. Sifton from Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 948 (i).
——— Mr. Sifton's Address *re* Canada's Attitude: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 947 (i).
All-Red Route, &c., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 87 (i).
——— Remarks *re* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12162 (vii).
——— Statement *re* Negotiations: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 366 (i).
——— Tenders, Proposals, &c., Cor. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6460 (iv).
——— Mr. White's Duties in England: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 694 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 608 (i).
American Bank Note Co., Agreement *re* Printing Stamps: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2593 (ii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
American Cereal Co., Customs Refunds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3484 (ii).

Amherst Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12233 (vii).
Ancoin *vs.* The King, Cor. *re* Suit in Supreme Court, N. S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McLennan) 558 (i).
Anglo-American Cable between P.E.I. and Mainland, Breaking of: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 8439 (v).
Anglo-American Treaty, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 937 (i), 6985 (iv).
——— Further Information: (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7447, 7834 (iv).
——— Information *re* Presenting (Mr. R. L. 8516 (v).
——— Anglo-American Treaties, Cor. *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9715 (v).
——— Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. Sproule) 10120 (v).
——— Treaty submitted to Can. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6926 (iv).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.
Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank: *See* 'B. No. 141.'
Anglo-Canadian Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 126.'
Anglo-French Exhibition, Canadian Representative: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8611 (v).
——— Goods purchased from T. Lindsay Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8615 (v).
——— Purchase of Goods, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8443 (v).
——— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8443 (v).
Anglo-French Treaty, Ratification by Imperial Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11705 (vi).
See 'Franco-Canadian.'
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Cor., Reps., &c.; M. for copies (Mr. Monk) 594 (i).
See 'Japanese,' &c.
Annapolis and Digby Mail Service, Amounts paid: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 12653 (vii).
Annapolis Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11207 (vi).
Annual Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iii).
See 'Militia.'
Anuities by Govt. for Old Age: *See* 'B. No. 120.' *See* 'Old Age,' &c.
Anse à la Barbe Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12028 (vi).
Anse à l'Illot Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Anse St. Jean Bridge, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Anthracite Coal, Qantity imported from U. S. and other Countries: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1510 (i).
Anti-Cigarette Bill: *See* 'Tobacco.'
Antigonish Armoury, Leasing, &c., Letters, Tels., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. Chisholm) 1131 (i).
Antigonish, Increased Accommodation, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Antigonish Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7110 (iv).
Appeal Court, B.C., Salary of Judge: M. to withdraw Res. (Mr. Aylesworth) 7992 (iv).
See 'Justice,' &c.
Apple and Fruit Inspectors, Number of Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 353 (i).
Apples, &c., Marking of: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Apples seized by Inspectors at Montreal, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1508 (i).
Architects of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 88.'
Architectural Institute of Canada: M. (Mr. Ethier) to Refund Fees, 11234, 11404 (vi).
Architects on Public Works Payments, &c.: Remarks, in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).
Architectural Branch, Public Works Dept., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11096 (vi).
Archives Dept., Index Cards purchased, Names of Firms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 6057 (iii).
Archives Fittings, Furnishings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5700 (iii).
Archives: in Com. of Sup., 671 (i).
'Arctic, Str., Amounts expended for Repairs, Supplies, &c., from June, 1904, to June, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 184 (i).
——— History of Cruise in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (ii).
Armouries, Construction of: in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Army and Navy Veterans at the Tercentenary: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7448 (iv).
See 'Que. Tercentenary.'
Arnprior Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iv).
Arsenault, Mr. Auguste, Emplymt. in Customs, Montreal, Charges against: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1347 (i).
Arthabaskaville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Artz, J. G., Apptmt. of. Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 13578 (vii).
Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 58.'
Ashcroft-Dawson Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).
Ashouapmouchouan, Peribonka Training Dykes: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Ash Wednesday, Adjournment: Notice of Motion (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4221; M. 4314 (iii).
Asiatic Immigration into B.C.: *See* 'Immigration Act.'
Asiatic Labour in B.C., Rep. in Victoria 'Times': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6526 (iv).
See 'Japanese,' &c.
Assaults on Women, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 79.'

Assay Office, Vancouver, Results, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 13573 (vii).
Assurance Fund of Saskn. and Alta.: *See* B. No. 168.'
Astronomical Boundary Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9737 (v).
Astronomical Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 1450, 1485 (i).
Atlantic, Que. and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 134.'
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction: in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).
Atlantic Steamers, Mail Service, Cost per Annum: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5656 (iii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Aud. Gen.'s Office: in Com. of Sup., 635 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (Vol. i): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i).
——— (Vol. ii): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 766 (i).
——— (Vol. iii): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6 (i).
Auditor General's Salary: *See* 'B. No. 208.'
Audits and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12658 (vii).
See 'Banks,' 'Finance,' &c.
Australia, G. B. and Canada Fast Line Steamers, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 558 (i).
See 'Can. and Australia.'
Australian Mission of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 2218
Australian Representative from Can. in 1901, Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 2168 (ii).
Automobiles injuring Persons: *See* 'B. No. 140.'
Autonomy Act, Validity of: Return, Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 5727 (iii).
Aylmer Customs Collector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 1506 (i).
Aylmer Drill Shed: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
Baddeck Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11219 (vi).
Badgley Island, Trespass by T. H. Jackman, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1937 (i), 2217 (ii).
Baie St. Paul, Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Bait Freezer and Cold Storage Co., N.B., Lease of Land to, Cost and Terms: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 563 (i).
——— Cor., Agreements, &c., with Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 558 (i).
See 'Cold Storage,' 'New Brunswick,' &c.
Bait Freezer at North Sydney, Govt. Assistance *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 3848 (ii).
Balsam Lake Section, Trent Canal, Claims for Damages: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10308 (vi).
Balsam Lake and Gull River, Ret. Incomplete: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 6059 (iii).
See 'Canals, Trent.
Bank Act, (additional circulation), Amt. *See* 'B. No. 160.'
Banks, Financial Stringency: *See* 'Wheat Transportation.'
Banks, Govt. Assistance *re* Grain Blockade: *See* 'No. 159.'
Bank of Hamilton, Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 56.'
Banking System: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Pringle) *re* Newspaper Reports, 2306 (ii).
——— Par. in 'Financial Post': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) 4770 (iii).
See 'Can. Bank of Commerce.'
Bank of Vancouver: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Bank of Winnipeg: *See* 'B. No. 19.'
Banque de St. Jean, Investigation *re* Failure, Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9335 (v).
Barachois de Malbaie Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Barachois Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 11223 (vi).
Barlow, Dr. A. E., Emplymt. in Geological Survey: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5205 (iii).
——— Survey *re* Temagami District: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5473 (iii).
——— Payments *re* Survey of Temagami District: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5787 (iii).
Bate & Co., and W. C. Edwards & Co., Amts. paid to *re* Supplies: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 3435 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3234 (ii).
Batiscan River, Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Batiscan Wharf, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Battlefields: *See* 'Can. Patriotic,' &c.
Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. Nos. 111 and 219.'
Battlefields: *See* 'Quebec.'
Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8576 (v).
Bayfield, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 6223 (iv).
See 'Grand Bend,' &c.
Bay St. Lawrence, Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Bear River Station Dwelling House, Tenders, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2161 (ii).
Beauchemin, A., Emplymt. at Sorel (Mr. Taylor) 5467 (iii).
Beauharnois Canal, Investigation by M. Dupuis, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3038 (ii).
——— Lease, Conditions, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bergeron) 1131 (i).
———Inquiry for (Mr. Bergeron) 1740 (i).

Beauharnois Canal, Lease to Robert Co., Employment of Mr. Deschenes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 8443 (v).
—— Lease of Water Power to McIntyre and Roberts Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).
—— Robert Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 13475 (vii).
—— Water Power, New Lease, Copy of: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 946 (i).
Beaver Harbour Wharf: Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Beaverton Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12090, 13344 (vii).
Becancour, &c., Counties, Dredging at during 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3040 (ii).
See 'Dredging,' &c.
Becancour Harbour Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2392 (ii).
—— Dredging, Commencement of Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7212 (iv).
Behring Sea Commission, Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 1733 (i).
—— Sir C. H. Tupper's Travelling Expenses: Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 4669 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2883 (ii).
Belgian Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
Belgian Syndicate, Royal Commission, and Chap. 138, R.S.C., Judges as Commissioners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 842 (i).
Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 13569 (vii).
Bellechasse Islet Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4830 (iii).
Belle River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).
Belle River Harbour Improvements, Expenditure, *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 685 (i).
Belleville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).
Belleville Drill Hall, Negotiations for Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1509 (i).
—— Payments to Mr. J. Hurley, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1737 (i).
Belleville Floods, Investigation by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 3319 (ii), 4744 (iii).
Belleville Harbour, Issue of Bonds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 6237 (iv).
—— Total Revenue, Expenditure for 1903-7: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 2592 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Porter) 2983 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Porter) 4408 (iii).
Belleville Hospital Lot, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 4830 (iii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Porter) 5211 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 7506 (iv).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G. T. Ry. Co.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Northrup) 2796 (iii).
Belleville Post Office, Excessive Postage: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 7933 (iv).
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.: *See* 'B. No. 20.'
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co. Bill, on Order for 2°: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 681 (i).
Belleville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7678 (iv).
Bell Memorial Association, Grant by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) on M. for Sup., 11206 (vi).
See 'Brantford.'
Bell Rapids P. O., Establishment of: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 8883 (v).
Berins Fish Hatchery, Failure of Spawn Supply: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3240 (ii).
Bernier, Capt., Islands, Customs Ports, &c., Flagged by him: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5208, 5466 (iii).
Berthier Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
'Bessie Butler,' Str., Dimensions, Use of by R. C. Clergy: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 12411 (vii).
Bic Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
—— Material supplied, Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 9713 (v).
Big Lorraine Harbour, Dredging Entrance Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Bills of Exchange Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 142.'
Bills, Royal Assent, Mess. from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 2974, 2995 (ii), 5135, 6157 (iii), 6526 (iv), 13587 (vii).
BILLS:
Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1°*, 3 (i).
Bill (No. 2) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 90 (i); 2°m., 3014; in Com., 3034 (ii).
Bill (No. 3) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 91; 2°, 570; in Com., 583; 3°*, 583 (i).
Bill (No. 4) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°, 91 (i); 2°m., 3406 (ii).
Bill (No. 5) Respecting Co-operation.—(Mr. Monk).
1°, 92; 2°m., (i); M. to place on Govt. Orders, 3654 (ii); 2°m., 4547; in Com., 4564; 3°*, 4566 (iii).
Bill (No. 6) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Maclean, South York).
1°, 93; 2°m., 938 (i), 3320, 3363 (ii).
Bill (No. 7) To incorporate the North Empire Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Adamson).
1°*, 231; 2°*, 463 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5077 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 8) Respecting the Tobique Manufacturing Company, and to change its name to 'Fraser Lumber Company, Limited.—(Mr. Carvell).

1°*, 231; 2°*, 463 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 9) Respecting Surveys of Public Lands of the Dominion and the Surveyors entitled to make such surveys (Mr. Oliver).

1° 231; 2° and in Com., 754, 948; 3°*, 953 (i), Sen. Amts., 3755 (ii).

Bill (No. 10) To amend the Irrigation Act. —(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 231; 2°, 766; in Com., 767, 953 (i); wthdn., 2974 (ii).

Bill (No. 11) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Maclean, S. York).

1°, 231 (i).

Bill (No. 12) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Maclean, Lunenburg).

1°, 313 (i); 2°, 3414 (ii).

Bill (No. 13) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher).

1°*, 350; 2°*, 680; in Com., and 3°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 14) Respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. McColl).

1°*, 350; 2°*, 680; in Com., and 3°*; 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 15) Respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company. — (Mr. Sloan).

1°*, 350; 2°*, 680; in Com., and 3°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 16) Respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Guthrie).

1°*, 350; 2°*, 680; in Com., 1894; 3°, 1929 (i).

Bill (No. 17) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. McCarthy, N. Simcoe).

1°, 349 (i); 2°m., 3414 (ii).

Bill (No. 18) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Kennedy).

1°, 350; 2°, 938 (i).

Bill (No. 19) To incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—(Mr. Bole).

1°*, 430; 2°*, 680 (i); in Com., 2787; 3°*, 2924 (ii).

Bill (No. 20) Respecting the Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Company.—(Mr. Porter).

1°*, 430; 2°m., 681, 779; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 7669 (iv), 8332, 8552, 8609, 9066 (iv).

Bill (No. 21) Respecting the British Yukon Railway Company.— (Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 430; 2°*, 645 (i); in Com., 3621 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 22) Respecting the Macleod, Cardston and Montana Railway Company.—(Mr. Herron).

1°*, 430; 2°*, 680; in Com., and 3°*, 1894 (i).

Bill (No. 23) Respecting the Ministers' Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.—Mr. Bickerdike).

1°*, 430; 2°*, 645 (i); in Com., 2788; 3°*, 2924 (ii).

Bill (No. 24) Respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert).

1°*, 430; 2°*, 645; in Com., and 3°*, 1468 (i).

Bill (No. 25) Respecting the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke.)

1°*, 430; 2°*, 645 (i); in Com., 3194, 3226; M. to ref. back to Com., 3228; in Com., 3362, 3621, 3692, 3793 (ii), 4224; 3° m., 4357, 4536 (iii).

Bill (No. 26) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cash.)

1°*, 430; 2°*, 645; in Com., and 3°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 27) To amend the Government Railways Act.—(Mr. Macdonald.)

1°, 430 (i); 2°, 5211; in Com., 5246; 3°*, 5247 (iii).

Bill (No. 28) To amend the Copyright Act.—(Mr. Macdonell.)

1°, 508; 2°, 939; in Com., 940 (i); 3°*,3014 (ii).

Bill (No. 29) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°, 508 (i); 2°, 5247 (iii).

Bill (No. 30) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Ethier).

1°, 560 (i).

Bill (No. 31) To amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. Sinclair).

1°*, 562 (i); 2°, and in Com., 5247 (iii).

Bill (No. 32) To incorporate the Bank of Vancouver.—(Mr. Macpherson).

1°*, 606; 2° m., 779; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 4580; 3°*, 4582 (iii).

Bill (No. 33) Respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher).

1°*, 606; 2°*. 779 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 34) Respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. Hughes, Victoria).

1°*, 606; 2°*, 779; in Com., 1894; 3°*, 1931 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 35) To incorporate the Travellers Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Gervais).
1°*, 606; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5077 (iii).

Bill (No. 36) Respecting the Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*, 606; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 37) To incorporate the Canada Weather Insurance Company.—(Mr. Schell, Oxford).
1°*, 753; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 5077, 5174; 3°*, 5174 (iii).

Bill (No. 38) Respecting the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*,754; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 39) Respecting the Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*, 754; 2°*, 1059; in Com., and 3°*, 1895 (i).

Bill (No. 40) Respecting the Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Macpherson).
1°*, 754; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 6182 (iii), 6227; 3°*, 6231 (iv).

Bill (No. 41) To incorporate the Standard Plate Glass Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 754; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 6183; 3°*, 6184 (iii).

Bill (No. 42) Respecting Insurance.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°, 827; 2°, 1741 (i).

Bill (No. 43) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Barr).
1°, 840 (i); 2° m., 5212 (iii).

Bill (No. 44) To incorporate the Alberta Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Talbot).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 45) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 46) Respecting the Cumberland Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Monk).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1109 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 47) Respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—(Mr. Stewart).
1°*, 891; 2°, 1059 (i); in Com., 3622, 3794 (ii), 4230; 3°*, 4230 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 48) Respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. German).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 49) To incorporate the Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 5109; 3° m., 5519 (iii).

Bill (No. 50) Respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Copp).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., 4231; 3°*, 4231; Sen. Amts., 5785 (iii).

Bill (No. 51) Respecting the Erie, London and Tilsonburg Railway Company.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4240 (iii).

Bill (No. 52) Respecting a Patent of Eugene Francois Giraud.—(Mr. Gordon).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 53) Respecting the New Brunswick Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Carvell).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5762 (iii).

Bill (No. 54) To incorporate the Northwestern Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher).
1°*, 1108; 2°, 1468 (i).

Bill (No. 55) To incorporate the Western Rivers Improvement Company.—(Mr. Sloan).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i)

Bill (No. 56) To incorporate the Bank of Hamilton Pension Fund.—(Mr. Barker).
1°*, 1207; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5077 (iii).

Bill (No. 57) Respecting a certain Convention between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 941; in Com. on Res., 1213; 1° m., 1215, 1384 (i); 2°, 2221, 3493; in Com., 3577, 3581, 3636 (ii); 3° m., 4317, 4372 (ii).

Bill (No. 58) Respecting the Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 59) To incorporate the Chartered Bank of British Columbia.—(Mr. Macpherson).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 60) Respecting Patents of the Goodwin Car Company.—(Mr. Osler).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2924 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 61) Respecting Patents of Montague Moore and Thomas James Heskett.—(Mr. Osler).

1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2924 (ii).

Bill (No. 62) Respecting the Subsidiary High Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters in the Dominion of Canada—(Mr. Guthrie).

1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., 5077, 5174; 3°*, 5175 (iii).

Bill (No. 63) Respecting Patents of the Sutherland Rifle Sight Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonald).

1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 64) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Porter).

1°, 1283 (i); on order for 2°, 5226 (iii).

Bill (No. 65) To amend the Immigration Act.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 1284 (i).

Bill (No. 66) To amend the House of Commons Act.—(Mr. Borden).

1°, 1346 (i); 2° m., 5226 (iii).

Bill (No. 67) Respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Pardee).

1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4240; Sen. Amts., 5955 (iii).

Bill (No. 68) Respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff).

1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., 4239, 4545, 4577; 3°*, 4579 (iii).

Bill (No. 69) To incorporate the Ruthenian Catholic Mission of the Order of Saint Basil the Great in Canada.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).

1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3194 (ii).

Bill (No. 70) To incorporate the Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).

1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., 4231, 4546, 4579; 3°*, 4580 (iii).

Bill (No. 71) Respecting the Standard Mutual Fire Insurance Company, and to change its name to 'the Standard Fire Insurance Company.'—(Mr. Maclean, South York).

1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 9964 (v).

Bill (No. 72) Respecting Patents of the Windsor Pump and Foundry Company, Limited.—(Mr. Clarke).

1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 73) Respecting the Quebec Railway, Light and Power Company.—(Mr. Power).

1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1895 (i); in Com., 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 74) Respecting the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company.—(Mr. Grant).

1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1931 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4240; Sen. Amts., 6189 (iii).

Bill (No. 75) To incorporate the Woman's Auxiliary to the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.—(Mr. Worthington).

1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1931 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2790 (ii).

Bill (No. 76) Respecting the Interprovincial Railway Bridge Company of New Brunswick.—(Mr. C. Marcil).

1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1895 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4240 (iii).

Bill (No. 77) Respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Dubeau).

1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1895 (i); in Com., 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

Bill (No. 78) To amend the Provisions of the Criminal Code respecting Offensive Weapons.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 1668 (i).

Bill (No. 79) To amend the Provisions of the Criminal Code respecting Assaults on Women and Children.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 1670 (i).

Bill (No. 80) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Alcorn).

1°, 1671 (i); 2°, 5228 (iii).

Bill (No. 81) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).

1°*, 1732; 2°*, 1931 (i); in Com., 4231; in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

Bill (No. 82) Respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—(Mr. Adamson).

1°*, 1732; 2°*, 1931 (i); in Com., 4996, 5049; 3°*, 5077 (iii); Sen. Amts., 10511 (vi).

Bill (No. 83) Respecting the Owen Sound and Meaford Railway Company.—(Mr. Telford).

1°*, 1732 (i); 2°*, 2062 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4240 (iii).

Bill (No. 84) To incorporate the Dominion Transportation and Storage Company.—(Mr. German).

1°*, 1859 (i); 2°*, 2062 (ii).

Bill (No. 85) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lavergne, Montmagny).

1°, 2021 (ii); 2° m., 5242 (iii).

Bill (No. 86) To incorporate the Northern Empire Railway Company.—(Mr. Caron).

1°*, 2160; 2°*, 2386 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5387 (iii).

Bill (No. 87) To incorporate the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Sloan).

1°*, 2160; 2°*, 2346 (ii); in Com., 4545; 3°*, 4545; Sen. Amts., 6189 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 88) To incorporate the Institute of Architects of Canada.—(Mr. Walsh, Montreal, Ste. Anne).

1°*, 2214; 2°*, 2386 (ii); in Com., 5379, 5408, 5785, 5953; 3°*, 5955 (iii).

Bill (No. 89) To authorize the Sale to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, of a portion of Major's Hill Park, in the City of Ottawa, as a Hotel Site.—(Mr. Pugsley).

Res. prop., 1584 (i), 2221; in Com. on Res., 2258; 1°*, 2260 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 12061; 3°*, 12084 (vii).

Bill (No. 90) To amend the Passenger Ticket Act.—(Mr. Reid, Grenville).

1°,2466 (ii); 2° m., 5244 (iii).

Bill (No. 91) To amend the Act respecting the Supreme Court of Canada.—(Mr. Gervais).

1°, 2542 (ii).

Bill (No. 92) To amend the Criminal Code with regard to the Speedy Trial of Indictable Offences.—(Mr. Gervais).

1°, 2543 (ii).

Bill (No. 93) To amend the Criminal Code and punish homicide while hunting.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 2590 (ii).

Bill (No. 94) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending 31st March, 1908.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Ways and Means, 2780; 1°, 2°, and in Com., 2782; 3°*, 2785 (ii).

Bill (No. 95) To amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°, 2974 (ii).

Bill (No. 96) To amend the Criminal Code with regard to conspiracy in restraint of trade.—(Mr. Gervais).

1°, 2976 (ii).

Bill (No. 97) Respecting the hours of labour on Public Works.—(Mr. Verville).

1°, 3157 (ii).

Bill (No. 98, from the Senate) Respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Blain).

1°, 3315 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., 4580; 3°*, 4580 (iii).

Bill (No. 99) To amend the Irrigation Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 3315 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 4671; 3°*, 4674 (iii).

Bill (No. 100) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Martin, St. Mary's).

1°*, 3316 (ii).

Bill (No. 101) Respecting the Fort William Terminal Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Macpherson).

1°*, 3477 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., 6180 (iii), 6223; 3°*, 6225 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 102) To amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 3477; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 3933 (ii).

Bill (No. 103, from the Senate) Respecting the Eastern Trust Company.—(Mr. Guthrie).

1°*, 3653 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 6191 (iii).

Bill (No. 104, from the Senate) To amend the Companies Act.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°*, 3653 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 5492; 3°, 5495 (iii).

Bill (No. 105) To regulate the placing and maintaining of Booms in International Streams.—(Mr. Pugsley).

1°, 3654 (ii).

Bill (No. 106) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lavergne, Montmagny).

1°, 3655 (ii).

Bill (No. 107 from the Senate) Respecting the Trans-Canada Railway Company.—(Mr. Girard).

1°*, 3834 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., 5386; 3°*, 5387 (iii).

Bill (No. 108 from the Senate) Respecting the Windsor, Chatham and London Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke).

1°*, 3834 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 5387 (iii).

Bill (No. 109) To authorize a Bounty to Volunteers who served the Crown in South Africa.—(Mr. Oliver).

Res. prop., 3316; in Com. on Res., 3756, 3805; 1°* of B., 3834 (ii); Res. prop., 11938; in Com on Res., 12595; 2°, and in Com., 12595, 13047; 3°, 13207; Sen. Amts., 13524 (vii).

Bill (No. 110, from the Senate) Respecting a certain Patent of Frederick C. Rehm, Elias Frank and Isidore Frank.—(Mr. Béland).

1°*, 3896 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 4996 (iii).

Bill (No. 111) Respecting the Canadian Battlefields at Quebec.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

Res. prop., 3579; in Com. on Res., 3901; 1°, 3902 (ii); 2° m., 4376; in Com., 4393, 4408, 4497; 3° m., 4529 (iii).

Bill (No. 112) To amend the Railway Act as respects the Constitution of the Board of Railway Commissioners.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 3751; in Com. on Res., 3903; 1°*, 3933 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 4964 (iii), 8510; 3°*, 8514 (v).

Bill (No. 113) To amend the Land Titles Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 4221 (iii); 2° m., 6517; in Com., 6518; 3°*, 6520 (iv).

Bill (No. 114) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).

1°, 4312 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 115) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4566 (iii); 2° m., 7835, 7939, 7998; on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8076, 8089, 8138, 8185 (iv), 8296, 8332, 8387, 8619 (v), 11707; Amt. wthdrn., and in Com., 11796; in Com., 11827, 11885 (vi), 12919, 12984; 3° m., 13229; 3°*, 13258; Sen. Amts., 13579 (vii).

Bill (No. 116) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4576 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 8501; 3°*, 8510 (v).

Bill (No. 117) To amend the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund Act.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 4576; 2°, and in Com., 4994; 3°*, 4995 (iii).

Bill (No. 118) To amend the Railway Act with respect to Telegraphs and Telephones, and the Jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 4658 (iii); 2°, 10625; in Com., 10636, 10658; 3° m., 10777, 11124, 11590; ref. back to Com., 11633; 3°*, 11633 (vi).

Bill (No. 119) To encourage the Construction of Dry Docks.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 4314; in Com. on Res., 4675; 1°*, 4689 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6911 (iv); in Com., 10761; 3°*, 10771; Sen. Amts., 11633 (vi).

Bill (No. 120) To authorize the Issue of Government Annuities for Old Age.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Res., 4689; 1°*, 4702 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 10848 (vi), 12053; 3°*, 12054; Sen. Amts., 13316 (vii).

Bill (No. 121) To amend the Supreme Court Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4826; 2°, and in Com., 5497; 3°*, 5499 (iii).

Bill (No. 122) To make better Provision for the exercise of Admiralty Jurisdiction within Canada, in accordance with the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, 1890.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

Res. prop., 2881 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4835; 1°*, 4867 (iii).

Bill (No. 123, from the Senate) To amend the Gold and Silver Marking Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°*, 5337; 2°*, and in Com., 5495; 3°*, 5497 (iii).

Bill (No. 124, from the Senate) For the relief of Andrew Walker.—(Mr. Guthrie).

1°*, 5336; 2°*, 5464 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 7142 (iv).

Bill (No. 125, from the Senate) Respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. Macpherson).

1°*, 5255; 2°*, 5464; in Com., 6183; 3°*, 6189 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 126, from the Senate) To change the name and head office of the Anglo-Canadian Insurance Company.—(Mr. Gervais).

1°*, 5256; 2°*, 5464 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 7725 (iv).

Bill (No. 127, from the Senate) Respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.—(Mr. Pringle).

1°*, 5255; 2°*, 5464; in Com., 6183 (iii), 6231; 3°*, 6231 (iv); Sen. Amts., 12773 (vii).

Bill (No. 128, from the Senate) Respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. Michaud).

1°*, 5255; 2°*, 5464; in Com., 6181 (iii), 6225; 3°*, 6227 (iv).

Bill (No. 129, from the Senate) To incorporate the London and Lancashire Guarantee and Accident Company.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°*, 5255; 2°*, 5464 (iii).

Bill (No. 130, from the Senate) To amend the Naturalization Act.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

1°*, 5256 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 11990 (vi); 3°*, 12393 (vii).

Bill (No. 131, from the Senate) Respecting the Occidental Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).

1°*, 5337; 2°*, 5464 (iii); in Com., 7724 (iv); 3°*, 8332 (v).

Bill (No. 132, from the Senate) To incorporate the Standard Accident and Guarantee Company.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°*, 5337; 2°*, 5464; in Com., and 3°*, 6191 (iii).

Bill (No. 133, from the Senate) To amend the Boards of Trade Act.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°*, 5337 (iii); 2°, 11987; in Com., 11987 (vi), 12393; 3°*, 12393 (vii).

Bill (No. 134, from the Senate) Respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Marcil).

1°*, 5649; 2°, 5763; in Com., and 3°*, 6191 (iii).

Bill (No. 135) To amend the Immigration Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 5657 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6429; 3°*, 6517 (iv).

Bill (No. 136) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial years ending respectively the 31st March, 1908, and the 31st March, 1909.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Ways and Means, 5919, 5955; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5957 (iii).

Bill (No. 137, from the Senate) Respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment).

1°*, 5913; 2°*, 6191 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 8332 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 138, from the Senate) Respecting the Pacific and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment).

1°*, 5913; 2°*, 6191 (iii); in Com., 8610, 9069; 3°*, 9070 (v).

Bill (No. 139, from the Senate) For the relief of Edith Maud Rosario Gammell.—(Mr. Galliher).

1°*, 5913; 2°, 6190 (iii); in Com., 7141; 3°*, 7142 (iv).

Bill (No. 140) To amend the Criminal Code respecting injuries to Persons due to Motor Vehicles.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°*, 5993 (iii).

Bill (No. 141, from the Senate) To incorporate the Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank.—(Mr. Guthrie).

1°*, 6054; 2°*, 6191 (iii); in Com., 7724; 3°*, 7724 (iv).

Bill (No. 142) To amend the Bills of Exchange Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 6054 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6520; 3°*, 6523 (iv).

Bill (No. 143) To amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. Templeman).

Res. prop., 5161; in Com. on Res., 6118; 1°*, 6142 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6466; 3°*, 6517 (iv).

Bill (No. 144) To amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 6142 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6523; 3°*, 6525 (iv).

Bill (No. 145) To amend the Act relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies.—(Mr. Brodeur).

Res. prop., 3193; in Com. on Res., 6161, 6191; 1°*, 6215 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6408; 3°*, 6429 (iv).

Bill (No. 146) Respecting Proprietary and Patent Medicines.—(Mr. Templeman).

Res. prop., 4963; in Com. on Res., 6215; 1°*, 6218 (iii); 2°, 10551 (vi); in Com., 12622; 3°*, 12628 (vii).

Bill (No. 147) To repeal the Canned Goods Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°, 6221; 2°, and in Com., 6870; 3°*, 6890 (iv).

Bill (No. 148) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°, 6221; 2°, 6900; in Com., 6900 (iv), 10553; 3°*, 10569 (vi).

Bill (No. 149) To amend the Meat and Canned Foods Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°, 6221; 2°, and in Com., 6890; 3° m., 7215; ref. back to Com., 7227; 3°*, 7257 (iv).

Bill (No. 150) To amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 6221 (iv); 2° m., 8481; in Com., 8483 (v), 10518; 3°*, 10526 (vi).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 151, from the Senate) Respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—(Mr. Crawford).

1°*, 6287; 2°, 6561; in Com., 7141, 7667, 8125 (iv), 8332, 8552, 8609, 8741, 9066, 9377, 9461; 3°*, 9472 (v).

Bill (No. 152) Respecting Signal Dues at Halifax.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°, 6457 (iv); 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 8510 (v).

Bill (No. 153, from the Senate) To incorporate the Saskatchewan Power Company, Limited.—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 6525; 2°*, 6636; in Com., 7675, 7722 (iv), 8560, 8610, 9166; 3° m., 9167 (v).

Bill (No. 154, from the Senate) Respecting the Board of the Presbyterian College, Halifax.—(Mr. Sinclair).

1°*, 6525; 2°*, 6636; in Com., 7667; 3°*, 7669 (iv).

Bill (No. 155, from the Senate) Respecting the Pontiac Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).

1°*, 6525; 2°*, 6636 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8332 (v).

Bill (No. 156, from the Senate) Respecting the Northern Bank and Crown Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Guthrie).

1°*, 6525; 2°*, 6636; in Com., and 3°*, 7725 (iv).

Bill (No. 157) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°, 6843 (iv).

Bill (No. 158) Respecting Meaford Harbour.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°, 7195 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 8510; 3°*, 8510 (v).

Bill (No. 159) Respecting a certain Issue of Dominion Notes.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°, 7307 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10795; 3°*, 10848 (vi).

Bill (No. 160) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°, 7307 (iv); 2°, 10919; in Com., 10933; 3°*, 10952 (vi).

Bill (No. 161) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Beauparlant).

1°, 7307 (iv).

Bill (No. 162) To amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).

1°, 7931 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10703; 3°*, 10716 (vi); Sen. Amts., 12393 (vii).

Bill (No. 163) To authorize the exchange of certain School Lands for other Dominion Lands.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 8086 (iv); 2° m., 8467; in Com., 8478; 3°*, 8480 (v).

Bill (No. 164, from the Senate) For the relief of Edith May Gilmore.—(Mr. Reid, Grenville).

1°*, 8377; 2°*, 8610 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 165) Respecting the Court of Appeal of British Columbia.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

Res. prop., 8185 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8465; 1°, 8466 (v); 2°, and in Com., 10862; 3°*, 10863 (vi).

Bill (No. 166, from the Senate) To amend the Prisons and Reformatories Act in so far as the same affects the Province of Nova Scotia.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°*, 8604 (v); 2°, 10690; in Com., 10691; 3°*, 10693 (vi).

Bill (No. 167, from the Senate) Respecting the Phœnix Assurance Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonald).

1°*, 8603; 2°*, 9070; in Com., and 3°*, 9964 (v).

Bill (No. 168) To authorize the payment to the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta of part of the Assurance Fund under the Land Titles Act, 1894.—(Mr. Oliver).

Res. prop., 7094 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8480; 1°*, 8481 (v); 2°, 10525; in Com., 10526; 3°*, 10528 (vi).

Bill (No. 169) To amend the Yukon Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 8604 (v); 2°, 10528; in Com., 10529; 3°, 10545; Sen. Amts., 11634 (vi).

Bill (No. 170, from the Senate) Respecting the Nipissing Central Railway Company.—(Mr. McCool).

1°*, 8694; 2°*, 9070; in Com., and 3°*, 9964 (v).

Bill (No. 171) Respecting the Government Guaranteed Bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°, 8835 (v); 2°, and in Com., 10771; 3°*, 10777 (vi).

Bill (No. 172) To incorporate the Dominion Power Company.—(Mr. Hall).

1°*, 9021; 2°*, 9168 (v).

Bill (No. 173) To restrain the Use of Tobacco by Young Persons.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 9021 (v); 2°, and in Com., 10693; 3°*, 11235 (vi); Sen. Amts., 13044 (vii).

Bill (No. 174, from the Senate) Respecting certain patents of the General Chemical Company.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 9126; 2°*, 9472 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

Bill (No. 175, from the Senate) For the relief of Catherine Ann Cannon.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 9126; 2°*, 9472 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

Bill (No. 176, from the Senate) For the relief of Ada Katurah Stewart Paulding.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 9126; 2°*, 9472 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 177, from the Senate) For the relief of Mary Alexander.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 9126; 2°*, 9472 (v); in Com., and 3°* 10472 (vi).

Bill (No. 178, from the Senate) Relating to the Water-Carriage of Goods.—(Mr Johnston).

1°*, 9330 (v); M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).

Bill (No. 179, from the Senate) To incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Keewatin.—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 9330; 2°*, 10008 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 11460 (vi).

Bill (No. 180, from the Senate) Respecting the Crown Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Tisdale).

1°*, 9330; in Com., 9962; 3°*, 9964 (v).

Bill (No. 181) To consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 9333 (v); 2°, 11125; in Com., 11158, 11408, 11460, 11502, 11940; 3° m., 11970 (vi), 12394; 3°*, 12399; Sen. Amts., 13522 (vii).

Bill (No. 182, from the Senate) For the relief of Hattie Spratte.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°*, 9889; 2°*, 10008 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

Bill (No. 183, from the Senate) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°*, 10119 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12851, 13052; 3°*, 13223 (vii).

Bill (No. 184, from the Senate) To amend the Chinese Immigration Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 10008 (v); 2°, 10545; in Com., 10546, 10743, 11020; 3°*, 11022 (vi).

Bill (No. 185, from the Senate) Respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal.—(Mr. Johnston).

1°*, 10008; M. for 2°, 10122 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 12595 (vii).

Bill (No. 186) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1909.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Ways and Means, 10510; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 10510 (vi).

Bill (No. 187, from the Senate) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. Black).

1°*, 10717 (vi); 2° m., 13506; in Com., 13507; 3°*, 13508 (vii).

Bill (No. 188, from the Senate) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 10717 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12559, 13207; 3°*, 13215 (vii).

Bill (No. 189) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

Res. prop., 11300; in Com. on Res., 11351; 1°, 10717; 2°, 11315; in Com., 11362, 11535, 11634 (vi), 12163; 3°*, 12189; Sen. Amts., 13520 (vii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 190, from the Senate) Respecting Juvenile Delinquents.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°*, 10915 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12399; 3°* 12406 (vii).

Bill (No. 191) Respecting the payment of Bounties on Lead contained in Lead-bearing Ores Mined in Canada.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 10952; in Com. on Res., 10952; 1°* of B., 10953; 2°, 11235; in Com., 11243; 3°, 12054 (vii).

Bill (No. 192, from the Senate) To incorporate the Alberta and British Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Herron).

1°*, 11120; 2°*, 11460 (vi); in Com., and 3°*, 12594 (vii).

Bill (No. 193) To amend the Timber Marking Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°, 11120 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12408; 3°*, 12408 (vii).

Bill (No. 194) To amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. Paterson).

Res. prop., 11233; in Com. on Res., 11312; 1°* of B., 11315; in Com., 11980 (vi).

Bill (No. 195, from the Senate) To incorporate the Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—(Mr. Zimmerman).

1°*, 11589; 2°*, 11885 (vi); in Com., and 3°*, 12595 (vii).

Bill (No. 196, from the Senate) For the relief of Arthur James Townsend.—(Mr. Copp).

1°*, 11589; 2°*, 11885 (vi); in Com., and 3°*, 12984 (vii).

Bill (No. 197, from the Senate) Respecting the Sale and Marking of Manufactures of Gold and Silver, and Gold and Silver Plated Ware.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°*, 11990 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12554; 3°*, 12559 (vii).

Bill (No. 198, from the Senate) Respecting a certain Patent of William B. Smith.—(Mr. Galliher).

1°*, 12393; in Com., and 3°*, 12984 (vii).

Bill (No. 199) To provide for the payment of Bounties on Crude Petroleum.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 12162; in Com. on Res., 12406; 1°* of B., 12407; 2°, and in Com., 12644; 3°*, 12644 (vii).

Bill (No. 200) Respecting the Salary of the Superintendent of Insurance.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 12162; in Com. on Res., 12407; 1°* of B., 12407; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 12644 (vii).

Bill (No. 201) To assist in maintaining an Independent and Efficient service of Telegraphic news from Great Britain for Publication in the Canadian Press.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 12052; in Com. on Res., 12407; 1°* of B., 12408; 2°, 12644, 12837; in Com., 12848; 3°*, 12851 (vii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 202) To authorize the Construction of a Branch Line of the Prince Edward Island Railway from Harmony, on the Souris Branch to Elmira.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 12052; in Com. on Res., 12408; 1°* of B., 12409; 2°, 12628; in Com., 12631; 3°*, 12643 (vii).

Bill (No. 203, from the Senate) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act as regards Grain.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 12594; 2°, and in Com., 13048, 13208; 3°*, 13215 (vii).

Bill (No. 204) To amend chapter 38 of the Statutes of 1907, in amendment of the Railway Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 12549; 2°, and in Com., 13046; 3°*, 13047 (vii).

Bill (No. 205) To Prohibit the Importation, Manufacture and Sale of Opium for other than Medicinal Purposes.—(Mr. Lemieux).

Res. prop., 12503; in Com. on Res., 12550; 1°* of B., 12551; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 12851; Sen. Amts., 13523 (vii).

Bill (No. 206) To amend the Judges' Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

Res. prop., 12392; in Com. on Res., 12551; 1°* of B., 12554; 2°, and in Com., 13048; 3°*, 13051 (vii).

Bill (No. 207, from the Senate) Respecting certain Patents of the Metal Shingle and Siding Company, Limited.—(Mr. Galliher).

1°*, 12649; 2°, 12649; in Com., and 3°*, 12984 (vii).

Bill (No. 208) Respecting the office of the Auditor General.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 12502; in Com. on Res., 12644; 1°* of B., 12645; 2°, and in Com., 12645; 3°*, 12645 (vii).

Bill (No. 209) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 12392; in Com. on Res., 12645; 1°* of B., 12649; 2°, and in Com., 13053; 3°*, 13207 (vii).

Bill (No. 210) To amend the Northwest Territories Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°*, 12650; 2°, and in Com., 13051; 3°*, 13052 (vii).

Bill (No. 211) To amend the Act of the present session intituled 'An Act respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.'—(Mr. Pringle).

1°*, 2°*, 12773; in Com., and 3°*, 13224 (vii).

Bill (No. 212) To amend the Criminal Code, and to repeal section 415 of the Railway Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 12919; 2°, and in Com., 13316; 3°*, 13320 (vii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 213) Respecting Aid for the extension of the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 13066; M. for Com. on Res., 13258; in Com. on Res., 13278; 1°* of B., 13282; 2°, and in Com., 13419; 3°*, 13420 (vii).

Bill (No. 214) Respecting certain Aid for the Extension of the Canadian Northern Railway.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 13069; in Com. on Res., 13282; 1°* of B., 13285; 2°, and in Com., 13420; 3°*, 13420 (vii).

Bill (No. 215) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in aid of the construction of the Lines of Railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 13071; in Com. on Res., 13285; 1°* of B., 13315; 2°, and in Com., 13478; 3°*, 13490 (vii).

Bill (No. 216) Respecting the Canadian Patriotic Funds Association.—(Sir Frederick Borden).

1°*, 2°, and in Com., 13320; 3°*, 13321 (vii).

Bill (No. 217) Respecting the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 13080; in Com. on Res., 13416; 1°* of B., 13417; 2°, and in Com., 13491; 3°*, 13493 (vii).

Bill (No. 218) To authorize the sale or other disposal of certain Ordnance Lands in the Cities of Toronto and Montreal.—(Sir Frederick Borden).

Res. prop., 13226; in Com. on Res., 13417; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., 13418; 3°*, 13419 (vii).

Bill (No. 219) Respecting the National Battlefields at Quebec.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

1°, 13495; 2°, and in Com., 13501; 3°*, 13506 (vii).

Bill (No. 220) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial year ending 31st March, 1909.—(Mr. Fielding).

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 13579; in Com. on Ways and Means, 13579; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., 13579; 3°*, 13579 (vii).

Binder Twine Bounty, Amounts paid from 1903 to 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4583 (iii).

Binder Twine in Kingston Penitentiary, Sale and Contracts: in Com. of Sup., 5522 (iii).

Binder Twine, Purchasers' Names and P. O. Addresses: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 9715 (v).

——— Seizures, and Payments to Mr. A. Smith: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).

Blackhalls Estate, Claims *re* Caraquet Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 11686 (vi).

Blairmore Townsite: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 10087 (v).

Blanche River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).

Blankets purchased by Militia and Indian Depts., Amount, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4584 (iii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Clements) 6465 (iv).

Blind River Wharf Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12091 (vii).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 12739 (vii).

Blue Books, Distribution to Members, Changes: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 194 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 241 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 432 (i).

Blunden, Fred. W., Imprisonment of: Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 12902

——— Trial and Conviction, Cor. *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Ward) 3466 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ward) 5211 (iii).

Boards of Trade Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 133.'

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, &c., Protection *re*: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2992 (ii).

——— Transfer of Power Plant, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1114 (i).

See 'Canals—Trent.'

Boiler Inspection Insurance Co., Payments to Mr. R. Stewart: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5941 (iii).

Boivin, Cote & Co., Amounts paid to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 12650 (vii).

Bonanza Post Office Theft, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1291 (i).

Bonaventure River Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).

Boneless Meat, Frozen, Imported into G.B., Par. in English Newspapers: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3230 (ii).

Bonn Post Office, Application *re* Establishment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 10516 (vi).

Bonusing System *re* Immigration: Notice of Motion (Mr. Monk) 6288 (iv).

See 'Immigration,' &c.

Booms in International Streams: *See* 'B. No. 105.'

Boone, C. S., Co., Amounts paid for Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4244, 5083 (iii).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 5476 (iii).

Borden, Sir Frederick, and Cold Storage Co.: *See* 'New Brunswick.'

Boundary Delimitations, Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9738 (v).

Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Bounties on Crude Petroleum: *See* 'B. No. 199.'

Bounties on Lead: *See* 'B. No. 191.'

Bounties paid on Binder Twine, Lead, &c., Amount from 1903 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4583 (iii).

See 'Lead,' &c.

Bounties, Total Amount paid by Govt since 1906: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 895 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 1130 (i).
Bounties paid by Govt. for 1908-9: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13226 (vii)
Boyle Concessions, Memorials from Dawson Legislature: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 509, 562, 681 (i).
Brampton Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 10888 (vi).
Brampton Post Office, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7480 (iv).
Brandon Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 8517 (v), 10953, 10974 (vi).
Brantford Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10891 (vi).
Brantford Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).
Brantford Stove Works Strike, Arrests *re* Picketing: Remarks (Mr. R. Smith) 9027 (v).
——— Cor. with Justie Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 10016 (v).
Brantford Telephone Monument: on Conc., 13567 (vii).
See 'Bell.'
Brass, Mr. Albert, Postmaster at Rusagnoris, Charges *re* Political Activity: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 6642 (iv).
Brass, Quantity and Quality, Importation into Canada: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6232 (iv).
Braund, Samuel, Apptmt. as Inspector of Port Maitland Pier: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 5674 (iii).
Breton Cove Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Brewster and Park Hill Mail Route, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6404 (iv).
Bridge Strengthening, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12259 (vii).
Bridge Subsidies to Rvs.: Amt. (Mr. Leonard) in Com. on Res., 13310 (vii).
Bridgewater Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7135 (iv).
Brier Island Fog Alarm, Installation of, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9473 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 9266 (v).
Brighton Wharf, Repairs *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 5913 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Owen) in Com. of Sup., 12133, 12138 (vii).
B.C., Chartered Bank of: *See* 'B. No. 59.'
B.C., Court of Appeal: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
B.C., Fisheries Commission, Report *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
B.C., Fishing Licenses issued to Packers' Association: Ques. (Mr. Kennedy) 8173 (v).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.
B.C., Revenue contributed from 1872-3 to 1905: M. for Ret.* (Mr. D. Ross) 3435 (ii).
B. C. Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 13.'
B. C. Telegraphs, Claims of C. P. Ry. *re* Cape Beale Lines: in Com of Sup., 5732(iii).
British Pensioners, Notice from Imp. Govt. of Deductions: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7501 (iv).
British Yukon Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 21.'
Britton, Mr. Justice, Payment *re* Treadgold Commission: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5474 (iii).
Brock, Mr., Emplymt. *re* Geological Survey: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5204 (iii).
Brockville, Cheese Curing Room, Lease, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brodeur) 3897 (ii).
———Cold Storage Plant, Disposal of: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 3234 (ii).
Brockville and Ottawa, Ry. Connections, Charges against Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 1429 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn. House, 186 (i).
——— Connection with C.P.R.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 432 (i).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) 9 (i).
Brodeur, Hon. L. P., Advances *re* Travelling Expenses for Priv. Sec., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1690 (i).
——— Travelling Expenses since July, 1904: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1689 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1347 (i).
See 'Travelling Expenses.'
Brome County, Number of Employees, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 6241 (iv).
Bronte Harbour, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii).
——— Dues for Wharfage, Amount collected: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
——— Pier Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12091 (vii).
Bronze Coat-of-Arms, Duty *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).
Bubonic Plague, Prevention of into Canada: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 686 (i).
Buchanan Townsite, Application *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10079, 10083 (v).
——— Homestead Entry by Mr. Ramsland: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10082 (v).
Buctouche Channel, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
Budget, The, Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 5137 (iii).
Debate:—(Mr. Foster) 5260; (Mr. Paterson) 5296; (Mr. Cockshutt) 5314; (Mr. Sifton) 5338; (Mr. Bergeron) 5357; (Mr. Pardee) 5364; (Mr. E. D. Smith) 5375, 5388; (Mr. Thompson) 5405; (Mr. M. S. Schell) 5616, 5957; (Mr. W. Jackson) 5959; (Mr. Armstrong) 6046, 6062; (Mr. Guthrie) 6011; (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6097; (Mr. U. Wilson) 6082 (iii); (Mr. Loggie) 6553; (Mr. Mackenzie) 6573; (Mr. Sinclair) 6615; (Mr. Sproule) 6595; (Mr. N. F. Wilson) 6610 (iv).
See 'Financial Review,' &c.

Budget Speech sent out by Deptl. Clerks: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10349 (vi).

Budget Speech: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 519, 559 (i), 4316, 4670 (iii).

Buell, W. S., Emplymt. *re* Telephone Commission: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 10011 (v).

Buffalo imported for Game Preserve, Alberta, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 847 (i).

Buffalo purchased for Park Reserves, Authority for Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 896 (i).

Buffalo Herd, Location at Elk Park, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5208 (iii).

—— Name of Purchaser: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5795 (iii).

—— Purchase of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 5755 (ii), 10102 (v).

Buildings B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi), 13338 (vii).

Buildings, Cost of Construction: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12661 (vii).

——Construction of: Papers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 12771 (vii).
See 'Public Works.'

Buildings, Generally, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).

Buildings, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 10953 (vi), 13335 (vii).

Buildings, Man. and N. W., Amounts paid by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 698 (i).

Buildings, Man. and N. W. T., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8517 (v).

—— N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv), 13328 (vii).

—— N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 7110 (iv), 13326 (vii).

—— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).

—— P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 7183 (iv).

—— Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).

—— Saskatchewan and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
See 'Public Works.'

Burlington Channel, Lighthouse, Damages to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 5467 (iii).

—— Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12092 (vii).

—— Repairs, Apptmt. of Foreman, &c.: Ques (Mr. E. D. Smith) 4403 (iii).

Business of the House: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 5135 (iii).

—— Precedence *re* Questions: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 430 (i).

—— Precedence on Tuesday: Remarks: (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2982 (ii).

—— Public Bills and Orders, Priority of Procedure: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2939 (ii).

Business of the House, Public Bills, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) *re* Procedure, 2786 (ii).

—— Remarks on M. for Sup., 10688 (vi).
See 'Govt. Business,' &c.

Butler, Mr. M. J., Dep. Min. of Rys., Salary: in Com. of Sup., 12755 (vii).

Butter and Cheese exported from Prov. of Quebec, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 2162 (ii).

Butter Imports, Quantity and Countries of Origin: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1116 (i).

Cabinet Changes: ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 24; (Mr. Foster) 80; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 44 (i).

Cabinet Ministers and Govt. Contracts, &c.: *See* 'Cold Storage,' &c.

Cable Service in St. Lawrence: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).

Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 33.'

Calgary P.O., and Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8578 (v).

Calgary Town Sites: Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) on M. for Sup., 9775 (v).

Cameron, John, Homestead Inspector, Employment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4769 (iii).

Campaign Funds, Charges by Min. of Public Works, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 26 (i).

—— ref. to in debate on Address (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 65 (i).

Campaign Literature sent out by Depts.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 10343 (vi).

Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 14.'

Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ontario Ry. Co., Exercise of Powers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 236 (i).

Campbellton, Harbour, Gas Buoys, Tender *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 8612 (v)

—— I.C.R. Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12258 (vii).

Campbellton Wharf, Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi), 13344 (vii).

—— Tenders *re* Piling Supply, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 8612 (v).

Canada-Australia SS. Service, Yearly Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1289 (i).

—— Discontinuance of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 941 (i).

Canada and Australia SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).

Canada and China, Japan, &c., SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).

Canada Eastern Ry., Cattle killed, Compensation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).

Canada and France SS. Communication, Provision *re* Treaty: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12391
See 'Franco-Canadian.'

Canada and Germany Trade Relations: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10601 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lalor) 13081 (vii).
Canada Shipping Act: *See* 'B. Nos. 2, 12, 17, 183, 209.'
Canada Shipping Act: *See* 'Masters and Mates.'
Can. Temperance Act Amt.: *See* 'Bill No. 187.'
Canada Temperance Act: M. (Mr. Fielding) to place on Order Paper, 13493 (vii).
Canada Weather Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 37.'
Canadian Associated Press: *See* 'B. No. 201.'
Canadian Associated Press, Govt. Subventions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5080 (iii).
Canadian Bank of Commerce, Letter of Mr. B. E. Walker: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) 6005 (iii).
Can. Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. Nos. 111, 219.'
Canadian Battlefields: *See* 'Battlefields,' &c.
Canadian Building, Rental, Space, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5207 (iii).
Canadian Ensign: *See* 'Red Ensign.'
Canadians entering U. S., Deportation of Macedonians, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 2738; Letter of Messrs. Allen, Cassels & Defries: Read, 2739 (ii).
Canadian Naturalization and British Rights: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) on M. for Sup., 12084 (vii).
Canadians at Niagara, Indignity by U. S. Customs Officers: Remarks (Mr. Bristol) 11121 (vi).
Can. Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 81.'
Can. Northern Ry. Extension, Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 214.'
Can. Northern Ont. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 67.'
Can. Northern Que. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 77.'
Canadian Northern Ry., Erwood and Pas Mission Branch, Rep. of Engineer: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 13309, 13475 (vii).
C. P. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B No. 45.'
C. P. Ry., Compensation *re* Right of Way: in Com. of Sup., 5561 (iii).
——— Land Taxation, Test Cases, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2170 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 5049 (iii).
——— Papineauville and Little Nation River Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).
——— Plaster Rock Branch Line Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
——— Saskatchewan Bridge Subsldy: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vii).
Can. Patriotic Funds Association: *See* 'B. No. 216.'
Canadians repatriated from U. S., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 684 (i).
Canadian Timber used in Govt. Works: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 11208 (vi).
Canadian Towing and Wrecking Co., Payments *re* Contracts, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 3241 (ii).
Canada and U. S., Boundary Treaties: Information *re* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7834 (iv).
——— Trade Treaty Negotiations, Completion of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 937 (i).
See 'Anglo-American.'

CANALS—
Beauharnois Canal, Investigation by M. Dupuis, Expenditure, *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3038 (ii).
Beauharnois Canal, Lease, Conditions, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bergeron) 1131 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Bergeron) 1740 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 946 (i).
——— Lease to Robert Co., Emplymt. of Mr. Deschenes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 8443 (v).
——— Lease of Water Power to McIntyre and Roberts Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).
——— Robert Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 13475 (vii).
Canals: in Com. of Sup., 5663 (iii).
——— Extra Remuneration: in Com. of Sup., 5697 (iii).
——— Generally, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10325 (vi).
——— Remuneration *re* Sunday Attendance: in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).
——— Staff and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).
——— Statistical Branch: in Com. of Sup., 10317 (vi).
——— list of officers: Read (Mr. Graham) 10317 (vi).
Carillon Dams and Slides: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
Chambly Canal, Towpath: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
Cornwall Canal, Accident *re* Banks: Statement (Mr. Graham) 11120 (vi).
——— Further Information *re* Break: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11406 (vi).
——— Opening of: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12660 (vii).
——— Repairs *re* Break in Banks: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Graham) 12161 (vii).
Cornwall Canal, Arrangements with M'f'g. Cos. *re* Water Power: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 13084 (vii).

CANALS—*Con.*
Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).
——— Gate Lifter: in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).
——— Wharf: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Pringle) 12095 (vii).
Galops Canal, Upper Entrance, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5671 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Reps., &c.: Laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 8378 (v).
See main heading.
Lachine Canal, Basin Walls: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
——— Compensation to Richards *re* Horse: in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).
——— Lock Repairs: in Com of Sup., 5672 (iii).
——— Slope Walls, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5663 (iii).
——— Staff: in Com. of Sup., 5696 (iii).
Murray Canal, Bridgemen's Houses: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
Quebec Canals, Steam Road Rollers: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
Rideau Canal, Buoys between Merrickville and Edmond Rapids, Contract *re* Lighting: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8613, 9476 (v).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
St. Lawrence Canal, District Office: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal Construction: in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).
Soulanges Canal, Claims *re* Accidents, &c.: M. for Reports* (Mr. Boyer) 6239 (iv).
——— Electric Power, Contract with Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10011 (v).
——— Expenditure *re* Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10513 (vi).
——— Floods, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
——— Investigation *re* Charges against Overseer: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6407 (iv).
——— Report of Mr. Boyer: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9890 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12413 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).
——— Manning & Macdonald's Claims: in Com. of Sup., 5668 (iii).
Trent Canal, Balsam Lake Section, Claims for Damages: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10308 (vi).
——— Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, &c., Protection *re*: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2992 (ii).

CANALS—*Con.*
Trent Canal, Bobcaygeon Dam, Transfer of Power Plant, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1114 (i).
——— Bradford Canal, Building of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 13476 (vii).
——— Buckhorn Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
——— Cameron Lake Water Levels, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9772 (v).
——— Claims for Damages: Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 10308 (vi).
——— Clearing of Logs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 10310 (vi).
——— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
——— Contracts, Deposits, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1734 (i).
——— Damages *re* Floods: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
——— Engineers Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6925 (iv).
——— Extension from Balsam Lake to Gull River, Reps., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 2991 (ii).
——— ret. incomplete: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 6059 (iii).
——— Holland River Dredging, Advertisements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 3241 (ii).
——— Holland River Extension: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11939 (vi).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
——— Lindsay Lock and Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
——— Newmarket Canal Reps., Surveys, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10315 (vi).
——— Newmarket Canal Extension to Devil's Elbow: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 10306 (vi), 12225 (vii).
——— Surveys: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 10338 (vi).
——— Surveys, Reports *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6988 (iv).
——— Tributary Works, Completion of Works, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1115 (i).
——— Tributary Works, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1114 (i).
——— Wilberforce Dam, Obstructions to Traffic, Cor., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 2988 (ii).
Welland Canal, Boundary Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12207 (vii).
——— Contract Power Co., Amount diverted at De Cew Falls, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 897 (i).

CANALS—*Con.*
Welland Canal, Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
——— Culvert and Dock, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
———Deepening, Estimated Cost: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 10311 (vi).
——— Dredging Deep Cut Slide: in Com. of Sup., 5673 (iii).
———Electric Lighting, Power Plant: in Com. of Sup., 12195 (vii).
———Feeder, Rep. of Judge Madden *re* Investigation: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lalor) 852 (i).
——— Investigation *re* Water Rents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 174 (i).
——— Piers and Bridges at Queenston Heights: in Com. of Sup., 12207 (vii).
——— Port Colborne Elevator and Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12211 (vii).
——— Port Colborne, Total Expenditure *re* Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4403 (iii).
——— Port Colborne Elevator, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
——— Resignation of John R. Scott: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 6058 (iii).
——— Widening: in Com. of Sup., 12210 (vii).
Canned Foods Inspection Act, Enforcement of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3846 (ii).
———Cor. *re* Regulations, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Clements) 557 (i).
——— Names of Counties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 514 (i).
Canned Goods Act: *See* 'B. No. 147.'
Canned Pease imported from France, Quantity &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3847 (ii).
Cannon, Catherine Ann, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 175.'
Canso Medical Officer, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 6646 (iv).
——— Successor to Dr. Brane: Ques. (Mr Stanfield) 1735 (i).
Cape St. Mary, Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Cap St. Ignace Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
Captains of Govt. Vessels, Examinations *re* Efficiency, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 3236 (ii).
Caraquet Wharf, Ice-breakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi).
Caribou Island Causeway: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Carillon Dams and Slides: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
'Carlotta G. Fox,' Schr., Seizure of: *See* 'Pelagic Sealing.'
Caron and Thiberge, Messrs., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 10517 (vi).
Cascumpec Harbour Buoys, Tenders for Placing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 681 (i).
Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6059 (iii).
——— Statement *re* Conditions of Investigation of Marine Dept.: Remarks on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse., 6143 (iii).
——— Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6464 (iv).
See 'Marine,' &c.
'Castle,' Tug, Removal of Wreck, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6641 (iv).
Cataract Power Co., Welland Canal, Amount diverted at De Cew Falls, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 897 (i).
'Catharine C.,' Incomplete Return: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5727 (iii).
Catholics and Public Offices, Ref. to Speech in Senate: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sproule) 5047 (iii).
Cattle Embargo in G. B., Removal of, Action by Govt. since 1896: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2167 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 2795 (ii).
———Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 6223 (iv).
———Cable, *re* Removal by G. B.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13228 (vii).
——— Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (Mr. Armstrong) 13081 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).
Cattle Exports and Imports from Canada to G.B.: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 6460 (iv).
Cattle exported to U.S. during 1900-7, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1507 (i).
Cattle exported to U.S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 2767 (ii).
Cattle Inspection *re* Ocean Service: in Com. of Sup., 3220 (ii).
Cattle Quarantine Stations: in Com. of Sup., 11008 (vi).
Cattle registered, Importation from U.S. from 1904-7: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 6238 (iv).
Cattle sold from Experimental Farm: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 2389 (ii).
Cavalry Brigade, Eastern Townships, Camp at Quebec, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
Cement Testing Laboratory: in Com. of Sup., 11078 (vi).
——— Stmnt. (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 11206, 11250 (vi).
Census and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 673 (i), 12879 (vii).
Census Map, Publishing of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4406 (iii).

Census (complete) of the N. W. Provs., Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 3422 (ii).
Central Ry. of Canada, Charter Grant, Deposit *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4767 (iii).
'Challenge,' Dredge, Quantity of Material removed: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 12651 (vii).
Chambly Canal, Towpath: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
Chambly Canton, Complaints *re* Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5653 (iii).
Chambly Common, Area, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5652 (iii).
'Champlain,' Str., Use in Quebec for Political Purposes: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9126, 9280, 9342, 9460 (v).
Chapel Point Ferry Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 513 (i).
Chapman, Mr. F. O., Emplymt. in Immigration Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9964 (v).
Charlan, Mr., Salary as Tobacco Expert: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 11495 (vi).
Charlemagne and Terrebonne Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 685 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 853 (i).
Charlos Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Charlotte County Wharf, Pet. *re* Erection: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 5202 (iii).
Charlotttown Board of Trade, Pets. *re* Sailing Vessels: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Martin) 6240 (iv).
Charlottetown Pipe Line to Tank, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5655 (iii).
Charlottetown Ry. Station, Contract Price *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 517 (i).
——— Specifications, &c., *re* Construction: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3241 (ii).
Chartered Bank of B. C.: *See* 'B. No. 59.'
Chartered Banks of Canada, Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 8086 (iv).
Charwomen, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10508 (vi).
Chase's Point, N.B., Pet. *re* Wharf: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7937 (iv).
Chateauguay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030
Chatham, N.B., Ry. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12757 (vii).
Cheese Adulteration: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Chicoutimi Boom, Payments from Pulp Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 8174 (iv).
Chicoutimi, Dredging Contract, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 7203 (iv).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
——— Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7279 (iv).
——— Public Works, Expenditures, &c: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Chilvers, Messrs., Emplymt. of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 8894, 9266 (v), 10515 (vi).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 184.'
Chinese Immigration into B.C., O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 554 (i).
Chinese Immigration, Decision of N. S. Supreme Court *re* Evasion of Poll Tax: Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 513 (i).
Chinese and Japanese Riots, B.C., Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13155 (vii).
Christmas Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 754 (i).
Church of England, Missionary Society, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
Church Point Wharf, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Chute a Blondeau Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12092 (vii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5087; Amt. (Mr. Macpherson) to adjn. Debate, agreed to (Y. 61; N. 51) 5133 (iii).
——— on M. to resume adjn. debate: Remarks Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5246, 5251 (iii).
Cigarettes, Legislation *re*, Res. of W.C.T.U. of Brampton: Read (Mr. Blain) 7278 (iv).
Cigarettes: *See* 'Tobacco.'
Cigar Stamps, Use of Black Ones: Ques. (Mr. Dubeau) 12390 (vii).
Cimon, Hon. Mr. Justice, Apptmt. to Quebec District: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
——— Jurisdiction of Justice Dept. *re* Residence: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2545 (ii).
——— Payment *re* Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
——— Residence in District: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2218 (ii).
Cirkel, Franz, Remuneration *re* Rep. of Geological Survey *re* 'Graphites': Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 7935 (iv).
See 'Graphite.'
Civil Servants, General Increases to: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com of Sup., 12913 (vii).
Civil Service Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 189.'
Civil Service Bill, Correction in 'Hansard' *re* Increases: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11494 (vi).
——— and Employees of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 13528 (vii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8516 (v).
——— Procedure, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11124 (vi).
——— Resolutions *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11016 (vi).

Civil Service Commission, Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13168 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Distribution to Press: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 5723 (iii).
——— Govtl. Action, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7322 (iv).
——— Inquiry for (Mr R. L. Borden) 3317 (ii), 4963, 5408, 5567 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 5491 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 938, 1740 (i), 2787 (ii), 4315, 4495 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Perley) 90 (i).
——— Issue of Commission of Investigation: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6466 (iv).
——— Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassel's Powers: (amt.) to Com. of Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7506, Neg. (Y. 48; N. 99) 7618 (iv).
——— Instructions to Judge Cassels: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 7505 (iv).
——— O.C. to Mr. Justice Cassels *re* Investigations: M. to adjn. Hse., 6143 (iii).
See 'Cassels,' &c.
——— Marine, Deptl. Dismissals: Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6003 (iii).
——— Number distributed: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 6060 (iii).
——— Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5882 (iii).
——— Report: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 5620 (iii).
——— Translation into French: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6222, 6925 (iv), 11312 (vi), 13477 (vii).
Civil Service Employees, 1905-6-7, Dates of Apptmts., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barker) 558 (i).
Civil Service Examiners: in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vii).
——— Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 8086 (iv).
Civil Govt.: *See* 'Supply.'
Civil Service List: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 93 (i).
Civil Service System, Reorganization of: Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9132; Neg. (Y. 30; N. 72) 9218 (v).
——— Prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) M. to drop, 6242 (iv).
Clarke, Capt. Arthur, Compensation *re* Death, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8179 (iv).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vii).
Clarke City, Seven Islands: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
——— Expenditure *re* Public Works: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2394 (ii).
Clarke's Harbour, Dog Fish Works: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vii).
Clearwater Lake, Half-breeds Rights: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 175 (i).
——— Squatters Rights to Lands: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9995 (v).
Clement, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11300 (vi).
Clement, Mr. W. H. P., Services in Yukon, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5650 (iii).
See 'Yukon.'
Clerical and Temporary Clerks, Public Works Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 11099 (vi).
Clerk of Crown in Chancery, Office: in Com. of Sup., 10508 (vi).
Clerk of Works on Public Buildings: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).
Clifton Breakwater, N.B., Amount of Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 695 (i).
Clifton Wharf Repairs, Extension of Contract: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4831 (iii).
Closure Rule: *See* 'Obstruction.'
Cloutier, J. E., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8380 (v).
Coal and Govt. Lands, Acres in possession of Gov.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 843 (i).
Coal Areas, Agents for Applicants: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 5469 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5468 (iii).
——— held by F. E. Keniston, Cor., Papers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 5476 (iii).
——— Names and Addresses of Agents *re* Applications: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 5789 (iii).
Coal Deposits in P.E.I., Boring for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 515 (i).
Coal Duties, Refunds *re* Coke, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Zimmerman) 6924 (iv).
Coal Lands in Alberta and Sask., Total Area sold, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 9278 (v).
——— Royalty Fees, Sale or Lease of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 11019 (vi).
Coal Lands, Applicants, Names, Price, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 3434 (ii).
Coal Land Leases, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2395 (ii).
Coal Lands, Disposed of by Govt., Original Applicants, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3480 (ii).
——— Leased by Govt., Names of Original Grantees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3232 (ii).
——— Leased, Sold or Assigned, since March, 1907: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 698 (i).
Coal Lands in N.W.T., Leases granted, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 5087 (iii).
Coal Lands, O.Cs., Regulations, &c., *re* Disposal: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 4246 (iii).
——— Purchase Price on Sections 16, 20 and 21: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 10512 (vi).
——— Purchases on Sections 27, 28, 33 and 34, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 10512 (vi).
——— Sale through J. W. Bettes, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 6242 (iv).

Coal Lands, sold by P. E. Lessard: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 6241 (iv).
——— Sale by McGivern & Hayden: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 6241 (iv).
Coal Lands in Sections 2, 4, 9, 15, 17 and 28, First Applicants, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 3850 (ii).
——— Section 13, First Applicants, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 3851 (ii).
Coal Lands, Timber, &c., Dates of Regulation, O.Cs., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 12656 (vii).
Coal Mining Privileges in Section 11, Applications, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 3850 (ii).
Coal Mine Royalties in Alberta, Sums received: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 12391 (vii).
Coal Mining in Sask. and Alberta, Returns made to Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 10257 (v).
Coal Shipments from N.S. and Cape Breton, Res. from Board of Trade, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5470 (iii).
See 'Shipping,' &c.
Coasting Privileges, Prop. Rys. withdrawn, 2795 (ii).
Coasting Trade, O.Cs. *re* Foreign Vessels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4586 (iii).
Coasting Trade *re* Norwegian Ships, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 6237 (iv).
Cobourg Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii).
——— Harbour, Amount expended *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 359 (i).
Colborne Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii).
Colchester Election, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 39 (i).
Colchester Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 680 (i).
Colchester Point, Essex County Pier,, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 12652 (vii).
Cold Storage, Assistance *re* East Elgin Establishment: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 351 (i).
Cold Storage Plant, Canso, Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8379 (v).
Cold Storage Plants, Construction in Alberta, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1685 (i).
——— Construction of, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 236 (i).
——— Grants to: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1937 (i).
See 'Butter,' 'Cheese,' 'Brockville,' &c.
Cold Storage Ret., Letter of Mr. McKeown, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4223, 4407 (iii).
See 'N.B. Cold Storage,' &c.
Cold Storage Shipments, Number for year ending March, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6403 (iv).
Collingwood Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12096 (vii).
Colonial Conference, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 82; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 41 (i).
See 'Intercolonial,' &c.
——— Travelling Expenses, ref. to in Com. of Sup. on Marine Estimates, 3985 (ii).
——— Travelling Expenses of Minister: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 998, 1040 (i).
See 'Travelling Expenses.'
Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds, Cor., &c., Govtl. Action: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 174 (i).
Colonization Lands: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 3752 (ii).
Colonization Societies, Quebec, Amounts paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 684 (i).
Commercial Agents, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).
Commercial Travellers, Provincial Tax, Agreement *re* Abolition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Guthrie) 5794 (iii).
Commerical Treaty with Italy: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 10593 (vi).
Commissions appointed between 1896 and 1908, Costs, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Porter) 1295 (i).
Committees, Sel. Standing: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6 (i).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc. in Rep., 90 (i).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Names, 1207 (i), 3315 (ii).
Committee Meeting, Rep. in Toronto 'Globe': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) 2382 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 2383; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2383 (ii).
Committees, Organization of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 507, 560 (i).
——— Sitting concurrently with Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9579 (v).
See 'Pub. Accts.'
Companies Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 104.'
Conciliation Boards, Applications *re* Industrial Disputes Investigations, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3482 (ii).
Concrete Wharfs, Dissatisfaction in Ont.: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 11278 (vi).
Congdon, Mr. F. T., Instructions *re* Trust Estates: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12413 (vii).
——— Stmnt. *re* Estates Administration: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10111 (v).
——— Reply from Yukon: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13420, 13518 (vii).
Congdon vs. Mrs. Wiley, Investigation, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 565 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Aylesworth) 841 (i).
See 'Yukon.'

Contractors' Securities, Amounts retained: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
Convict Labour, Control of, Sale of Articles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 238 (i).
Cookshire Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7281 (iv).
Co-operation: *See* 'B. No. 5.'
Cooper & White, Payments *re* Rental for Govt. Lands, Welland County: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 3841 (iii).
Copper Cliff Postmaster, Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 658 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com., 11913 (vi).
Copyright Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 28.'
'Coquitlam,' Str., Seizure of, Compensation *re*: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2389 (ii).
Corby Distillery, Deficits in Spirit Production: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12410 (vii).
Cornwall Canal, Accident to Banks: Statement (Mr. Graham) 11120 (vi).
——— Arrangements with Mfg. Cos. *re* Water Power: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 13084 (vii).
——— Electric Lighting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).
——— Further Information *re* Break: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11406 (vi).
———Gate Lifter: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
——— Opening of: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12660 (vii).
——— Repairs *re* Break in Banks: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
——— Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Graham) 12161 (vii).
——— Wharf: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Pringle) 12095 (vii).
Corry Building, Total Rental per Annum, Taxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 11938 (vi).
Cosgrave, Mr. J. J., Total Cost of Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5797 (iii).
Coteau Landing Wharf, Repairs to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).
Cotton, Raw, Imported from U.S. in 1905-7, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1511 (i).
Cotton Strikers, Montreal, Commission Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Court of Appeal, B.C.: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
Cow Bay (Port Morien) Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Cowie, Mr. F. W., Salary, Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5649 (iii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Cowly, and Highwood, Railway Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Cranbrook Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Credit by False Pretences: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
Criminal Code Amendments, Placing on Govt. Orders: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 9281 (v).
Criminal Code (assault) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 79.'
——— (homicide while hunting) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 93.'
——— (injuries by motor vehicles) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 140.'
——— (libel) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 161.'
——— (offensive weapons) Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 65, 78.'
——— (speedy trials) Amt. *See* 'B. No. 92.'
——— (trade restraint) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 96.'
——— (trading stamps, credit) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
Criminal Statistics: *See* 'Pardoning Power.'
Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lake) 10916 (vi).
Crossings of Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Crown Bank of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Crown Life Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 180.'
Crude Petroleum Bounty: *See* 'B. No. 199.'
Cumberland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi).
Cumberland Ry. and Coal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 46.'
Currie, W. D., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 7731 (iv)
Customs Act Amt: *See* 'B. No. 194.'
CUSTOMS :
Absinthe and Brandy Importations, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).
Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
American Cereal Co., Customs Refunds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3484 (ii).
Anthracite Coal, Quantity imported from U.S. and other Countries: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1510 (i).
Apples seized by Inspectors at Montreal, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1508 (i).
Arsenault, Mr. Auguste, Emplymt. in Customs, Montreal, Charges against: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1347 (i).
Aylmer Customs Collector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 1506 (i).
Bernier, Capt., Islands, Customs Ports, &c., Flagged by him: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5203, 5466 (iii).
Brass, Quantity and Quality, Importation into Can.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6232 (iv).
B.C., Revenue contributed from 1872-3 to 1905: M. for Ret.* (Mr. D. Ross) 3435 (ii).
Bronze Coat-of-Arms, Duty *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).
Butter Imports, Quantity and Countries of Origin: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1116 (i).
Canned Pease imported from France, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3847 (ii).
Coal Duties, Refunds *re* Coke, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Zimmerman) 6924 (iv).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*
Cotton, Raw, Imports from U.S. in 1905-7, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1511 (i).
Customs Dept., Apptmts. and Civil Service Report: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v).
——— Criticism of Civil Service Commission: (Mr. Cockshutt) on M. for Sup., 10428 (vi).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 637 (i).
——— Estimates, Obstruction in Sup.: Remarks (Mr. Paterson) in Com. of Sup., 10133 (v).
——— Inspectors, Travelling Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 9536 (v).
——— Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
——— Outside Service, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 9226, 9430 (v).
——— Printing, Stationery, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9577 (v).
——— Salaries, Payments of, Speech of Hon. Mr. Paterson, *re* Obstruction: Remarks (Mr. Owen) to Com. of Sup., 9894 (v).
Customs and Excise Revenues from June 1st to 15, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 10791 (vi).
Customs Receipts and Expenditures, 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12655 (vii).
Customs Statistics, and Trade and Commerce Rets., Dupliate Printing: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr Foster) on M. for Sup., 9732 (v).
Detroit River Tunnel, Duties on Construction Material, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1116 (i).
——— Customs Collection *re* Construction Materials: M. for O.Cs.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).
——— Ques (Mr. McLaren) 3840 (ii).
——— Material entered free of Customs: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 10254 (v).
——— Material imported for Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4583 (iii).
Detroit River Tunnel and Customs Tariff on Material from U.S.: M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10417 (vi).
——— Explanation (Mr. Paterson) 13524 (vii).
Dillon, Michael, Emplymt. by Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
Farm and Garden Produce at Sault Ste. Marie, Customs Duties collected: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 13060 (vii).
Foreign Purchases, Customs Collections *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5475 (iii).
CUSTOMS—*Con.*
Franco-Canadian Treaty, Shipments from Canada, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4763 (iii). *See* main heading.
Fraser, Donald, Customs Collector, Investigation *re* Defalcations: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5200 (iii).
——— Dismissal from Customs Service: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 5473 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9442 (v).
French Books, Reductions of Customs *re* French Treaty: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2160 (ii).
German Goods imported under Preferential Tariff, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).
Guarantee Cos.: in Com. of Sup., 9577 (v).
Halifax Customs House: in Com. of Sup., 7144 (iv).
Honey Imports from 1898-1908, Amount, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8177 (iv).
Hull Customs Imports, Amount for 1906-8: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 11703 (vi).
Imports and Exports, Values from June to Dec., 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
——— ending Sept. 30th and Oct. 30th, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 350 (i).
Imports from France, Value for Five Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1124 (i).
Imports for Home Consumption, Values for 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13063 (vii).
Japanese Trade with Canada, Total Amount for 1905-6-7: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 897 (i). *See* main heading.
Man. Customs Collectors, Brokerage Fees charged, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
Massey-Harris Co., Rebate of Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8441 (v).
Montreal Examining Warehouse, Valuations, Reps., Cor., Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 698 (i).
Montreal Customs Frauds, Penalties, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 9558 (v).
Niagara Falls, Fort Erie, &c., Customs Officers, Salaries: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6980 (iv).
Opium, Amount received *re* Customs Duties, Pet. from B.C., *re* Prohibition: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 8614 (v).
Pacaud, Benjamin, Apptmt. to Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5200 (iii).
Pork, Fresh, Quantity imported for Home Consumption: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5650 (iii).
Port South Bar, C.B., Vessels entered for Customs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9271 (v).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*
Prince Rupert Customs Collectors, Transfer of Mr. B. R. McDonald: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 6401 (iv).
Pulp Wood, Exported to U.S., Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1511 (i).
Revenue Cruisers: in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
Sand, Cement or Clay Utensils, imported from G.B. in 1904-5-6-7: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 1506 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Port, Farm Produce entered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 898 (i).
Seizures for 1905-7, Reasons, Fines, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Cockshutt) 4588 (iii).
Sugar Imports for 1908, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
Unleavened Bread, Pet. *re* Customs Duties: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 8616 (v).
Venoit, Mr., Collector of Customs at Bathurst, N.B., Political Interference: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 7730 (iv).
Windsor Customs, Pepin, J. A., Emplymt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
——Customs Officers, Ages, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 12655 (vii).
—— Wallace, Michael J., Emplymt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7500 (iv).
Winnipeg Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8566 (v).
Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5201 (iii).
Cypress Hill Homestead Lands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Cypress Hills Timber Reserve, Preservation of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3841 (ii).
Cyr, Mr., Letter from *re* Stmnt. of Mr. Foster: Read (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 8460; Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 8460; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 8461 (v).
Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner's Report: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2786 (ii).
Dairying and Fruit Industry: in Com. of Sup., 10397 (vi).
Dairy Products: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Daley, Mr. R., Emplymt. in Geological Survey: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5204, 5473 (iii).
Dauphin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).
—— Valuation of Site: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi).
Dawson City Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Debates of the House, Statement *re* Speakers (Mr. Kennedy) 13537 (vii).
Debates, Official Reports of, Analytical Index: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10504 (vi).
—— Average Price per Column: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3479 (ii).
Debates, French Edition, Apptmt. of French Supt. of Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
—— Delay in Printing: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
—— Delay in Distribution: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3486 (ii).
Debates Committee, Correction of Clerical Error in Res. of House (Mr. Gervais) 824 (i).
—— 1st Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 2590 (ii).
—— 2nd and 3rd Reports of Committee: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 6979 (iv).
—— 2nd Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 7834 (iv).
—— 2nd Rep., Adoption of: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 12504 (vii).
—— 2nd Rep. of Com.: Amt. (Mr. Gervais) on M. to adopt, 13224 (vii).
—— 4th Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 8835 (v).
—— Conc. without Notice: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8896 (v).
—— M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10225; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 94) 10252 (v).
—— Remarks (Mr. Monk) *re* conc., 9709, 9889, 10119 (v).
See 'Hansard.'
Debt of Canada, Portions falling due, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 315 (i).
—— Falling Due, 1908: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 315 (i).
See 'Finance.'
Deep Sea Fisheries on Pacific Coast, Cruiser, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Deep Waterways Commission, Proceedings *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11205 (vi).
—— St. Lawrence, Damming at Long Sault: Remarks (Mr. Broder) 13142 (vii).
See 'St. Lawrence.'
—— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11101 (vi).
Demurrage on Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
Denis, Mr. Gaspard, Postmaster at St. Michel des Saints, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 9474 (v).
Deptl. Buildings, Mackenzie Avenue: in Com of Sup., 1505 (i).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Deputy Ministers, Payments for Special Services, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1736 (i).
Desaulniers, Mr. Gonzalve, Emplymt. as Translator: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 1121, 1290 (i).
Deschambault Wharf, Tenders *re*, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5464 (iii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 5801 (iii).
Detroit Tunnel, Customs Collection *re* Construction Materials: M. for O.Cs.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).

Detroit Tunnel, Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1116 (i), 4583 (iii).

——— M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10417 (vi).

——— Material entered free of Customs: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 10254 (v).

——— explanation (Mr. Paterson) 13524 (vii). *See* 'International.'

Devil's Elbow, Canal Work: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).

'D. H. Thomas,' Tug, Dom. Grant: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 8184 (iv).

Digby Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11226 (vi).

Digby to Westport Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7203 (iv).

Dillon, Gerald P., Apptmt. to N.W.M. Police Force: Ques. (Mr. D. Ross) 6001 (iii).

Dillon, Michael, Emplymt. by Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).

Diocese of the Synod of Keewatin: *See* 'B. No. 179.'

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, Establishment of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2562 (ii).

Distilleries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 814 (i).

Divorce of Mary Alexander: *See* 'B. No. 177.'

Divorce of Catherine Ann Cannon: *See* 'B. No. 175.'

Divorce of Edith Maud Rosario Gammell: *See* 'B. No. 139.'

Divorce of Edith May Gilmore: *See* 'B. No. 164.'

Divorce of Ada Katurah Stewart Paulding: *See* 'B. No. 176.'

Divorce of Hattie Spratte: *See* 'B. No. 182.'

Divorce of Arthur James Townsend: *See* 'B. No. 196.'

Divorce of Andrew Walker: *See* 'B. No. 124.'

Docks, Piers, &c., constructed at Bayfield, Grand Bend, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 2397 (ii).

Dockyards, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).

Documents in Departments, Access to Originals by Members: M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret., 1132; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 86) 1201 (i).

Debate:—(Mr. Oliver) 1133; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1137; (Mr. Foster) 1135; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1140; (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 1143; (Mr. Sproule) 1147; (Mr. Brodeur) 1140; (Mr. Bennett) 1151; (Mr. Lennox) 1155; (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1160; (Mr. Barker) 1162; (Mr. Galliher) 1170; (Mr. D. Ross) 1172; (Mr. Haggart) 1175; (Mr. Devlin) 1177; (Mr. Bergeron) 1180; (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1183; (Mr. Northrup) 1190; (Mr. Sproule) 1194; (Mr. Ames) 1195 (i).

Documents, Original, Production of, &c., Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 1617, 1622; Agreed to, 1668 (i).

Debate:—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1623; (Mr. Foster) 1628; (Mr. D. Ross) 1632, 1653; (Mr. Oliver) 1636; (Mr. Barker) 1655; (Mr. Northrup) 1658; (Mr. Bristol) 1663; (Mr. Boyce) 1666 (i).

Documents, Original, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 1766 (i).

Debate:—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1775; (Mr. Haggart) 1778;; (Mr. Sproule) 1782; (Mr. Lennox) 1786; (Mr. Barker) 1793; (Mr. Bristol) 1797; (Mr. Osler) 1800; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1801; (Mr. Fielding) 1805; (Mr. Lancaster) 1814; (Mr. Perley) 1818; (Mr. Broder) 1825; (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1827; (Mr. Northrup) 1830; (amt.) 1839; Neg. (Y. 50 · N. 95) 1883; (Mr. Lake) 1839; (Mr. Alcorn) 1843; on M. (Mr. Macdonald) to adjn. debate (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1844; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1847; (Mr. Foster) 1851; (Mr. Crocket) 1861; (Mr. Blain) 1871; (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1875; (Mr. Armstrong) 1878 (i).

Documents, Original, Custody of: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 7810 (iv).

——— Detention, &c., Par. in Press. Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Clements) 6010 (iii).

——— Examination of by Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) 3853 (ii).

——— Notice of Motion, on Order being called: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2794 (ii).

——— Production of Originals, Announcement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 1425 (i).

——— Production in Committees: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 1427 (i).

——— Production of on Order from Hse. · Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1617; Agreed to, 1667 (i).

——— Production of to Members: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Foster) 1766 (i).

——— Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1927 (i).

——— and Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 2305, 2308 (ii).

——— Member's remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 2305 (ii).

Dodds, Mr. W., Information *re* Immigration Frauds at Halifax: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 5655 (iii). *See* 'Halifax.'

Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Canso, Operation at: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5651 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 5777 (iii)

——— Total Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8179 (iv).

——— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. McLennan) 5790 (iii).

Dog Fish Scrap, Shipments from Canso to U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1126 (i). *See* 'Clarke's,' &c.

Dokis Indian Land Sale, Commission to Mr. P. Ryan: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 12732 (vii).

Dokis Indians Reserve, Consent from Chief, *re* Sale of Timber: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 8175 (iv).
——— Name of Govt. Agent: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5084 (iii).
——— Notice of Sale, Names of Newspapers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 7500 (iv).
——— Protests *re* Sale: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 10918 (vi).
——— Sale of Timber: Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Sup., 7801 (iv).
——— Surrender of Timber, O.Cs., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5087 (iii).
——— Surrender of Title, Negotiations *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3849 (ii).
——— Total Expenditure *re* Surrender: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 10512 (vi).
Dom. Arsenal, Cor. with Ross Rifle Co. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7991 (iv).
Dominion Arsenal, Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 7434 (iv), 12154 (vii).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 50.'
Dominion Camp Equipment Co., Incorporation of: Ques (Mr. Worthington) 3238 (ii).
Dom. Buildings, Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11007 (vi).
——— Ont., Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7467 (iv).
——— Que., Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).
——— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10981 (vi). *See* 'Public Works—Buildings.'
Dom. Coal Lands: in Com. of Sup., 10066 (v). *See* 'Coal,' &c.
Dom. Elections Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 29, 80, 115.'
Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 115) 2° m., 7835.
Debate:—(Mr. R. L. Borden) 7859; (Mr. Greenway) 7880; (Mr. Alcorn) 7890; (Mr. Bole) 7939; (Mr. Boyce) 7949; (Mr. Conmee) 7982, 7998; (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8012; (amt.) 8076; (Mr. Crawford) 8076, 8089; (Mr. Monk) 8116, 8138; (Mr. Devlin) 8143; (Mr. Lake) 8150; (Mr. D. Ross) 8185; (Mr. Schaffner) 8200; (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 8242; (Mr. W. Wright) 8271; (Mr. Dugas) 8282 (iv); (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8296 (v); (Mr. Foster) 8321; (Mr. Burrows) 8357; (Mr. Staples) 8387; (Mr. Carvell) 8401; (Mr. R. L. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8423; (Mr. Galliher) 8619; (Mr. Armstrong) 8645; (Mr. Oliver) 8659; (Mr. Bergeron) 8681 (v); (Mr. Miller) 11707; (Mr. Conmee) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 11727; (Mr. Boyce) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 11739; (Mr. Alcorn) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 11753; (Mr. Aylesworth) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 11755 (vi).
In Com., 11796 (vi).
Ballot Papers, Fraudulent Marking (sec. 20) 11890; Amt. (Mr. White) 11890; Amt. (Mr. Porter) 11892 (vi), 13013; Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 13022, 13027; Amt. (Mr. Aylesworth) 13025; Amt. (Mr. Borden) 13026; (Mr. Crocket) 13028; Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 13028; Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 13036; Amt. (Mr. Bennett) 13037; Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 13037; Amt. (Mr. Daniel) 13037 (vii).
Boards of Registration (sub.-sec. 4) 12995 (vii).
Canvassing by Aliens (sec. 25), Amt. (Mr. Lake) 11898 (vi).
Contributions for Political Purposes (sec. 28) Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 11927; Amt. (Mr. Wilson) 11930; Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 11931 (vi).
Contributions, Statement (sec. 18) 11884; Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 11884 (vi).
Conveyances of Voters (sec. 23) 11894; Amt. (Mr. Clarke) 11896; Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 11897 (vi).
Conveyances, paying for (sec. 10) 11829; Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 11835 (vi).
Corrupt Practices, Amt. (Mr. Fowler) 13044 (vii).
Enumerators, Posting of Notices (sec. 6) 11824 (vi).
Lists transmitted by Clerk of Crown in Chancery (sec. 1, sub.-sec. 8) 13004 (vii).
Manitoba Lists, Transmission (sec. 1, subsec. 10) 13009 (vii).
——— Polling Divisions (sec. 1, subsec. 2) 13005 (vii).
Nomination Papers, Address of Candidate (sec. 3) 11815; Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 11816; Amt. (Mr. Bristol) 11820; Amt. (Mr. Ames) 11820, 11827 (vi), 13010 (vii).
Ontario, Unorganized Territories (sec. 1) 11796 (vi), 12919 (vii).
Persons on General List, omitted from Special List (sec. 13) 11865 (vi), 13009 (vii); Amt. (Mr. Clarke) 11881 (vi).
Polling Divisions (sec. 6) 13001 (vii).
Posters, Names and Addresses (sec. 26) 11922; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11922 (vi).
P.E.I., Oath (sec. 16) 11882 (vi).
Returning Officers, Instructions to (sec. 11) 11845 (vi); Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13032 (vii).
Voters' Lists Preparation (subsec. 5) 12998 (vii).
Yukon Enumerators (sec. 5) 11823, 11829 (vi), 13013 (vii).
3° m., 13229; Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13230; Neg. (Y. 60; N. 99) 13249; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13251; Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 13255; Amt. (Mr. Foster) 13257; 3° Agreed to, 13258 (vii).
Dom. Elections, Forms, Writs, Instructions, &c., issued in 1907: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 555 (i).
Dom. Elections Act, and Govt. Measures, Proceeding with: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7721 (iv).
Dom. Elections Bill and Obstruction Tactics: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9225 (v).
Dom. Guarantee Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. Nos. 127 & 211.'
Dom. Govt. Employees, Interference at Election: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 9 & 181.'

Dom. Lands, Agents, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10038 (v).
—— Area disposed of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3431 (ii).
Dom. Lands and Exchange of School Lands: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
Dom. Land Grants to Rys. prior to 1896, Total Acreage: Ques. (Mr. W. McIntyre) 8182 (iv).
Dom. Lands, Sales of, during 1907: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 3435 (ii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 5727 (iii).
—— Total Area disposed of from 1896 to 1905, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 3852 (ii).
Dom. Lands Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9987, 9996 (v).
Dom. Liabilities due N.B. from 1869 to 1884: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2217 (ii).
See 'Finance.'
Dom. Loan and Overdrafts, Disposition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 313 (i).
Dom. Notes, Issue of : *See* 'B. Nos. 159 & 160.'
Dom. Notes, Outstanding, Total Amount, 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 691 (i).
—— Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5562 (iii).
Dominion Police Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii).
Dom. Post Offices, Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11007 (vi).
Dom. Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 172.'
Dominion Power Co.'s Bill: Inquiry for (Mr. Cockshutt) 10919 (vi).
Dom. Revenue from 1873 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1733 (i).
Dom. Transportation and Storage Co.: *See* 'B. No. 84.'
Dorchester Wharf Addition: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Dorval, Dredging at St. Lawrence Yacht Club: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 13060 (vii).
Doukhobors bonused as Immigrants: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9952 (v).
Doukhobors, Condition of: Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (Mr. Foster) 2218 (ii).
—— Destitute Condition at Fort William (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5007 (iii).
—— Homesteads cancelled, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9957 (v).
—— Manner of living, Letter from Yorkton: Read (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5751 (iii).
—— Prisoners at Fort William, Release of by Justice Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 6847 (iv).
—— Religious Fanatics: Par. in 'Press' (Mr. J. D. Reid) 12161 (vii).
—— Tels. *re* Pardon by Justice Dept.: Ques.: (Mr. Lake) 6983 (iv).
Doukhobors, Yorkton, Tel. from Sec. of Bard of Trade: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7620; Remarks (Mr. Lake) on M. for Sup., 7621 (iv).
Dover Wharf on Petitcodiac River: in Com. of Sup., 11692 (vi).
Dowling, Dr. D. B., Emplymt. in Geological Survey: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5206 (iii).
—— Emplymt. by German Development Co.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5564 (iii).
—— Leave of Absence from Geological Survey: Remarks (Mr. Templeman) in Com. of Sup., 10581 (vi).
Doyle, Mr. P., Immigration Agent, Superannuation of: Ques. (Mr. Oliver) 6923 (iv).
Draper, P. M., Candidate for Municipal Office: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
—— and Mr. Pepper, Candidates for Municipal Office: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 687 (i).
Dredges registered in Canada, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11497 (vi).
Dredging Companies, Contracts, Investigations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5924 (iii).
Dredging Contracts, Basis of Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9710 (v).
—— Midland, &c., Renewals without Tender, O.Cs. *re*: M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 6741 (iv).
—— advertisements *re* tenders: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 7195 (iv).
Dredging Contracts, O.C. *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Bennett) 6853, 6927 (iv), 8696 (v).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10259 (v).
—— Payments to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1736 (i).
—— Quebec Harbour: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7104 (iv).
—— Renewal without Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6633 (iv).
—— Tenders *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9773 (v).
Dredging at Fort William, Amount paid to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8839 (v).
Dredging Instructions to Inspectors, Circular Letter: Read in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Pugsley) 12043 (vi).
Dredging in Ontario Harbours, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 1129 (i).
Dredging in Ontario and Quebec, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 9276, 10008 (v).
Dredging, Ont. and Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).

Dredging in Quebec Counties in 1907, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3240 (ii).
Dredging in Quebec Province, Claims Pending, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7200 (iv).
Dredging in St. Lawrence, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bergeron) 2896 (ii).
Dredging Plant (new) for Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).
Dredging Plant for St. Lawrence River (lower): in Com. of Sup., 4754 (iii).
Dredging Works at Nicolet River, &c., Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3896 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 4247 (iii).
Dredging Work at Rigaud River, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boyer) 6240 (iv).
Dredging in Vaudreuil County, Supt.'s Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
See 'Public Works,' &c.
Drill Halls, Number constructed since 1896, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 177 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 556 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5659 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Worthington) 4834 (iii), 6222 (iv).
Drill Shed, Lindsay, Date of Construction: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1111 (i).
See 'Militia.'
Drop Letter, One-Cent Rate: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 3158 (ii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Drug Contracts with Bole Drug Co.: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bole) 5562 (iii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5513 (iii).
Drury, R. L., O.C. *re* Apptmt. to Japan: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4963 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4769 (iii).
Dry Docks, Construction of: *See* 'B. No. 119.'
Drysdale, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Acceptance of Office: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4768 (iii).
——— Date of Communication *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5084 (iii).
——— O.Cs. &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Taylor) 5086 (iii).
Dundee Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).
Dunsmuir, Hon. Mr., Lt. Gov. of B.C., Assent to Natal Act and Dom. Interference: Remarks (Mr. R. Smith) 1738 (i).
——— Tel. from Sec. of State: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1859 (i).
——— Cor. with Govt. *re* Legislation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1861 (i).
Eagle Lake Coal Lands, Surrender of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 694 (i).
Easter Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6464, 6843 (iv).
Eastern Block Extension: in Com. of Sup., 1504 (i).
Eastern Trust Co.: *See* 'B. No. 103.'
Eastman Rifle Match, Accident, &c., Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1125 (i).
East Templeton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Eclipse Manufacturing Co., Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3239 (ii).
——— Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6461 (iv).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 3435 (ii).
Eclipse Manufaturing and Office Specialty Co., Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7468 (iv).
Edmonton, Dunvegan and B.C. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 38.'
Edmonton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (iii), 8579 (v), 13336 (vii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 68 & 213.'
Egypte and St. Ephrem d'Upton, Mail Contract, Renewal of: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5257 (iii).
Eight Hour Day for Ry. Employees: *See* 'B. No. 157.'
Elder-Dempster SS. Subsidy to South Africa: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2792 (ii).
Election Bills: *See* 'B. Nos. 29, 80, 115.'
Election in N.B., Interference of Dom. Govt. *re* Patronage: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 3043 (ii).
See 'N. B.' &c.
Election of New Members, Certificates: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Elections, Petitions, Supreme Court Judgments: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Election Writs, Issue of: *See* 'B. No. 66.'
Electoral Districts, Issue of Writs: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
——— Ottawa and Labelle, Certificates of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 890 (i).
Electrical Power exported from Niagara Falls, Cor., &c., *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 2397 (ii).
Electric and Gas Power Licenses, granted under Statute, c. 16, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 360 (i).
Elmwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).
Emerson Public Building: in Com. of Sup. 8534 (v), 13335 (vii).
Empire and Ascension Day Adjnmt.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8894 (v).
Employees of Parlt. and Printing Bureau, Salaries, Religions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5206 (iii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 5479 (iii).
Engineering Branch, Public Works Dept., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11093 (vi).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 51.'
Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13296 (vii).
Escoumains Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Esquimalt and Halifax Garrisons, Equipment, of &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1293 (i).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Cor., &c., *re* Maintenance: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1128 (i).
——Maintenance of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1117 (i).
—— Transfer to Canada: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1293 (i).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 15.'
Essex County, Junior Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1939 (i).
Estevan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8581 (v), 13336 (vii).
Estevan Quarantine Lands, Disposal of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10093 (v).
Estimates, Basis of Appropriations *re* Interim Supply Bill: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5919 (iii).
—— Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 5661 (iii).
—— Discussions on Resolutions: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).
—— Insufficient Votes *re* Public Works, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5923 (iii).
Estimates of 1908-9: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 554 (i).
—— Suppl. (1908): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 2381 (ii), 5134 (iii), 12503 (vii).
Exchange of Schools' Lands: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
Exchequer Court Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 116.'
Exchequer Court, Printing Reports, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5508 (iii).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
Excise Collectors, Payments for Customs Collections: in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).
Excise, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 813 (i).
—— Inspectors' Travelling Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 814 (i).
—— Provisional Allowance to Inland Revenue Officers: in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).
Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 10569 (vi), 12889 (vii).
Exhibitions, Amount of Subsidies paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4406 (iii).
Exhibitions outside of Canada, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4584 (iii). *See* 'Anglo-French.'
Experimental Farm (Central) Amounts paid for Seeds, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 556 (i).
Experimental Farm Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
——Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10904 (vi).
Experimental Farms, Establishment of, Names of Provs.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 7990 (iv).
—— Number controlled by Dom. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 3897 (ii).
Experimental Farm in Quebec District, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2593 (ii).
—— Pet. from Quebec Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 8182 (iv).
Experimental Farm, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 1018 (i).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 12549 (vii).
—— Sale of Cattle, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 2795 (ii).
—— Total Receipts from Sales, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4585 (iii).
Express Charges in Mar. Provs., Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 518 (i).
Expropriation of Lands by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
Facilities and Increased Accommodations, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12259 (vii).
Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Fair Wages Schedule on Dredging Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 7200 (iv).
Falconer, Kenneth, Arrangement *re* Balance of Payments: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10516 (vi).
—— Emplymt. by Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5078 (iii).
—— Payments to *re* Services: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8890 (v).
—— Payments by Ry. Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).
Falconer, Mr. K.: *See* 'Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping.'
Farm and Garden Produce at Sault Ste. Marie, Custom Duties collected: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 13060 (vii).
Farnell, Gordon, Contractor for Halifax Mails: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7731 (iv).
Farnham Post Office, Alterations: in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).
—— Vote *re* Improvement: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
Father Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Favoured Nation Treatment, Conventions *re* Commercial Relations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 846 (i).
Fence Posts Fees, Memorial from Union of Manitoba Municipalities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 10258 (v).

Fernie Public Building, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (iii), 10866 (vi).
'Fielding,' Dredge, Number of Days Working, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7199 (iv).
Financial Arrangements with Banks: *See* 'Wheat Transportation.'
Financial Review: Amt. (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 13420 (vii).
—— Reply (Mr. Fielding) 13442 (vii).
See 'Budget.'
FINANCE:
Accounts and Claims against Govt., Total Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 362 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 352 (i).
American Bank Note Co., Agreement *re* Printing Stamps: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2593 (ii).
Audits and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12658 (vii).
—— Independent Audit, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 11232 (vi).
Bank Act Amendments: Prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4248 (iii).
—— Par. in 'Financial Post': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) 4770 (ii).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) *re* Newspaper Reports, 2306 (ii).
Banks, Financial Stringency: *See* 'Wheat Transportation.'
Banque de St. Jean, Investigation *re* Failure: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9335 (v).
Bounties paid on Binder Twine, Lead, &c., Amount from 1903 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4583 (iii).
Bounties paid by Govt., for 1908-9: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13226 (vii).
Canadian Bank of Commerce, Letter of Mr. B. E. Walker: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) 6005 (iii).
Chartered Banks of Canada, Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 8086 (iv).
Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds, Cor., &c., Govtl. Action: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 174 (i).
Debt. of Canada, Portions falling due, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 315 (i).
See 'Loans.'
Dom. Liabilities due N.B. from 1869 to 1884: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2217 (ii).
Dom. Notes Outstanding, Total Amount, 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 691 (i).
Dom. Revenue from 1873 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1733 (i).
Estimates of 1908-9: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 554 (i).
—— Suppl. (1908): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 2381 (ii), 5134 (iii), 12503 (vii).
Financial Arrangements with Banks: *See* 'Wheat Transportation.'
FINANCE—*Con.*
Finance, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 637 (i), 12914 (vii).
Financial Review: Amt. (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 13420 (vii).
—— Reply (Mr. Fielding) 13442 (vii).
See 'Budget.'
Financial Stringency, &c., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 35 (i).
Govt. Securities in Gold *re* Dom. Notes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 6235 (iv).
Grain Shipments, Financial Aid, Extended Explanation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 607 (i).
See 'Wheat.'
Insurance Companies' Deposits, Total Amount, Securities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 241 (i).
Loan of Aug., 1907, Names of Banks where Discounted: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 564 (i).
Loans to Govt. Outstanding, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 235
Loan of 1874, Commission for Renewal: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11501 (vi).
Loans negotiated in London, Conditions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts, Disposition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 313 (i).
—— Personal Explanation (Mr. Foster) 13582 (vii).
Loans, Temporary, Total Amount, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 233, 314 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 554 (i).
Loans, Temporary or Advances, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12654 (vii).
Mint, Amount of Silver and Gold Coins, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8612 (v).
—— Cor. with Imp. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Caron) 5210 (iii).
—— Date of Operation, Values of Coinage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11296 (vi).
—— Issue of Gold Coins: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 2593 (ii).
—— Sums expended, Apptmts., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 232 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 557 (i).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Amounts collected and expended, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 1688 (i).
—— Claim of Govt., &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3465 (ii).
—— Indebtedness, Payments, Audit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1931 (i).
—— Bonds, Payment of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2979 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3436; Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3442; Agreed to (Y. 108; N. 53) 3464 (ii).

FINANCE—*Con.*
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Toll Gates upon Island of Montreal, Abolition of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3299 (ii).
Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co., Govt. Deposit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3485 (ii).
N.B. Credit, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1937 (i).
Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid under present Agreement and Previously: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 315 (i).
—— Dates of last Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 237, 564 (i).
—— Increased Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 173 (i).
—— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 79; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 61 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Dom. Govt. Guarantee, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2394 (ii).
—— Investigation *re*: M. for Sel. Com.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2547 (ii).
See main heading.
Receiver General's Office: in Com. of Sup., 12160 (vii).
Treasury Board: in Com. of Sup., 5562 (iii).
Truro, N.S., Tax Bill, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3480 (ii).
Trust Funds: *See* 'Colonial Securities.'
Wheat Transportation from N.W., Financial Aid by Govt., Cor., Memorials, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Foster) 2173 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1938 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 173 (i).
See 'Grain.'
Fire caused by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 18.'
Fire Extinguishers, Purchase by Govt., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1510 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 1690 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 4832 (iii).
—— Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7663 (iv).
—— File, Cor., quoted by Minister, custody of: Remarks (Mr. Blain) on M. for Sup., 7763 (iv).
—— Inquiry for Original Papers (Mr. Foster) 8901, 9281 (v).
—— Personal Explanation (Mr. Pugsley) 5658 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) on M. for Sup., 7639 (iv).
Fire Guardians, Number employed in Alberta: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 3433 (ii).
Fisheries Act (jurisdiction of officers) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 31.'
FISHERIES:
Bait Freezer and Cold Storage Plant in St. John, N.B., Cor., Agreements, &c., with Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 558 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 563 (i).

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Bait Freezer at North Sydney, Govt. Assistance *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 3848 (ii).
Behring Sea Commission, Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 1733 (i).
—— Expenses of Sir Charles H. Tupper: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2883 (ii).
—— Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 4669 (iii).
Berins Fish Hatchery, Failure of Spawn Supply: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3240 (ii).
Bounties paid to Cape Breton Fishermen, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1130 (i).
B.C. Fisheries Commission, Report *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
B.C., Licenses issued to Packers' Ass'n.: Ques. (Mr. Kennedy) 8173 (iv).
—— Grants to Japanese: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 7445 (iv).
—— Negotiations, Instructions to Mr. Bastedo: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4407 (iii).
—— Reports *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. Smith) 6849 (iv).
'Carlotta G. Cox,' Seizure of: *See* 'Pelagic Sealing.'
Deep Sea Fisheries on Pacific Coast, Cruiser, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Clarke's Harbour, Dog Fish Works: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vii).
Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Operation at Canso: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5651 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 5777 (iii).
—— Total Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8179 (iv).
—— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. McLennan) 5790 (iii).
Dog Fish Scrap, Shipments from Canso to U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1126 (i).
Fisheries Committee, Sel. Standing, Apptmt. of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1691 (i).
Fisheries Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 12261 (vii).
—— Inspectors in Alberta, Names, &c: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 12390 (vii).
Fisheries Jurisdiction with Provinces, Conference *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3235 (ii).
—— Instructions to Agent: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3429 (ii).
—— Jurisdiction *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 2395 (ii).
Fisheries in Mar. Provs., Violation of Act: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1513 (i).
—— Officers Jurisdiction, Convictions, Fines, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 4247 (iii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Fisheries Negotiations, &c., Between U.S and Canada: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2023 (ii), 6844 (iv).
——— Boundary between Can. and U.S.: Information *re* (Mr. Sproule) 6632, 6739 (iv).
——— Regulations, Violation of: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 5781 (iii).
Forchu Fish Hatchery, Duties of Supervisor: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3427 (ii).
Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to Messrs. Noble and Birnie: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 980 (i).
——— Report from Mr. Birnie: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5729 (iii).
See 'Noble.'
Lake Winnipeg Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1683 (i).
——— Fisheries, Legislation *re* Closing: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2389 (ii).
Leases granted between Lake Superior and Rocky Mountains, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1683 (i).
Leases, Sessional Papers No. 207: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 6241 (iv).
Licenses granted in Clearwater, &c., Lakes, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 555 (i).
——— on Lesser Slave Lake, Date of Lease, Protest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 6398 (iv).
Licenses issued in Saskatchewan Lakes, Number, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. T. Chisholm) 559, 697 (i).
——— Issue of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 351 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2896 (ii).
Lobster Fish Factory, License to E. H. McLennan, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2983 (ii).
Lobster Fishing Fines, Names and Amounts: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 10256 (v).
——— Fishing and Packing Licenses, Granting in P.E.I.: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. Martin) 5475 (iii).
——— Fishing in Lunenburg, &c., Complaints *re* Undersized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2792 (ii).
——— Fishing in St. John, N.B., Legal Size &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 10257 (v).
——— Fishing at Pictou: Inquiry for Ret (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12772 (vii).
——— Licenses, Refusals in Northumberland Co.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9472 (v).
——— Licenses in Savage Harbour, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4404 (iii).
——— Overseers in Lunenburg, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2793 (ii).
FISHERIES—*Con.*
Lobster Fishing, Pet. from Fishermen's Union of N.S. *re* Regulations: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 6644 (iv).
——— P.E.I. Pets. *re* Issue of Licenses: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2388 (ii).
Louisburg Bait Freezer, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4406 (iii).
Man., Fish Exportations from, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4240 (iii).
Mar. Provs., Fisheries, Violation of Act: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1513 (i).
Markey Fishing Leases, Copy of Ret. laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 11404 (vi).
Matane River Fishing, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 5775 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 7446 (iv).
Noble, Mr. James, Conviction *re* Fishery Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5650 (iii).
See 'Georgian Bay.'
Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, Seizure of Schr. 'Carlotta G. Cox': on M. for Sup. (Mr. Sloan) 3934 (ii).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. Sloan) 3156 (ii).
Port Hood Fishery Officer, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10254 (v).
Pound Net Licenses granted in 1905, Cor. with A. E. Dyment, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 2795 (ii).
Protection, Amounts expended since 1885, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1118 (i).
Protection Service: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vii).
Quahaug and Clam Fishing, Contemplated Change: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1940 (i).
River John Licenses, Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10511 (vi).
Salmon Licenses, Leases, &c., in B.C.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5652 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5801 (iii).
——— Licenses in Gardner's Inlet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 5652 (iii).
——— Number granted in B.C., Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 5998 (iii).
——— Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 5651 (iii).
Salmon Net Fishing in Restigouche River Privileges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13518 (vii).
Seizures of Schooners, B.C., Compensation by Russian Govt.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Selkirk Fish Hatchery, Failure of Spawn Supply: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3240 (ii).
Shad Hatchery, Windsor, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Black) 8894 (v).
Townsend Whaling Licenses: *See* 'Whaling.'

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Trap Bag Nets in Pokemouche River, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9476 (v).
Trap-Net Licenses issued to John A. Webster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7204 (iv).
Washington Fisheries Commission, Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 1732 (i).
Washington Treaty and Behring Sea Commission, Duration of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2165 (ii).
Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c.: M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10259 (v).
——— Moneys Due, Penalties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5996 (iii).
Fish Island Lighthouse, Name of Present Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 6058 (iii).
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, Apptmt. to Hague Tribunal: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 8294 (v).
Floods at Chatham, Damages, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 4742 (iii).
Fog Signal Co., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 11497 (vi).
Forbes, Mr Justice, Personal Status, &c., Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Taylor) for Copies*,899 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2390. 3840 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 1860 (i).
Forchu Fish Hatchery, Duties of Supervisor: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3427 (ii).
Foreign Purchases, Customs Collections *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5475 (iii).
Foresters, Ancient Order of: *See* 'B. No.62.'
Foresters, Order of, Charges in 'Le Canada': Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bennett) 6005 (iii).
Forest Rangers *re* Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 10049 (v).
Forest Reserves, Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 10049 (v).
Fortier, Mr. Eugene, Payments *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8613 (v).
Fortifications, Construction of, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6646 (iv).
Fort William Terminal Ry. and Bridge Co.: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
Foss, Mr. C. O., Apptmt. on G.T.P. Engineering Staff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 358 (i).
Foster, Frederick, Emplymt. of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 12652 (vii).
Franco-Canadian SS. Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty: Prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 941 (i).
——— Preparation of Stmnt. *re* Duty Units (Mr. Foster) 943 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., Stmnt., 1213 (i).
——— Remarks *re* Discussion (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3754 (ii).
——— *See* 'B. No. 57.'
Franco-Canadian Treaty, Canadian Products enjoying Benefits of Minimum Tariff, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 851 (i).
——— Consideration of Proposed Convention: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. Monk) 923 (i).
——— Correction *re* Travelling Expenses of Sir Charles Tupper (Mr. Ames) 1424 (i).
——— Delay in Approval, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Talbot) 12655 (vii).
——— Delay due to Canadian Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13534 (vii).
——— Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1206 (i).
———Distribution to Members: Remarks (Mr. Beland) 605 (i).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12351
——— Favoured Nation Clause, Foreign Powers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 845 (i).
——— Favoured Nation Clause: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 514 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 564 (i).
——— and German Surtax, Effect of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 844 (i).
——— Imports from U.S., Exclusion of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 845 (i).
——— Information in Detail asked for (Mr. Foster) 1585 (i).
——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 570 (i).
———Maximum and Minimum Rate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 178 (i).
——— Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6 (i).
——— Papers to be Distributed (Mr. Fielding) 848 (i).
——— Preferential Tariff, Names of Countries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 844 (i).
——— Printing and Distribution: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 93 (i).
——— Ratification by French Senate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 13083 (vii).
——— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 28; (Mr. Foster) 82; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 43 (i).
——— Shipments from Canada, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4763 (iii).
——— Stmnt. *re* Tariffs: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8 (i).
——— U.S. Exports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 896 (i).
Fraser, Mr. A. W., Emplymt. as Counsel *re* Sussex St. Property Purchase: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3478 (ii).
——— Payments to for Legal Services: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2979 (ii).
Fraser, Mr. Donald, Dismissal from Customs Service: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 5473 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* Defalcations: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5200 (iii).
See 'Customs Defalcations,' &c.

Fredericton Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Fredericton Ry. Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12758 (vii).
Free Transportation of Members by SS. Cos.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
Freight Rates, Discrimination *re* City of St. John, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Crocket) 2397 (ii).
French Books, Reduction of Customs Duties *re* French Treaty: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2160 (ii).
French Immigration Agents, Names, Facilities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
French Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
French Language, Legislation *re*, Par. in 'La Presse': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8291 (v).
——— Par. in 'Le Soleil': Ques. of Privilege (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1209 (i).
French Language, Pet. *re*: Read (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8886; Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 8886 (v).
French Language on Ry. Crossings, &c. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2021 (ii).
French Translation of Govt. Statutes and Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) on M. for Sup., 3179 (ii).
See 'Debates.'
French Treaty, Taking Effect: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 8614 (v).
French Treaty: *See* 'B. No. 57.'
Fritz Cirkel, Mining Engineer, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7202 (iv).
See 'Graphite.'
Frozen Wheat, Shipments from Man., Inspection under Seed Act: M. (Mr. Blain) to adjn. House, 825 (i).
Fruit and Dairy Divisions, Separation of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2166 (ii).
Fruit Inspection in Closed Packages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 2981 (ii).
Fruit Inspection, Complaints *re* Apple Packing: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 2754 (ii).
Fruit Marks Act, Prosecutions *re* Apple Packing: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 4830 (iii).
Fruit and Vegetable Inspectors, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 516 (i).
Fumigation Stations: in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).
Fushimi, Prince, Expenditure *re* Visit: in Com. of Sup., 5783 (iii).
Gaetz Brothers, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 10514 (vi).
Galops Canal, Upper Entrance, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5671 (iii).
Game Preserve, Alberta, Payments for Buffalo imported from Montana: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 847 (i).
Gammell, Edith Maud Rosario, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 139.'
Gananoque and Burnt Island Lights, Buoys, &c., Apptmt. of Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8383 (v).
Gananoque Drill Shed: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
Garrison Artillery, B.C., 5th Regiment, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5792 (iii).
Garrison Commons, Toronto, Date of Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 353 (i).
Garthby Wharf, Inspection by Midraud, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3844 (ii).
See 'Lake Aylmer.'
Gatineau Point Bridge, Sums contributed by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 355 (i).
Gaudette, Mr. Victor, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 1120 (i).
——— Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 515 (i).
Gelinas, Mr., Repayment of Travelling Expenses: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 654, 668 (i).
General Chemical Co., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 174.'
Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Blain) on Conc., 13568 (vii).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Geological Specimens: in Com. of Sup., 12261 (vii).
Geological Survey Department, Total Expenditure from 1896 to 1908: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6402 (iv).
——— Technical Officers, Salaries, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 13574 (vii).
——— Yacht, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11231 (vi).
Georgetown Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7182 (iv).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 47.'
Georgian Bay Canal, Plans, Reports, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. McCool) 1941, 1992 (i), 5228 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal Scheme: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10312 (vi).
——— Report *re* Estimated Cost: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 12053 (vii).
——— inquiry for (Mr. Bergeron) 12836 (vii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Survey, Final Report of Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brabazon) 240 (i).
——— Final Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. White) 240 (i), 5465 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. White) 11827 (vi).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Haggart) 1739 (i).
——— Reps., &c.: Laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 8378 (v).
Georgian Bay Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12145 (vii).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to Messrs. Noble and Birnie: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 980 (i).
—— Report from Mr. Birnie: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5729 (iii).
See 'Fisheries.'
German Development Co.: Remarks (Mr. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 10579 (vi).
See 'Dowling.'
German Goods imported under Preferential Tariff, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).
Gillis, Release from Penitentiary: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 510 (i).
Gilmore, Edith May, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 164.'
Girard, Eugene Francois, Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
Girouard, J. E., Resignation from Yukon Council: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11938 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11634 (vi).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
—— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7139 (iv).
Glencoe Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3846 (ii).
Glencoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup. 7486 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Glucose, Quantity imported from G.B.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6980 (iv).
Gobeil, Mr., Dep. Min. of Public Works, Retirement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1452 (i).
Goderich Harbour, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
—— Claims of Smeeth & McGillicuddy: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Goderich Military Camp, Target Practices, &c,: Ques. (Mr Bristol) 9712 (v)
—— Remarks (Mr. Maclaren) 9779 (v).
Godfroi River Wharf, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3423 (ii).
Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 123 & 197.'
Gold Commissioner's Office, Yukon, Number of Clerks, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).
See 'Yukon.'
'Golspie, Str., Payments *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 1084 (i).
Gooderham & Worts Distillery, Deficit in Spirit Production: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12411 (vii).
Goodwin Car Co., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 60.'
Gore's Landing Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Govt. Business: Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7834 (iv), 12049, 12163 (vii).
—— Introduction of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10258 (v), 10303, 10403, 10511, 11123, 11826 (vi).
—— M. for Precedence on Mondays (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6287 (iv).
—— Precedence *re* Motion for Want of Confidence: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6917 (iv).
—— Ry. Subsidies: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12504 (vii).
Govt. Business: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 13207 (vii).
—— Suppl. Estimates, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 11016 (vi).
Govt. Employees at Ottawa, Number of Permanent and Temporary, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Northrup) 558 (i).
Govt. Grounds, Condition of: Remarks (Mr. Talbot) 1741 (i).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Govt. Officials and Municipal Elections, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Sproule) 2890 (ii).
Govt. Officials as Political Partizans in Elections: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on B. 115, 11903 (vi).
Govt. Ownership, &c., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 75; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 51 (i).
Govt. Rys. Act: *See* 'B. No. 27.'
Govt. Railways System: *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Govt. Securities in Gold *re* Dom. Notes, &c.: Ques. (Mr Marshall) 6235 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, Amounts paid for Provisions, &c., for Three Years: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1512 (i).
—— Captains' Residences, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 3241 (ii).
—— Ice-breakers, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5763 (iii).
—— Maintenance and Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i).
—— Number purchased, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10731 (vi).
—— Pay of Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10736 (vi).
—— Purchase of Supplies, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1099 (i).
—— Trips of Mr. Cowie, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5467 (iii).
Govt. Works, Emplymt. of Technical Students: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3288 (ii).
Governor General's Expenditure since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 555 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. U. Wilson) 3581 (ii).
Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 610 (i).
Grain Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Grain Blockade in the West: *See* 'B. No. 159.'

Grain Commission, Names of Members, Distribution of Evidence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3486 (ii).
Grain Commission's Report: Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 2381 (ii), 4224, 4316 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr .Staples) 180 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Staples) 180, 609 (i).
Grain Inspection in 1906, Total Expenditure, Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4586 (iii).
Grain Shipments, Financial Aid, Extended Explanation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 607
See 'Wheat,' &c.
Grain Standards Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 203.'
Grand Bend, &c., Pier, Delays in Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 4408 (iii).
——— Final Estimate of Chief Engineer Lafleur: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8892 (v).
Grand Bend Wharf, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5085 (ii).
See 'Public Works—Wharfs,' &c.
Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Grand Forks Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Grand Manan Telegraph System, Application *re* Leasing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Grand Marais Harbour, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 12140 (vii).
Grand Mechins Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Grand Mere Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Grandes Piles Dam, Amount voted, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 13059 (vii).
Grand River Wharf, Tenders, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8382 (v).
Grande Riviere Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
G.T.P. Ry. Co., Guaranteed Bonds: *See* 'B. No. 171.'
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY:
Accidents to Employees: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 6655, 7447 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr Talbot) 6850 (iv).
——— Investigation by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. Smith) 10624 (vi).
Application for Portion of Metlakatla Indian Reserve, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. D. Ross) 1512 (i).
Apptmt. of District Engineer at Kenora: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 895 (i).
Bond Issue, Sale of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8440 (v).
Classification of District 'B' and 'F,' Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 12051 (vii).
See 'Hodgins.'
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Commissioners' Rep., Printing and Distribution: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7 (i).
——— Commission, Total Salaries, Expenses &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13226 (vii).
Commission issued to Inspectors: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9716 (v).
Construction, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 37 (i).
——— Estimated Cost, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 10393 (vi).
——— Inclusive of Terminals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9265 (v).
——— Inquiry for Figures (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10916, 11939 (vi).
——— M. to Lay Statement on Table (Mr. Graham) 12049 (vii).
——— Total Cost, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii), 9265 (v), 11407 (vi).
——— Statement (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 12238 (vii)
——— Reply to Mr. Borden's Statement (Mr. Graham) 12662 (vii).
Construction Tenders, Total Amounts, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. J. T. Schell) 600 (i).
Contracts, Date, Estimated Cost, Mileage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6458, 6636 (iv).
Contracts *re* Eastern and Western Sections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6234 (iv).
Contracts, Safeguard Clauses in Govt. Contracts: M. for Copies* (Mr. Morin) 2398 (ii).
Eastern Division, Estimated Length, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5563 (iii).
——— Recent Estimate of Cost: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5259 (iii).
Eastern Limit, Mountain Section, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 9265 (v)
Engineers and Assistant Engineers, Names, &c., Date of Apptmt., Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5802 (iii).
Engineering Staff, Changes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 509, 681 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 853 (i).
——— Resignation of Mr. Hodgins: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 516 (i)
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 558 (i).
See 'Hodgins.'
Foss, Mr. C. O., Apptmt. on Engineering Staff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 358 (i).
Grand Falls and Moncton Section, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 9266 (v).
G.T.P., and N.T. Ry., Disputed Questions: Ques (Mr. Barker) 6235 (iv).
Hodgins, Major, Resignation, Apptmt. of Successor: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 358 (i).
——— Retirement of, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 366 (i).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Hodgins, Major, Charges *re* Classification, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6844, 6925 (iv).
——Amt. to M. to ref. to Special Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7213, 7320 (iv).
—— Statement from Hon. Mr. Parent: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6985; Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7097 (iv).
—— Investigation *re*, 1st Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Geoffrion) 8515 (v).
—— M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12265; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) Minority Rep., 12291 (vii).
—— Counsel Fees, Payment: M. (Mr. Macdonald) 13578 (vii).
Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 10390 (vi).
La Tuque Branch, Damages by Flooding: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8607 (v).
—— Explanation (Mr. Graham) 8894 (v).
Liquor, Prohibition Zone, Cor., Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 558 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2024
Location, Conference in Montreal *re*: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7809 (iv).
Lyall, Mr. Peter, Contractor for G.T.P. Terminals at Winnipeg: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 7991 (iv).
Madawaska Right of Way: Remarks (Mr. Michaud) 12661 (vii).
Marier, Mr. J. E., Emplymt. on G.T.P. Commission: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2162 (ii).
Medical Attendance, O.C. regulating Deductions: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1937 (i).
—— Deductions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 9473 (v).
Medical Officer Parent, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8618 (v).
Miles under construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 165 (i).
Mission Reserve, Conditions of Sale to G.T.P. Ry. Co.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5256 (iii).
Montreal Branch Line Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).
Mountain Division, Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).
Nationality of Contractors: Discrimination against Canadians: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7936 (iv).
Payments to Mr. A. Brunet: in Com. of Sup., 10378 (vi).
Policy *re* Police Patrol: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7997 (iv).
Port Arthur Branch Line Subsidy: in Com on Res., 13303 (vii).
Prohibition Zone, Reduction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 516 (i).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Protests *re* Land Acquisitions: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 6640 (iv).
Rails purchased, Name of Manufacturers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 10738, 10790 (vi).
—— Importations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 12775 (vii).
—— corrected answer (Mr. Graham) 13065
Rails for Eastern Division, Purchase of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 9263 (v).
Return: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6288 (iv).
Route, Financial Reasons for Change of Route: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Fielding) 8089 (iv).
Sections B. and F., Amounts paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barker) 5211 (iii).
Securities *re* Construction Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 356 (i).
Supplies to Prince Rupert via American Routes: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 9025 (v), 10375 (vi).
Supply Transportation, Award of Contracts *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 2171 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1932 (i).
—— Contractor for District No. 3: Ques. (Mr. White) 1120 (i).
Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12728 (vii).
Ties purchased from U.S.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 1443 (i).
Town and Development Co., Location of Lands, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 5087 (iii).
Winnipeg and Moncton Route, Location of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 2386 (ii).
——Number of Miles completed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6643 (iv).
—— Tenders *re* Contracts, Signatures, &.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 935 (i).
G.T. Ry. and C.P.R. Connection at Wingham: Remarks (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) 191 (i).
G. T. Ry., Connection at Brockville: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) 9 (i).
——Connections at Prescott: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 433 (i).
——Entrance into Toronto, O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 556 (i).
G.T.R. Hotel Site at Ottawa: *See* 'B No. 89.'
G.T.Ry. Hotel: *See* 'Major's Hill.'
'Graphite,' Cost of Publication, Total Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5081 (iii).
See 'Fritz Cirkel,' &c.
Gratuities to Marine *re* Accidents to Seamen: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vii).
Gratuities to Public Works Officials: in Com. of Sup., 5730 (iii).
Gravenhurst Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).
Graving Docks, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).

Grazing Lands leased to Brown, Bedingfield & Co.: Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 13062 (vii).
Grazing Lands Reservations, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 3850 (ii).
Grazing Leases, Application of Messrs. Wood, Fleck and Finnie: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 238 (i).
Grazing Leases, Irrevocable for 21 years, Applications for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1511 (i).
Grazing and Irrigation Lands reserved by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3479 (ii).
Grazing Lease of H. Rivière, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 13060 (vii).
Grazing Ranches, Names and Addresses of Lessees in Townships 12 to 19: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7210 (iv).
G. B. and Canada Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 12728 (vii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
G. B. and U. S. Treaties: Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8694 (v).
See 'Anglo-American.'
Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Griffith Island, Georgian Bay, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1508 (i).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Buildings: in Com. of Sup.,7289 (iv).
Guelph Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7678 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Guelph-Goderich Mail Service, Arrangements with C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. A. F. Maclaren) 184 (i).
Gunn, Mr. B. B., Decease of: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 431 (i).
Gunnip, Mr. James, Pet. *re* Claims for Injuries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3844 (ii).
Hackett Dock, Purhase of at Amherstburg: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7730 (iv).
Halifax Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 7144 (iv).
—— Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7211 (iv).
Halifax Dominion Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7140 (iv).
Halifax Garrison, Coal Supply, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 10015 (v).
—— Disbandment of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1208 (i).
—— Discontent *re* Delay of Pay: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5659 (iii).
—— Occupation by Imp. Troops: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).
—— Retraction of Remarks of Minister of Finance: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 5784 (iii).
See 'Esquimault.'
Halifax Immigration Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7142-3 (iv).
Halifax Immigration Frauds. Dismissal of Mr. Bernstein: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8605 (v).
—— Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9334 (v).
See 'Immigration.'
Halifax, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii). 12227 (vii).
—— Military Buildings (Wellington Barracks): in Com. of Sup., 7143 (iv).
Halifax Platform *re* Conservative Speeches, ref. to in debate on Address (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 47; (Mr. Foster) 66 (i).
Halifax Quarantine Station, Lawlor's Island: in Com. of Sup., 7171 (iv).
Halifax, Signal Dues at: *See* 'B. No. 152.'
Halifax Southwestern Ry. (Tusket Wedge) Subsidy: in Com. of Res., 13296 (vii).
Halliday Bros., Supplies to Lighthouses, Rates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6236 (iv).
Hall's Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
Hamilton Bank, Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 56.'
Hamilton, Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7692 (iv).
—— Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7696 (iv).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 25.'
Hamilton Radial Electric B. 25: in Com., *re* Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to ref. back to Com., 3362 (ii).
Haney, M. J., Claims *re* P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 12762 (vii).
'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 9128 (v).
See 'Debates,' &c.
Harbottle, N. F., Employmt. in Excise Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 7730 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers, Generally, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11693, 12031 (vi).
—— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii).
—— N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
—— N. B., Members' Remarks checked: (Mr. Deputy Speaker) 11290 (vi).
—— N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).
—— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
—— P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).
—— P. E. I., General Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11292 (vi).
—— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
—— Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
See 'Public Works.'
Harlaka Junction Ry. Connection: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 1436 (i), 3317 (ii).
See 'I. C. R.,' &c.
Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
Harvey Bank Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).

Hawkeye, Mr., Emplymt. as Returning Officer: Remarks (Mr. Avery) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).
Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Instruction *re* Municipal Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3430 (ii)
——Political Interference, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) on M. for Sup., 6647 (iv).
Haycock, Mr. J. L., Interference in Elections: Remarks (Mr U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).
Hay Shipments to S. Africa, Claims against Dept. of Agriculture: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5791 (iii).
Hay and Straw Embargo by G. B.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4765 (iii).
Heath Point Lighthouse, Contract *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7210 (iv).
—— Purchase of Cement from A. E. Wallberg, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 4773 (iii).
Higgin's Shore Pier Wharf, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 694 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, Increase in Salaries: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 10737 (vi).
Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I. Ry., Claims of M. J. Haney, Arbitration, &c.: Remarks (Mr J. D. Reid) 1739 (i).
—— O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 1690 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Barker) 3042, 3690 (ii).
Hillsborough Bridge Construction, Land Purchases, &c., Reps., &s.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lefurgey) 2170 (ii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Lefurgey) 6160 (iii).
—— Total Expenditure *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1686 (i).
Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii)
—— Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7188 (iv).
Hindus Deportation from B.C., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Macpherson) 5337 (iii).
Hindus in B.C., Protests against Treatment: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (Mr. Foster) 5489 (iii).
—— Tel. *re* Contract Labour: Remarks (Mr Foster) 4407 (iii).
See 'Immigration.'
Hintz, Fred., Location of Homestead: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 6238 (iv).
See 'Homesteads,' &c.
Hodgins, Major: *See* 'G.T.P.'
Hog Cholera in Essex, Number of Animals slaughtered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 9280 (v).
—— Compensation paid, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 13085 (vii).
Hogg, Mr. W. D., Payments to since 1896, &c.: Ques. (Mr. P. D. McLean) 2981 (ii).
Holland River Dredging, Contract with Lake Simcoe Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2980 (ii).
—— Divisional Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4767 (iii).
—— Name of Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3037 (ii).
Holliday, Mr. P., Payments of Additional Living Allowance: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5475 (iii).
Home Guards, N.W.T., Issue of Scrip for Services: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 2161 (ii)
Homestead Application of Mr. John Haddock: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. on B. 181, 11197 (vi).
Homestead Cancellations: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 10090 (v)
Homestead Entries, Declarations, &c., by Mr. R. Cruickshanks: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 698 (i).
Homestead Entries in Man., &c., Total Acreage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 6920 (iv).
Homestead Entries granted for Quarter 10-17-17, W. of 4th Meridian: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 9773 (v).
Homesteaders for Sections 15, 16 and 27, &c., Issue of Patents: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 7503 (iv).
Homestead Entry for s.e. ¼ Section 16-28-1, Issue of Patent, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2167 (ii).
Homesteading on Section 18, Extensions *re* Time Allowance: Quese. (Mr. Ames) 8381 (v).
Homestead Entries in Section 27, Cor., Tels., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Staples) 4773 (iii).
—— n.e. ¼ Sec. 28, Permission *re* Grants: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1941 (i).
—— N.W. Quarter Section 35, History of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4762 (iii).
—— Records of Payments of Sale by Peter Luenson to F. Heintz, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr Porter) 1294 (i).
See 'Hintz.'
Homestead Entry by Mr. Tanguay: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10087 (v).
Homestead Entries: *See* 'Land Patents.'
Homestead Patents, Settlement Conditions: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10095 (v).
—— Sale of in Township 13, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 7206 (iv).
Honey Imports from 1898-1908, Amount, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8177 (iv).
Hoppins. Mr. Wm., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 3842 (ii).
Horses and Cattle, Imports to U.S. as Thoroughbreds, Prevention of: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 6000 (iii).
Hough, Campbell & Ferguson, Applications, &c., *re* Coal Mining Lands: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 698 (i)

Hough, Campbell & Ferguson, Sales of Lands to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 364, 568 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 3319 (ii).
House of Commons Act (election writ) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 66.'
HOUSE OF COMMONS:
Clerk of Crown in Chancery, Estimates: in Com of Sup., 10508 (vi).
Colchester Electoral District, Ceretificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 680 (i).
Committees sitting concurrently with Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9579 (v).
Debates of the House, Statement *re* Speakers (Mr. Kennedy) 13537 (vii).
Election Petitions, Supreme Court Judgments: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Electoral Districts, Issue of Writs: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
—— Ottawa and Labelle, Certificates of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 890 (i).
Employees of Parliament, Religion, Nationalities, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 5479 (iii).
House of Commons, Accommodation for Members in New Wing: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 10490 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
—— Additional Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1486 (i).
—— Civil Service Bill, and Employees of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 13528 (vii).
—— Clerks, Changes, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Owen) 4247 (iii).
—— Employees, Recommendations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 3899 (ii).
—— Increase of Salaries: in Com. of Sup 13562 (vii).
—— Delays in Mails: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 11939 (vi).
—— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 570 (i)
—— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).
—— Delay, &c.: Statement (Mr. Lemieux) 12044 (vi).
—— Salary Increases to Sessional Clerks: in Sup., Conc., 13578 (vii).
—— Ventilation and Cooling: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 10978, 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii).
House of Commons and Senate, Cost, &c., Outside of Indemnities: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4760 (iii).
Huron Electoral Division, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 890 (i).
——Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2541 (ii).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7 (i).
HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
Internal Economy Commission, Minutes: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2795 (ii).
Legislation, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10507 (vi).
Library of Parlt. Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 312 (i).
—— Joint Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 6 (i).
—— Montreal Directory: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 4764 (iii).
—— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Affidavits *re* Frauds: Read (Mr. Bole) 7942 (iv).
Members, New, Certificates: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Members and Senators appointed to Offices of Emolument, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 555 (i).
Montmagny Electoral District, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 9263 (v).
Nicolet Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1283
Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re*, Bourinot quoted. &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4103 (ii)
—— Appeal to Speaker from Chairman's Ruling (Mr. Taylor) Agreed to (Y. 84; N. 1) 4188 (ii).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 609 (i).
Peace Union, Parliamentary, Meeting at Ottawa: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13581 (vii).
Printing of Parlt., Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 312 (i).
Private Bills Com., Extension of Time: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 891 (i).
Private Bills Fees, Discrepancy between Senate and H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10122 (v).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen. Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 13580 (vii).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings and Adjournments: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1439 (i).
—— Meetings of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 945 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings concurrently with Sittings of Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9504 (v).
—— Production of Original Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 1383 (i), 4495 (iii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Joint Meeting of Members and Senators: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 6061 (iii).
Restaurant of H. of C. and Senate: M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Joint Com., 13224 (vii).
—— 1st Rep.: Presented (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 13510 (vii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
Returning Officers, Apptmnt. of: Remarks (Mr. Telford) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).
Returns, Questions, &c., ordered by House, Time to complete, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 4242 (iii).
Revised Statutes, French Version, Date of Completion: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 357 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 6983 (iv).
Rules of the House, Amendments to: Prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2984 (ii).
Rules *re* Hours of Adjournment: Prop. Res. (Mr. A. A. Wright) 584 (i).
Saturday Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11501 (vi).
Senate, Cost of outside of Indemnities: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 5087 (iii).
——— Days of Sitting, Cost for 1895 and 1906-7, of Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1114 (i).
Sergeant-at-Arms Estimates: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
South Huron, By-Election, Amounts paid Returning Officer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9270 (v), 11935 (vi).
Speaker's Expenses, Comparison, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i)
——— Pianos rented, &c., for Speakers' Rooms: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 563 (i).
Speech from the Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 3 (i).
——— Reply (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1584 (i).
Stanstead By-Election Papers, Destruction of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8087 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 8839 (v).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com. on Priv. and Elections, 8887 (v).
Vacancies in Electoral Districts: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Vacancy in Stanstead, Issue of Writ: Notification (Mr. Spaker) 569 (i).
Voters' Lists, Manitoba: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 10793 (vi).
——— Manitoba Polling Divisions by Judges: Remarks (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 13139 (vii).
——— Provincial: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
Votes and Proceedings, Correction in Names of Clerks (Mr. Burrows) 13066 (vii).
Watson, Mr., K.C., Apptmt. as Counsel *re* West Elgin Election Frauds: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 6848 (iv).
Wednesday Evening Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11232 (vi).
York Electoral District: Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1018 (i).
Howard's Cape Wharf, Pet. *re*, &c.: Ques (Mr. Lefurgey) 11702 (vi).
Hudson Bay Co., Original Land Register of Lord Selkirk's Estate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 4403 (iii).
Hudson Bay Patrol System: in Com. of Sup., 3985 (ii), 4747 (iii).
Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction: M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv).
——— Proposition *re* Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5789 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Borden) on Financial Review, 13467 (vii).
——— Surveys, Locations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12764 (vii).
See 'Railways.'
Hudson, Que., Dredging, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
Hull Customs Imports, Amount for 1906-8: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 11703 (vi).
Hull Post Office, Total Revenue for 1906, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 11704 (vi).
Humboldt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8582 (v).
Hunter, Henry C., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1292 (i), 3236 (ii).
Hunter, J. B., Apptmt. as Dep. Min. of Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 1452 (i).
Hunting, Killing of Persons, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 93.'
'Hurona-Mongolian' Collision, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 358 (i).
Huron Electoral Division, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 890 (i).
——— Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2541 (ii).
Hydrographic Surveys, Amounts expended, &c: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1128 (i).
——— River St. Lawrence and Gulf: in Com. of Sup., 13169 (vii).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Date of Resignation, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 166 (i).
Ice-breakers for Govt. Service: in Com. of Sup., 2941, 2949 (ii).
Ice-breaker for Northumberland Straits: in Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).
——— Progress *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1734 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 2944 (ii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Immigration: *See* 'Chinese,' &c.
Immigration Act (concealed weapons) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 65.'
Immigration Act Amt: *See* 'B. No. 135.'
IMMIGRATION:
Agents in G. B. and France: in Com. of Sup., 9840 (v).
——— Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 2169 (ii).
——— Reps. received from, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. U. Wilson) 557 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Agents, Special, Salaries, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 2398 (ii).
Agents in East Elgin, Number employed: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 692 (i).
——— Italy. Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 4584 (iii)
——— Kent County, Ont., on M. for Sup. (Mr. Clements) 3172 (ii).
——— payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 514 (i).
Agents appointed in Ontario, Names, Number, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 1129 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Clements) 3041 (ii).
Agents, Names, Addresses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 180 (i).
——— Names of those paid Commissions to in Europe, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 3844 (ii).
Agents in N.B., Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 843 (i).
Agents, Special Prizes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3484 (ii).
Agents in U.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9964 (v).
Asiatic Immigration into B.C.: *See* 'Japanese.'
Belgian Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
Bonuses, Abolition of: Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6663, 6945, 6989 (iv).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. Monk) 4769 (iii), 6288 (iv).
Bonuses, Abolition of: on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1295 (i), 3300 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) *re* Discussion of former Speech, 1293; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1299 (i).
——— Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1287 (i).
——— Increase to Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3429 (ii).
Bonuses, Par. in 'Canadian Gazette': Remarks (Mr. Robitaille) 7453 (iv).
B.C., Immigration, O.C. *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 9890 (v).
British Subjects, Regulations *re*, Deportations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9772 (v).
Buildings, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11008 (vi).
Chapman, Mr. F. O., Emplymt. in Immigration Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9964 (v).
Chinese Immigration into B.C., O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 554 (i)
Chinese Immigration, Decision of N.S. Supreme Court *re* Evasion of Poll Tax: Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 513 (i).
IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Colonization Societies, Quebec, Amounts paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 684 (i).
Detention Hospitals, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 5081 (iii).
Dodds, Mr. W., Information *re* Immigration Frauds at Halifax: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 5655 (iii).
See 'Halifax.'
Doukhobours bonused as Immigrants: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9952 (v).
——— Homesteads cancelled, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9957 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv. *re* (Mr. S. Hughes) 7321 (iv).
——— Religious Fanatics: Par. in Press (Mr. J. D. Reid) 12161 (vii).
Doyle, Mr. P., Immigration Agent, Superannuation of: Ques. (Mr. Oliver) 6923 (iv).
Dunne, M. C., Agent, Number of Immigrants located by him in Lennox and Addington County: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 555 (i).
Expenditure from March, 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 5080 (iii).
Expenditure *re* Maintenance of Immigrants: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5084 (iii).
French Immigration Agents, Names, Facilities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
French Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
Gimli Galicians, Relief to (Mr. Oliver) Rep. of Mr. Walker read: in Com. of Sup., 9979 (v).
Halifax Immigration Frauds, Par in Press: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4834 (iii).
——— Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9334 (v).
——— Dismissal of Mr. Bernstein: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8605 (v).
——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5567 (iii).
——— Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6465 (iv).
——— Rep. of Mr. Robertson: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9127 (v).
——— Restitution *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L Borden) 5659 (iii).
——— Statement *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L Borden) 4963 (iii).
Halifax Immigration Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7142-3 (iv).
Hindus in B.C., Protests against Treatment: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (Mr Foster) 5488 (iii).
——— Deportation from B.C., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Macpherson) 5337 (iii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Hindus, Tel. *re* Contract Labour: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4407 (iii).
Immigrants, Amounts paid for Maintenance, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Schaffner) 5476 (iii).
——— Bulgarians, Stranded in Toronto: Tel. read (Mr. Macdonell) 185 (i).
Immigrants at Chatham, Deportation of Five Families: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 6922 (iv).
——— Names and Causes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5796 (iii).
Immigrants deported, Expenditure *re* Transportation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 5080 (iii).
——— Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 177 (i).
Immigrants Destitute, Stranded in Toronto: Remarks *re* Question (Mr. Macdonell) 242 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 429 (i).
Immigrants distributed in West Kent, Certificates of Farmers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 1513 (i).
Immigrants from Europe, entering U.S., List furnished to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5082 (iii).
Immigrant Inspection on Ships, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1289 (i).
Immigrants landed in Canada June, 1907, Number deported, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3339 (ii).
Immigrants, Number entering Canada, Bonuses paid on, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5256 (iii).
——— Number settled in Canada in 1905-6-7, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 697 (i).
——— Reported by SS. 'Montreal,' Bonuses paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6921 (iv).
——— Stranded at St. Thomas, Deportation of: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 567 (i).
——— Total Number entering Canada for ten Months, Deportations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brabazon) 240 (i).
Immigration Act Amt., O.C. *re*: Ques (Mr. Lennox) 7500 (iv).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 8171, 8607, 8696 (v).
Immigration Act, B.C., Natal Act, Disallowance of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 567 (i).
Immigration, Circular issued to Immigrants *re* Fraudulent Powers: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 606 (i).
——— Co-operation with N.B. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).
——— Deportations: in Com. of Sup., 9882 (v).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Immigration from England, Statements of Mr. O. Smith, &c.: Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (Mr. Sproule) 5491 (iii).
Immigration Forms, Number returned by Farmers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3847 (ii).
Immigration from France and Belgium, Premiums paid to Clerical and Lay Agents: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6922 (iv).
Immigration, General Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 5751 (iii).
Immigration Hall, East Selkirk, Furniture, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6402 (iv).
Immigration and Commercial Agencies Rets.: Inquiry for (Mr. U. Wilson) 1108 (i).
Immigration Literature: in Com. of Sup., 9948 (v).
——— Contingencies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9948 (v).
Immigration, O.Cs. and Circulars issued *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. U. Wilson) 2171 (ii).
——— Regulations, O.C. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11018 (vi).
Immigration from U.S., Total Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5082 (iii).
Japanese Immigration: *See* main heading.
La Societe Canadienne d'Immigration, &c., Montreal, Pet. *re* Assistance: Ques. (Mr Monk) 4244 (iii).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 4773 (iii).
London Immigration, Central Board, Moneys paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2545 (ii).
McDonald, Albert G., Commission paid *re* Immigrants: Ques. (Mr. Alcorn) 8617 (v).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Alcorn) 4773 (iii).
Miller, Agent, Number of Immigrants located by him in Lennox and Addington: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 555 (i).
Oriental Immigration, B.C., Legal Expenses *re* Commission: in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Passages to Canada, Number rejected by SS. Companies: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5468 (iii).
Quebec Immigrant Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
——— Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
Relief to Settlers: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 9983 (v).
Salvation Army Immigrants, Letter from Dr. Nadeau: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7094 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9973 (v).
——— Stmnt. of Genl. Booth: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2390 (ii).
Temperance Colonization Society, Land Grants to, Terms of Settlement, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 4774 (iii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Teulon Immigration Sheds, Number cared for: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 892 (i).
U. S. Labourers: in Com. of Sup., 13169 (vii).
U.S., Total Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5082 (iii)
Victoria Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 10874 (vi).
Waugh, James S., Distribution of Immigrants, Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Gordon) 1690 (i).
—— Refund to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4765 (iii).
Waugh and Perrin, Agents, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 514 (i).
Winnipeg Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 8573 (v).
Imperial Conference, 1907, Expenditure by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 511 (i).
—— Travelling Expenses of Ministers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1513 (i).
See 'Colonial.'
Imperial Institute: in Com. of Sup., 10623 (vi).
Imperial Pulp Co., Denial *re* Managing Directorship: Par. in Montreal 'Star': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sifton) 3578 (ii).
Imperial Treaties, Status of Canada *re* Negotiations &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 1939 (i)
Imports and Exports ending Sept. 30th and Oct. 30th, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 350 (i).
—— Values from June to Dec., 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
Imports from France, Value for Five Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1124 (i).
Imports for Home Consumption, Values for 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13063 (vii).
Independence of Parlt. Act, Violation of *re* R. Stewart, M.P. for Ottawa: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5941 (iii).
Independent Bank Audit, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 11232 (vi).
Indiantown and Blackville Branch Ry., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12258 (vii).
INDIANS:
Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 12739 (vii).
Clearwater Lake, Halfbreeds' Rights: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 175 (i).
Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 10916 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
Destitute Indians, Relief, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5762 (iii).
Dokis Indian Land Sale, Commission to Mr. P. Ryan: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 12732 (vii).
Dokis Indian Reserve, Consent from Chief, *re* Sale of Timber: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 8175 (iv).
INDIANS—*Con.*
Dokis Indian Reserve, Name of Govt. Agent: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5084 (iii).
—— Notice of Sale, Names of Newspapers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 7500 (iv).
—— Protests *re* Sale: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 10918 (vi).
—— Total Expenditure *re* Surrender: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 10512 (vi).
Dokis Indians, Surrender of Timber, O.Cs., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5087 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3849 (ii).
—— Sale of Timber: Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Sup., 7801 (iv).
Indian Affairs: in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 7 (i).
—— Extravagant Management of: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Armstrong) 11022 (vi).
—— Generally, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5762 (iii).
Lands in Algoma, Sale of, 13095; Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13122; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 101) 13138 (vii).
—— Tel. from Mr. Sifton read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13416 (vii).
—— Ques. of Priv. *re* Mr. Sifton's Telegram, 13528 (vii).
Lands in Algoma, Withdrawal from Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2396 (ii).
Lands in B.C., Provincial Rights: Remarks (Mr. Macpherson) in Com. of Sup., 627 (i).
Lands and Islands owned by Indians, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5078 (iii).
Lands at New Westminster, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3037, 3839 (ii).
Land Sales in N.W. Indian Reserves, Applications, Advertisements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2170 (ii).
Lands, Number of Acres sold since 1896, Total Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4586 (iii).
Land Sales: in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).
Man. and Sask. Indians, Investigation of Mrs. Paget and Miss Ferguson, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. Wright) 6919 (iv)
Metlakatla and Songhees Indian Reserves, Legal Opinions of Justice Dept.: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Ret (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2381 (ii).
Muskoday Reserves, Negotiations *re* Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5082 (iii).
N. B., Agents Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 13170 (vii).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 12736 (vii).
—— School Inspector: in Com. of Sup., 13170 (vii).

INDIANS—*Con.*
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 12729, 12737 (vii).
Piegan Indian Reserve, Shipping and Weighing of Cattle: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 632 (i).
Rama Indian Fund, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 8610 (v).
St. Mary's Indian Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
St. Peter's Reserve Title, Extinguishment of, Issue of Patents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1932 (i).
—— Instruction to Agents *re* Rights of Purchasers: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2217 (ii).
—— Pet. *re* Election of Chief and Councillors: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 7990 (iv).
Schools. Dr. Bryce's Report: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
Sioux Indians: in Com. of Sup., 5762 (iii).
Six Nation Indians. Negotiations *re*, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 6242 (iv).
—— Refusal of Inspection of Memorials, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6239 (iv).
Swan Lake Reserve, Acquisition of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 693 (i).
—— Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).
—— Settlement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).
Yeomans, Agent. Complaints by John Franklin, &c., Letters *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Knowles) 1513 (i).
Ingonish Lightkeeper, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8618 (v).
Inland Revenue Act (excise duties, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 143.'
INLAND REVENUE:
Corby Distillery, Deficits in Spirit Production: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12410 (vii).
Excise, Provisional Allowance to Inland Revenue Officers: in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).
Gooderham & Worts Distillery, Deficit in Spirit Production: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12411 (vii).
Inland Revenue Act, Violations: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4964 (iii).
Inland Revenue, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Templeman) 6 (i).
—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 645 (i).
Mackenzie, Mr. Jas. H., Emplymt. in Toronto Inland Revenue Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5797 (iii).
Port Hope Inland Revenue Office, Apptmts. of Collector: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 895 (i).
Seizures, 1906-7, in Cornwall, Toronto, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 3846 (ii).
INLAND REVENUE—*Con.*
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 3851 (ii).
—— Seizures in Cornwall, &c., Names of Officers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 4247 (iii).
Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
Tobacco Manufacturers in Mar. Provs., Amounts of Fines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 363 (i).
Tobacco Manufacturers in P.E.I., Violation of Inland Revenue Act: Cor. read (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 9237 (v).
—— on M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9514 (v).
Tobacco. Protection to Canadian Industry, Pets., &c., *re* Amt. to Inland Revenue Act: M. for Copies (Mr. Dubeau) 899 (i).
Tobacco Seizures, at Charlottetown, Penalties, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2982 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act: *See* 'B. No. 64.'
—— (dairy products, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
—— (grain) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 203.'
—— (oat standards) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
Inspection of Staples: in Com. of Sup., 12261 (vii).
Inspection of Steamboats: *See* 'Canada Shipping Bills.'
Inspectors of Food Products, Number, Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 352 (i).
Institute of Architects of Can.: See 'B. No. 88.'
See 'Architects.'
Insurance Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 42.'
Insurance Bill, Discussion *re*: Personal Explanation *re* Par. in Montreal 'Star' (Mr. Foster) 1860 (i).
—— Introduction of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9272 (v).
—— Discussion *re* (Mr. Foster) 1107 (i).
—— Introduction of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7099 (iv), 8386 (v).
Insurance Commission, Exhibits of Commercial Travellers' Mutual Benefit Society, Originals asked for (Mr. Macdonell) 7988 (iv).
—— Evidence, Sale of for Private Profit: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 6059 (iii).
—— and Political Campaign Literature: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 10792 (vi).
—— Rep.: Ques. of Priv. *re* Stmnt. of Sir Frederick Borden, 9337; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 9352, 9461 (v).
—— Total Expenditure, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 232 (i).
Insurance Companies' Deposits, Total Amount, Securities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 211 (i).
Insurance, Supt. of: in Com. of Sup., 12160 (vii).

Insurance, Supt.'s Salary: *See* 'B. No. 200.'
Intercolonial Conference in London, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 13225 (vii).
—— Expenses of Ministers: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 13511 (vii).
See 'Colonial.'
I.C.R. Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 27.'
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 117.'
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:
Accidents, Letter *re*: Read (Mr. S. Hughes) 6985 (iv).
Advertising for Supplies, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 10186 (v).
Amherst Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12233 (vii).
Amqui Station, Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10012 (v).
—— Vote *re* Construction, Amount Expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12774 (vii).
Answer to Questions: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) 13415 (vii).
Antigonish Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Audit System: Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 10214 (v).
Book-Keeping System, Correction of Par. in St. John 'Daily Telegraph': (Mr. Graham) 5260 (iii).
Bridge Strengthening: in Com. of Sup., 12259 (vii).
Campbellton Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12258 (vii).
Cars sent to U.S., Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 10222 (v).
Cars in Service on Sundays: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6240 (iv).
Chatham, N.B., Ry. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12757 (vii).
Circular *re* Delay in Payment of Salaries: Read (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10126 (v).
—— Par. in St. John Press: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Fowler) 10016 (v).
Claims Agent, E. H. Allen, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 3480 (ii).
Claims for Damages by A. W. Belyea: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 9472 (v).
Claims for Damages to Property or Personal Injury, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Graham) 6002 (iii).
Claims for Damages, Settlement of: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5793 (iii), 7196 (iv).
Claims Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 10176 (v).
Cold Storage Cars for Dairy Produce, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1688 (i).
Collection of Revenues: in Com. of Sup., 5693 (iii).
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Compensation *re* Horses killed at Truro: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).
Concrete Pipes, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6640 (iv).
Dartmouth Branch Line Ry., Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).
Delays to 'Maritime Express': Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8614 (v).
Deterioration of Service: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 10147 (v).
Double Tracking: in Com. of Sup., 12236, 12250 (vii).
Earnings and Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13510 (vii).
Employees, Apptmts. in N.B. during Jan. and Feb., 1908, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5793 (iii).
—— Circular from Genl. Mgr. *re* Municipal Politics: Read (Mr. Sproule) 2304 (ii).
—— Circular *re* Municipal Elections: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2884; on M. for Sup., 2890 (ii).
—— Employees and Municipal Elections: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2309 (ii).
—— Increased Wages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2981 (ii).
—— Provident Fund Act, Names on List: ues. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4582 (iii).
—— and Quebec Provincial Elections: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9777 (v).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10126 (v).
Extension to Great Lakes, Prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2435 (ii).
Extension Policy, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 73 (i).
Fredericton Ry. Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12758 (vii).
Freight Rate Discrimination against Fredericton, N.B., Cor., &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Crocket) 2558 (ii).
Gross Earnings for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13225 (vii).
Halifax Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii), 12227 (vii).
—— Civic Elections in Halifax, Interference of Employees: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6845 (iv).
Halifax to Sydney Division, Transfer: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 12773 (vii).
Hanlon's Crossing Accident, Investigation *re*: M. for Paper* (Mr. Sinclair) 5800 (iii).
Hard Pine Tenders, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3233 (ii).
Harlaka Junction Ry. Connections: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 434, 1436 (i), 3317 (ii).
See 'Que. Central.'

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Ice Supply Contract: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5259 (iii), 7446 (iv).
Increased Accommodations: in Com. of Sup., 12259 (vii).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry., Change of Name, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6243 (iv).
Lac Saumon Station, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12652 (vii).
Legal Costs to Mr. MacIlreith: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 5553 (iii).
Legal Services: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 10190 (v).
Locomotives: in Com. of Sup., 10149 (v).
Locomotive and Car Shops, Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 12257 (vii).
Moncton, Additional Branch Line: in Com. of Sup., 12760 (vii).
Moncton Car Shops, Contractor, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1509 (i).
——— Car and Locomotive Shops: in Com. of Sup., 12250 (vii).
——— Lease, &c., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 1690 (i).
——— Payments to Mr. E. A. Wallberg: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 8892 (v).
——— Tenders *re* Leasing: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5800 (iii).
Motor Cars, Tests *re* Operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 565 (i).
Mulgrave Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
N.B. Elections and I.C.R. Employees: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3317 (ii).
Newcastle Station, Inspector of Works: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13511 (vii).
New Glasgow Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12230 (vii).
North Sydney Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Notices printed in French and English: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7936 (iv).
Number of Men employed in N.B., for Jan., Feb., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Daniel) 6241 (iv).
'Ocean Limited,' Date of Beginning and Ending of Running, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 6054 (iii).
Officials, A. T. LeBlanc, &c., Accounts, Vouchers, &c., for Travelling Expenses, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Boyce) 2982 (ii).
O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. on: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
——— Issue of Pass: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
Oxford and Pictou Branch, Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10733 (vii).
Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 10157 (v).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Passes issued to Mr. P. S. Archibald: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2387 (ii).
Petit Rocher Spur Line: in Com. of Sup., 12759 (vii).
Pictou Branch, Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) 12661 (vii).
Pictou to Copper Crown Co., Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10733 (vi).
Pictou Engine House, Contract *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1683 (i).
——— Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5558 (iii), 12230 (vii).
——— Station, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10789 (vi).
Piping: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10195 (v).
Private Car for Mr. Schreiber, Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10186 (v).
Quebec Central Ry. Connections: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 189 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 10179 (v).
Quilty, H. A., Examination *re* Train Despatcher: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13225 (vii).
Rails, &c., Number of Tons of: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6240 (iv).
Rails purchased from Algoma Steel Co., Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 9269 (v).
Railway Surveys, Colchester County, Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2980 (ii).
——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 5046 (iii).
Rates, Increase in Winter to P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5995 (iii).
Receipts and Expenditures: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 10514 (vi).
Revenue from Terminals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5471 (iii).
Ricard, Mr., Emplymt.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
Riviere du Loup Station, Improvement *re* Platforms: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 5468 (iii).
——— Station Master, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 7445 (iv).
Rolling Stock: in Com. of Sup., 5549 (iii), 12257 (vii).
——— Purchase, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6240 (iv).
——— Statement *re* Rolling Stock: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Graham) 5697 (iii).
Running of Official Cars on Limited Trains, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 5474 (iii).
St. Cyrille Ry. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12756 (vii).
St. John Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12257 (vii).
Ste. Monique Gates, Number to be made: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi)

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Ste. Rosalie Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5558 (iii), 12259 (vii).
Sackville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12235 (vii).
Springhill, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12233 (vii).
Station, Asphalt Platforms, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 5466 (iii).
Stationery Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 10181 (v).
Stellarton Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12230 (vii).
Stellarton to Pictou, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10734 (vi).
Stewart, Mr. James A., Emplymt. of: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9712 (v).
—— Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 10151 (v).
Sunday Cars, Instructions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 10734 (vi).
Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 10188 (v).
Sydney, Increased Accommodation: in Com., of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Sydney to Sydney Mines Branch Ry., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7201 (iv).
Sydney Mines Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12759 (vii).
—— Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Talbot, Mr. Evariste, Emplymt. of: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6400 (iv).
Tatamagouche, Delay of Trains, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1292 (i).
Ties delivered, Changes *re* Inspection: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 12052 (vii).
Trains breaking down, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6240 (iv).
—— Explanations *re* Delays, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6242 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10159 (v).
Transportation Question, Statement, on M. for Sup., 4420 (iii).
Trois Pistoles Station, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 12652 (vii).
Truro, Buildings, Name of Tenderers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 6233 (iv).
—— Engine House, Contract to Rhodes & Co.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1936 (i).
—— Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12231 (vii).
—— Sewerage Frontage: M. for Cor.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5800 (iii).
—— Station, Unsanitary Condition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7211 (iv).
William, Thos., Emplymt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2388 (iii).

INTERIOR:
Clearwater Lake, Squatters' Rights to Lands: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9995 (v).
Cypress Hill Homestead Lands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Interior, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 7 (i).
—— Deptl, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 616 (i), 9693 (v).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Applications for Homesteads: Letter from Mr. Seaman read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 9992 (v).
Roberts, Mr. J. M., Promotion *re* Interior Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9693 (v).
Rocky Mountain Park: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Seed Grain purchased, Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 8185 (iv).
Squatters' Claims in Alberta: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).
Swamp Lands in Man.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 10105 (v).
See 'Immigration,' 'Indians,' &c.
Internal Economy Board of H. of C., Minutes: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2795 (ii).
—— Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7 (i).
International Boundary Line: Representations *re* Buildings on: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 356 (i).
—— Correction of Answer (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 519 (i).
International Commission, Red River of the North: in Com. of Sup., 11118 (vi).
International Ry., N.B., Directors, Amount of Stocks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4246 (iii).
International Tunnel, Windsor, Customs Duty *re* Construction Material: Ques. (Mr. McLaren) 3840 (ii).
See 'Detroit.'
Interprovincial Bridge Co., N.B., Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).
Interprovl. Ry. Bridge Co. of N.B.: *See* 'B. No. 76.'
Inverness County, Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. McLennan) 12233 (vii).
Inverness Harbour, Purchase of McIsaac's Pond: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5792 (iii).
Inverness Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7172 (iv).
—— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5997. (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Amounts paid from 1903 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 4244 (iii).

Irrigation Act: *See* 'B. No. 10, 99.'
Irrigation in West, Investigation *re* Measurements: Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) in Com. of Sup., 9989 (v).
Jamestown Exhibition, Canadian Exhibits, Permission *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5079 (iii).
Japanese Colony in the West, Application from C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 7196 (iv).
Japanese entering B.C., Passports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 4243 (iii).
Japanese Immigration Act, Disallowance of *re* B.C.: Ques. Mr. R. Smith) 6642 (iv).
Japanese Immigration, Announcement of Mr. Lemieux's Mission: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1208 (i).
Japanese Immigration and Natal Act, Cor. with Lt.-Gov. of B.C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. Smith) 2170 (ii).
See 'Dunsmuir.'
Japanese Immigration, Cor. *re* Limitations, &c.: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 94 (i).
—— Debate in Japanese Diet, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4737 (iii).
—— from U.S., Deportations, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3900 (ii).
—— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 947 (i).
Japanese and Oriental Immigrants in B.C., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 692 (i).
—— O.Cs., Cor., Papers, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 854 (i).
—— Restriction of: Prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 699; (Mr. Macpherson) 719; (Mr. Sloan) 726; (Mr. D. Ross) 732; (Mr. Kennedy) 748 (i).
—— M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies of O.Cs., &c., 854 (i).
—— Parliamentary Control of (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2025; Amt. to Com. of Sup., 2043; Neg. (Y. 45: N. 100) 2158 (ii).
Japanese in B.C., Ques. of Priv. and Political Pamphlets: (Mr. Lemieux) 12659 (vii).
Japanese Immigration, Recent Eentries into B.C.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3751 (ii).
—— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 32; (Mr. Foster) 77; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 58 (i).
—— Rep. of Mr. King laid on Table (Mr. Lemieux) 1550 (i).
—— Restriction, B.C. Legislation: on M. for Sup. (Mr. D. Ross) 1744 (i).
—— Result of Mission: Statement (Mr. Lemieux) 1585 (i).
—— Riots, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5783 (iii).
—— Statement of Postmaster General: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1208, 1424 (i).
—— Syndicate *re* Purchasing of Land in Alberta, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2162 (ii).
Japanese Trade with Canada, Total Amount for 1905-6-7: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 897 (i).
Japanese Treaty, Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1928 (i).
See 'Anglo-Japanese,'
Jesus River Dredging, Payments to Mr. Morgan: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 6980 (iv).
Johnston, Mr. W. J., Extra Remuneration, Leave of Absence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5201 (iii).
Joliette Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Joly, Sir Henry, Lt.-Gov. of B.C., Cor., &c., sent to by Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 554 (i).
Judges' Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 206.'
Judges in Quebec Prov., Insufficient Number, Pets. from Bar, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 842 (i).
Judges' Salaries, Application *re* Payments: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11018 (vi).
Judges of Supreme Court, Quebec, Apptmt. on Commissions: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 357 (i).
Juniper Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
JUSTICE:
Accountants, Payments to by Dept. of Justice: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3233 (ii).
Ancoin vs. The King, Cor. *re* Suit in Supreme Court, N.S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McLennan) 558 (i).
Appeal Court, B.C., Salaries, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Aylesworth) 8185 (iv).
Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, Cor. *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Ward) 3466 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ward) 5211 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vii).
Chinese and Japanese Riots, B.C., Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13155 (vii).
Cimon, Hon. Mr. Justice, Apptmt. to Quebec District: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
—— Residence in District: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2218 (ii).
—— Jurisdiction of Justice Dept. *re* Residence: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2545 (ii).
Convict Labour, Control of, Sale of Articles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 238 (i).
Drysdale, Hon. Justice, Date of Acceptance of Office: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4768 (iii).
—— Date of Communication *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5084 (iii).
—— O.Cs., &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Taylor) 5086 (iii).
Essex County Junior Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1939 (i).
Exchequer Court, Printing Reports, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5508 (iii).

JUSTICE—*Con.*
Exchequer Court, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
Forbes, Mr. Justice, Professional Status, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2390, 3840 (ii).
——— Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Taylor) for Copies*, 899 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 1860
Fraser, Mr. A. W., Emplymt. as Counsel *re* Sussex St. Property Purchase: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3478 (ii).
——— Payments to for Legal Services: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2979 (ii).
Gillis, Release from Penitentiary: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 510 (i).
Hogg, Mr. W. D., Payments to since 1896, &c.: Ques. (Mr. P. D. McLean) 2981 (ii).
Judges in Quebec Prov., Insufficient Number, Pets. from Bar, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 842 (i).
Judges of Supreme Court, Quebec, Apptmt. on Commissions: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 357 (i).
See 'Quebec.'
Judges Salaries, Applications *re* Payments: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11018 (vi).
Justice, Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vii).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Bureau) 185 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii), 10396 (vi).
Legal Agents in Mar. Provs., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4768 (iii).
——— P.E.I., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4764 (iii).
MacIlreith, Mr. R. T., Payments to for Legal Services, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 695 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 11220 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Magee, Hon. Mr. Justice, Delay in delivering Judgments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2594 (ii).
Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Retirement of, O.C. *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Lanctot) 557 (i).
Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, Releases since 1896, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2822 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 9579 (v).
——— Explanation (Mr. Aylesworth) 13081 (vii).
Penitentiaries: in Com. of Sup., 12265 (vii).
——— B.C., Land Purchases: in Com. of Sup., 12918 (vii).
——— Generally, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii).
JUSTICE—*Con.*
Quebec Judges, Apptmt. to Superior Court: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 11825 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) on M. for Sup., 12190 (vii).
——— Apptmt. of Additional Judge: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).
St. Louis, Mr. H., Emplymt. by Justice Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1347 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 12918 (vii).
——— Holidays for Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 2791 (ii).
——— Meat Contracts: Remarks (Mr. Léonard) in Com. of Sup., 5519 (iii).
——— Officers and Municipal Elections: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 2791 (ii).
——— Warden Beauchamp, Interference in Elections, Charges *re* (Mr. Léonard) in Com. of Sup., 5538 (iii).
Sudbury County Court Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 12413 (vii).
Supreme Court Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vii).
Juvenile Delinquents: *See* B. No. 190.'
Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 39.'
Kananaski Falls Water Power, Granting of Rights: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3036 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3850 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5491 (iii), 6464 (iv).
Keewatin, Synod of the Diocese of: *See* 'B. No. 179.'
Keewatin Timber and Pulp Lands, Disposal of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13587 (vii).
Kentville Rifle Range, Ref. to in debate on Budget (Sir Frederick Borden) 5290 (iii).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).
Kincardine Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7698 (iv).
'King Edward' Dredge, Emplymt. in Lunenburg Harbour: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 13063 (vii).
Kingston, Artillery Park: in Com. of Sup., 7701 (iv).
Kingston, Gun Shed: in Com. of Sup., 7700 (iv).
Kingston, Military Buildings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
——— Military Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv).
——— withdrawal of vote: in Com. of Sup., 7814 (iv).
——— Military Magazine: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Knowlton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7290 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Koenig, Capt., Duties, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 11699 (vi).

Kun, Agnes Ballum, Exercise of Clemency by Justice Dept.: Res. of Town Council Sydney: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9334 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9580, 9710 (v).
Labour, Deptl. Rep: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 841 (i).
——— (Japanese Investigation) Rep.: Presented (Mr. Lemieux) 1583 (i).
———Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 12159 (vii).
Labour Disputes Bill, Applications, &c., *re* Settlement: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. Smith) 605 (i).
'Labour Gazette,' Cost of Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6407 (iv).
'Labour Gazette': in Com. of Sup., 12261 (vii).
Labour, Hours on Public Works: *See* 'B. No. 97.'
Labour Organization *re* Ry. Employees, Par. in Halifax 'Herald': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 8289 (v).
Labour, Unemployed, Protection to: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 10735 (vi).
Lacas, Mr., Payments to, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 640 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 979 (i).
——— Statement (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup., 1035 (i).
Lachine Canal, Basin Walls: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
——— Compensation to Richards *re* Horse: in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).
——— Lock Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 5672 (iii).
——— Slope Walls, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5663 (iii).
——— Staff: in Com. of Sup., 5696 (iii).
Lachine Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 12097 (vii).
Lachute, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7293 (iv), 13329 (vii).
La Compagnie de Publication du Canada, Amount paid by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5082 (iii).
Lacoste, Sir Alexandre, Amount of Pension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 1934 (i).
Lac Saumon Station, I.C.R., Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12652 (vii).
'Lady Evelyn,' Date and Place of Wintering, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7936 (iv).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
'Lady of the Lake,' Str., Purchase by Govt., Staff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3434 (ii).
——— Crew during Winter: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6403 (iv).
Ladysmith Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Ladysmith Wharf, B.C., Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8176 (iv).
Lafferty, Thos., Payment *re* Removal of Snag in St. John River: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8379 (v).
'La Gazette d'Arthabaska,' Postal Privilege *re*: Ques. (Mr. L. Lavergne) 6058 (iii).
Lake Ainslie Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
Lake Aylmer Wharf at Garthby: in Com. of Sup., 12032 (vi).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal: *See* 'B. No. 185.'
Lake Dauphin, Lowering Lake: in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).
Lakefield Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Lake François Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
Lake Megantic Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12032 (vi).
Lake Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7294 (iv).
Lake Megantic Public Works, Total Cost to Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 11299 (vi).
Lake St. Francis Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. John Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. Peter, Piers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4752 (iii).
Lakeville Harbour Opening: Conc., 13568 (vii).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* at R.M.C., on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1019 (i).
Lands applied for by Mr. Aylwin, under Irrigation Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 7209 (iv).
Lands, Dom.: *See* 'B. No. 181.'
Land Entries of T. J. Oliver and Fred. Hintz, Cancellation of, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 3235 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and N.W. Ters., Areas reserved on July 1st, 1896: Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 13512 (vii).
——— Selection and Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4766 (iii).
Lands in Sections 2, 10, 14, 22 and 24, Disposal of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5083 (iii).
Lands leased by Govt. in Section 11, Twp. 8, Original Grantees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3234 (ii).
Land Patents, Entry of Dates, Applications, Inspections, &c., of Quarter Section 16, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3432 (ii).
Land Patent for E. ½ S. E. ¼ Section 2, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 2169 (ii).
——— S. E. ¼ Sec. 2, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 2171 (ii).
Land Patents, Section 8, Twp. 53, &c., Occupation of Present Owner, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3430 (ii).
——— Sections 10 and 17, Applicants *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 9475 (v).
——— Sections 36, &c., Issue of: Ques (Mr. Lake) 3481 (ii).

Land Sales in N.W. Indian Reserves, Applications, Advertisements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2170 (ii)
Land Sales in N.W., Purchasers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3835 (ii)
Lands set Apart for Settlement since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule), 2796 (ii).
Land Subsidies to Rys., Areas granted from 1892-6: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8613 (v).
See 'Railways,' &c.
Lands, Surveys of: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Land Titles Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 113 and 168.'
Lands withdrawn for Settlement or Colonization Purposes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2393 (ii).
Langevin Block Basement, Number of Employees, &c: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3483 (ii).
See 'Public Works, Ottawa.'
La Societe Canadienne d'Immigration, &c., Montreal, Pet *re* Assistance: Ques. (Mr. Monk), 4244 (iii).
——— Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 4773 (iii).
Lavaltrie, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lead Bounties: *See* 'B. No. 191.'
Lead Production by Lead Producers, Stmnt. *re* Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11407, 11705 (vi).
Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7705, 7815 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Leech, Mr. R. A. E.. Apptmt. of: Notice of Motion (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3477 (ii).
Lee-Enfield Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Range: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes), 10014 (v).
——— Number purchased, Dates, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6644 (iv).
Legal Agents in Mar. Provinces, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sandfield) 4768 (iii).
——— P.E.I., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4764 (iii).
Legislation, House of Commons, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10507 (vi).
Lennox Island Wharf, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8444 (v).
Leonardsville Wharf, Contract *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
——— Report *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Les Eboulements Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
'Le Soleil,' Par. *re* Voting of French Members: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bergeron) 7992 (iv).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7993 (iv).
Lesser Slave Lake Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5719 (iii).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Lethbridge Armoury: in Com. of Sup, 13336 (vii).
Letter Carriers, Boots, Uniforms, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8872 (v).
——— Hours of Service, Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7728 (iv).
Level Ry. Crossings: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Levis Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Levis Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7294 (iv).
Lewis, N.W.M. Policeman, Murder of, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Herron) 8867 (v).
Liability of Ry. Employees: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
Libel Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 161.'
Library of Parlt., Joint Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 6 (i).
——— Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 312 (i).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
Life-Boats in B. C., Purchase of from U. S.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Life-Saving Stations and Awards: in Com. of Sup., 2972 (ii).
Life-Saving Stations, Establishment of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 3186 (ii).
Lighthouses, Agencies, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Lighting Buoys on Rideau Canal, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 9476 (v).
See 'Canals—Rideau.'
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 4755, 5039, 5773 (iii), 12262, 13323 (vii).
Lighthouse-Keepers on Pacific Coast, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Lighthouses in Nicolet River, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3837 (ii).
Lighthouses in Quebec, Classifications, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 172 (i).
——— Rep. of Inspectors, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Gauvreau) 697 (i).
Lighthouse Service on St. Lawrence, Steamers chartered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11299 (vi).
Light-Keepers Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4755, 5039 (iii), 13323 (vii).
Lightship Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Lime Kiln Crossing, Charter of Capt. Hackett's Tug, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7729 (iv).
Lime Kiln Crossing Lightship: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vii).
Lindsay Armoury: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10888 (vi).
See 'Militia.'
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 34.'
Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).

Literature, &c., distributed through Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 9095 (v).
Literary Aid Fund, Establishment of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1286 (i).
Lithographing and Printing, Expenditure by Govt. outside of Canada: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1506 (i).
Little Current Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Little Sands Wharf, Repairs, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin), 2397 (ii).
Live Stock Industry: in Com. of Sup., 12894 (vii).
Live Stock, N.B., Figures *re* Census, Methods of Obtaining, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot), 1506 (i)
Livingstone, Wm. G., Sale of Sections 22, 28 and 32, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 9475 (v).
Loan og 1874, Commission for Renewal: Ques. (Mr. Foster), 11501 (vi).
Loan of Aug., 1907, Names of Banks where Discounted: Ques. .Mr. Foster) 564 (i).
Loans to Govt. Outstanding, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 235 (i).
Loans negotiated in London, Conditions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts, &c.: Personal Explanation (Mr. Foster), 13582 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafs: *See* 'Dom. Loans,' 'Finance.'
Loans, Temporary or Advances, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12654 (vii).
Loans, Temporary, by Govt., Names of Lenders, Rates of Interest, &c.: M. for Ret.* Mr. Monk) 554 (i).
—— Total Amount, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 314 (i).
—— since Oct., 1906, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 314 (i).
Lobster Fish Factory, License to E. H. McLennan, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2983 (ii).
Lobster Fishing Fines, Names and Amounts: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey), 10256 (v).
Lobster Fishing Licenses, Refusals in Northumberland Co.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9472 (v).
—— Licenses in Savage Harbour, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin), 4404 (iii).
Lobster Fishing in Lunenburg &c., Complaints *re* Undersized, &c.: (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2792 (ii).
—— Overseers, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2793 (ii).
Lobster Fishing and Packing Licenses, Granting in P.E.I.: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. Martin) 5475 (iii).
Lobster Fisheries, Pet. from Fishermen's Union of N.S. *re* Regulations: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean), 6644 (iv).
Lobster Fishing at Pictou: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12772 (vii).
Lobster Fisheries, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Issue of Licenses: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2388 (ii)
Lobster Fishing in St. John, N.B., Legal Size, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 10257 (v).
Lockerby & McCombe, Amounts *re* Extra Harbour Dues: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 11935 (vi).
Locomotive and Car Shops, Moncton: in Com. fo Com of Sup., 12257 (vii).
Loggieville, Dredging, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9472 (v).
London and Lancashire Guarantee and Accident Co.: *See* 'B. No. 129.'
London Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 10094 (vi).
—— Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv).
See 'Militia.'
Londonderry and Bass River Mail Service, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2980 (ii).
Longueuil Public Building: in Com of Sup., 7304 (iv).
Lord's Day Act, Violations at Ottawa *re* Horse Racing: Remarks (Mr. Elson) 3753 (ii).
'Lord Kitchener,' Tug Boat, Payments *re* Services: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7198 (iv).
Lorneville Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Lotbinière Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Louisburg Bait Freezer, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4406 (iii).
Louisburg Harbour, N.S., Amount of Harbour Dues, 1906: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7503 (iv).
—— Harbour Master, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3428 (ii).
Louisburg Marine Hospital, Condition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4401 (iii).
Lovell, Mr. H., Decease of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 230 (i).
Lower Newcastle Wharf on Miramichi River: in Com. of Sup., 11095 (vi).
Lumber Combine Investigation, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2977 (ii).
Lumber Duties from U. S., on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9504 (v).
—— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 10259 (v).
See 'Pulp.'
Lumber manufactured in N. W. Provs., Royalty Payable, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3835 (ii).
Lunenburg Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vii).
Lyall, Mr. Peter, Contractor for G. T. P. Terminals at Winnipeg: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 7991 (iv).
—— Storage of Refuse of Montreal Harbour Property: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 11936 (vi).

MacIlraith, Mr., Legal Agent for Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 12220 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 695 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Mackenzie, Mr. Jas. H., Emplymt. in Toronto Inland Revenue Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5797 (iii).
Mackenzie, Mr. Wm., Par. in 'Globe' *re* Apptmt.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6985 (iv).
Mackinnon Post Office, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 10516 (vi).
Macleod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 22.'
Macleod Post Office, Report *re* Accommodation: Remarks (Mr Herron) in Com of Sup, 9110 (v)
McDonald, Albert G., Commission paid *re* Immigrants: Ques. (Mr. Alcorn) 8617 (v).
McDonald, Archibald, Dismissal from Whim Road, P. O.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Martin) 5087 (iii).
McDougall, Rev. John, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 688 (i).
McGee, Hon. T. D'Arcy, Monument *re*: Remarks (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6288 (iv).
McGregor's Creek, Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
McGuire, Hon. Thos., Superannuation of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 10514 (vi).
McInnes, Hon. W. B., Emplymt. in the Yukon, Total Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5794 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. White) 6061 (iii).
McKenzie, Mr. K. W., Apptmt. as Dom. Lands' Agent at Edmonton: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6981 (iv).
McLeod, Alex., Dismissal from Valleyfield, P.E.I., Post Office: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5087 (iii)
McLeod, Roderick, Date of Homestead Entry: Ques (Mr. Lake) 6401 (iv).
McPherson's Cove, Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11229, 11292 (vi).
Madawaska River Extension Dyke: in Com. of Sup., 11696 (vi), 13344 (vii).
Magdalen Islands Breakwater and Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Magee, Hon. Justice, Delay in delivering Judgments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2594 (ii).
Magnetawan River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Magog Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Mails from Canada to Europe, Quantity arrived: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 12653 (vii).
Mail Matter delayed in Transmission by C. P. R. Accident: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 9724 (v).
Mail Matter, Fraudulent Weighing, Inspection *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4827 (iii).
——— lost in C. P. R. Accident at Kenora, Rep. *re*: (Mr. Lake) 9281 (v).
——— Mutilated in Transmission, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2214 (ii).
Mail Service to Atlantic Steamers, Cost per Annum: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5656 (iii).
Mail Service in B. C., Improvements *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3754 (ii).
Mail Service beteen Darnley and Kensington, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4828 (iii).
Mail Service, Irregularity of in Argenteuil County: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 9119 (v).
Mail Service in N. B. and N. S., Number of Post Offices, Postal Revenue, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 852 (i).
Mail Service, Soulanges County, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).
Mail Service by Steamers via Coteau Landing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).
Mail Steamer, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4827 (iii).
Mail Subsidy to France: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Mail Subsidies to Steamships, Total Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
Mail Tenders at Rimouski, Complaints *re* 'Rhoda': Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5799 (iii).
Major's Hill Park and G. T. R. Hotel Site: *See* 'B. No. 89.'
Major's Hill Park and G. T. R. Hotel: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1425 (i).
Major's Hill Park: in Com. of Sup., 11015 (vi).
Malbay (Gaspé) Boat Shelter: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Manchester, Dr., Misappropriation of Moneys belonging to Mr. Walter Dick: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
Man., Additional Judges: *See* 'B. No. 206.'
Man. Boundaries, Bill *re* Extension: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1741 (i).
——— Consent of Legislature, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 936 (i)
——— Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2882 (ii), 11706 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 6222, 7506 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Papers, Memorials, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Schaffner) 852 (i).
——— Prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12776 (vii).
Manitoba Election Frauds, Investigation Com., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. W. J. Roche), 495 (i).
Man. Grain Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Man. Lands owned by Govt., Number of Acres, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1288 (i).

Man. Lands, Section 32, Town Site, Applications *re* Public Buildings: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1348 (i).
Man. and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 26.'
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Affidavits *re* Frauds: Read (Mr. Bole) 7942 (iv).
——— Polling Divisions by Judges: Remarks (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 13139 (vii).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 10793 (vi).
Manitoba Voters' Lists: *See* 'Dom. Elections Act.'
Manitoba and North Shore Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 137.'
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13289 (vii).
——— Reps. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 893 (i).
Manning & Macdonald's Claims *re* Soulanges Canals: in Com. of Sup., 5668 (iii).
Maple Creek Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 8600 (v), 13337 (vii).
Maple Syrup and Sugar Adulteration, Penalties *re* Violations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 6639 (iv).
Maps, Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12260 (vii).
Marconi Co. and Commercial Press Business, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 512 (i).
Marconi Station, Glace Bay, Interruptions *re* Service: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2161 (ii).
Marconi System: in Com. of Sup., 12143 (vii).
——— Regulation of Rates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 174 (i).
See 'Wireless.'
Marcoun, Mr., Commission *re* Settlement of Claims: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1122 (i).
Marier, Mr. J. E., Emplymt. on G.T.P. Commission: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2162 (ii).
Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).
Margaree Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 11229 (vi).
MARINE :
Aids to Navigation, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5040 (iii).
——— Construction of Lighthouses: in Com. of Sup., 5773 (iii).
'Arctic' Str., Amounts expended for Repairs, Supplies, &c., from June, 1904 to June, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 184 (i).
——— History of Cruise in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (ii).
Bellechasse Islet Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4830 (iii).
Brier Island Fog Alarm, Installation of, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9473 (v). *See* 'Marine Signals.'
Burlington Channel Lighthouse, Damages to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 5467 (iii).
MARINE—*Con.*
Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6059 (iii).
——— Statement *re* Conditions of Investigation of Marine Dept.: Remarks on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse., 6143 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* Marine Dept.: Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6464 (iv).
——— Absence of Mr. Watson: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 10918 (vi).
——— Apptmnt. of Ass't Judge in Exchequer Court: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11311 (vi).
——— Apptmt. of Counsel: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6845 (iv).
——— Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission : on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7322 (iv).
——— Apptmt. of Mr. Perron as Counsel: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 6926 (iv).
——— Counsel Fees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8837 (v).
——— Delay in Investigation, &c., C. S. Report, &c.: M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8445 (v).
——— Delay *re*, on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9725 (v).
——— Distribution of Evidence : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10789 (vi).
——— Evidence *re*:Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 11203 (vi).
——— remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8516 (v).
——— Evidence presented day by day to House: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8203 (v).
——— Evidence, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11301 (vi).
——— Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13169 (vii).
——— Letter of Instructions to Mr. Watson laid on the Table (Mr. Aylesworth) 7621 (iv).
——— Method of Procedure: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10741 (vi).
——— Officers under Suspension: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6846 (iv).
——— Mr. Perron's Duties: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 10743 (vi).
——— Postponment of by Judge Cassels : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8385 (v).
——— Proceedings in Public, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7321 (iv).
——— Rep. of Judge Cassels: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10915 (vi).
See 'Mar. and Fish.,' &c.
'Champlain,' Str., Use in Quebec for Political Purposes: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9126, 9280, 9342, 9460 (v).

MARINE—*Con.*
Fish Island Lighthouse, Name of Present Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 6058 (iii).
Gananoque and Burnt Island Lights, Buoys, &c., Apptmt. of Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8383 (v).
Govt. Steamers, Amounts paid for Provisions, &c., for Three Years: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1512 (i).
——— Captains' Residences, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 3241 (ii).
——— and Ice-breakers, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5763 (iii).
——— Maintenance and Supplies (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i).
——— Number of purchased, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10731 (vi).
——— Pay of Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10736 (vi).
——— Trips of Mr. Cowie, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5467 (iii).
Gratuities *re* Accidents to Seamen: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vii).
Heath Point Lighthouse, Contract *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7210 (iv).
Ingonish Light-keeper, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8618 (v).
Life-boats in B.C., Purchase of from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Lighthouse Agencies, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Lighthouses, Classification, &c., Rep. of Inspectors, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Gauvreau) 697 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 12262, 13323 (vii).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4755 (iii).
Lighthouse-keepers on Pacific Coast, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Light-keepers Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4755, 5039 (iii), 13323 (vii).
Lighthouses, Maintenance and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Lighthouses in Nicolet River, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3837 (ii).
Lighthouses in Quebec, Classifications, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 172 (i).
Lightship Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Louisburg Harbour, N. S., Amount of Harbour Dues, 1906: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7503 (iv).
Louisburg Marine Hospital, Condition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4401 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, Reorganization: in Com. of Sup., 3988 (ii).
——— O.Cs., Cor. *re* Change of System: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 852 (i).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 510 (i).
MARINE—*Con.*
Marine and Fisheries, Book-keeping, Papers laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 4223 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 4747 (iii).
——— Acting Deputy Minister: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11939 (vi).
——— Defalcations of Mr. Roy: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 10741 (vi).
——— Dep. Min., Ass't.: in Com. of Sup., 12915 (vii).
——— Dep. Minister, Resignation of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7938, 7995, 8088: Letter of Dep. Min. Read (Mr. Brodeur) 8088 (iv).
——— Deptl. Investigation by Minister: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6526 (iv).
——— remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6636 (iv).
——— Deptl., Misconduct of Official: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) 6633 (iv).
——— Deptl. Officers under Suspension, Dates of Aptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6982 (iv).
——— Deptl. Officials, Suspension of: Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6003 (iii).
——— Minister's Travelling Expenses, Refunds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8889 (v).
——— Purchase of Supplies for 1892-1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Johnston) 6241 (iv).
——— Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2883 (ii).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).
——— contingencies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 976 (i).
——— Steamers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Warehouse, Sussex St.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13062 (vii).
Marine Signalling at Briar Island, Change of System: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 9266 (v).
See 'Briar.'
Masters' and Mates' Examination: in Com. of Sup., 2969 (ii).
Merwin, Geo. T., Payments to by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 11701 (vi).
'Montcalm,' Str., Amount expended *re* Supplies, &c.: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Foster) 1886 (i).
——— Collission with C.P.R. Str., Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8086 (iv).
——— Investigation re: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8171, 9715 (iv), 10121 (v).
——— Purchase Price, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8441 (v).
——— Services as Ice-breaker: Remarks (Mr. Paquet) in Com. of Sup., 2941 (ii).
Negro Point Submarine Signal, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5202 (iii).

MARINE—*Con.*
Prescott Light Station, Presentation to Dr. W. C. Brown: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 983 (i).
Red Ensign Flying from Merchant Vessels, Authority for: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 12775 (vii).
St. Louis, Mr. H., Payments to by Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
Shipping Statistics *re* Tons Registered: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2790 (ii).
Sorel Property for Marine Dept., Purchase, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4751 (iii).
Toronto Harbour Life-Saving Station, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4586 (iii).
'Viligant,' Cruiser, Investigation *re* Collision: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 682 (i).
Westport, N.S., Installation of Marine Alarms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9274 (v).
Mar. Provs., Harbours and Rivers, Creosoted Timber: in Com. of Sup., 12028 (vi).
Markey Fishing Leases, Copy of Ret. laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 11404 (vi).
Markham Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7709 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Maskinonge River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Massey-Harris Co., Rebate of Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8441 (v).
Masters and Mates Examination: in Com. of Sup., 2969 (ii).
Masters' and Mates' Act Amt. B. No. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on order for 2°: Remarks 583 (i). *See* 'B. No. 2.'
Matane Breakwater and Landing Pier: in Com of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Matane River Fishing, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 5775 (iii).
Matchedash Bay, Dredging at Fesserton, Amt. expended: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 566 (i).
Mattawa Postmaster, Place of Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. White) 7179 (iv).
Meaford Harbour: *See* 'B. No. 158.'
Meaford Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act: *See* 'B. No. 149.'
Meat and Canned Foods Act Enforcement: in Com. of Sup., 12893 (vii).
—— Inspectors, Number of Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 352 (i).
—— Inspectors, Number, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 172 (i).
Meat and Food Inspection Act, Names and Number of Establishments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 1505 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 1690 (i).
Meat Inspection Act and Packing Houses, Cor., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 4589 (iii).
Meat Inspection Regulations, Speech of Mr. Fisher at Chatham: ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Clements) 196 (i).
Meat Inspection Act, Violations: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Clements) 3042 (ii).
Medicine Hat Buildings, Contract *re* Heating System: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 10791 (vi).
Medicine Hat Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8601 (v).
Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Members appointed to Offices, &c., ref. to in debate on Address (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 46 (i).
Members introduced 3, 680 (i), 2542 (ii).
Members and Senators appointed to Offices of Emoulment, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 555 (i).
Menzies, Mr. James, Emplymt. in Geodetic Survey, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1349 (i).
Merwin, Geo. T., Payments to by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 11701 (vi).
Mess. from His Ex., Franco-Canadian Treaty: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6 (i).
—— (Suppl. Estimates, 1908): Read (Mr. Speaker) 12503 (vii).
See 'Estimates,' &c.
Mess Pork, Quantity imported from U. S.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5650 (iii).
Metal Shingle and Siding Co., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 207.'
Methyated Spirits, Supplies to Manufacturers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 820 (i).
Metlakatla and Songhees Indian Reserves, Legal Opinions of Justice Dept.: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2381 (ii).
Michipicoten Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Middle River, Shear Dam Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11229 (vi).
Midland Dredging Co., Statement *re* Mr. McMullen: (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5714 (iii).
Midland Harbour Dredging, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3239 (ii), 8893 (v).
Midland and Tiffin, Dredging, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3428 (ii).
—— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
Midland, Tiffin and Victoria Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8181 (iv).
'Midland Times,' Truro, Amounts paid for Advertisements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3235 (ii).

Midland Towing and Wrecking Co., Contract *re*, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 3241 (ii).

Milford, Haven, N.S. Wharf, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 13060 (vii).

MILITIA :

Allowances, Arrears of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).

Annual Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5662, 5732 (iii); 10286 (v).

Antigonish Armoury, Leasing, &c., Letters, Tel., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. Chisholm) 1131 (i).

Armouries, Construction of: in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).

Arsenal, Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 7434 (iv); 12154 (vii).

Belleville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).

——— Negotiations for Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1509 (i).

——— Payments to Mr. J. Hurley, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1737 (i).

Blankets purchased by Militia and Indian Depts., Amount, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4584 (iii).

——— Return *re*: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 5914 (iii), 6465 (iv).

Boot Contract, Attack *re*: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Frederick Borden) 10739 (vi).

Brampton Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 10888 (vi).

Brandon Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 8517 (v), 10953, 10974 (vi).

——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10891 (vi).

British Pensioners, Notice from Imp. Govt. of Deductions: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7501 (iv).

Camp in Eastern Townships, proposed Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3842 (ii).

Camps, Holding of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9779, 9835 (v).

Cavalry Brigade, Eastern Townships, Camp at Quebec, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).

Customs Dues: in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iii), 12155 (vii).

Drill Halls, Number constructed since 1896, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 177 (i)

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 556 (i).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Worthington) 4834 (iii), 6222 (iv).

Eastman Rifle Match, Accident, &c., Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1125 (i).

Esquimalt Naval Station, Maintenance of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1117 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*

Esquimalt Naval Station, Cor., &c. *re* Maintenance: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1128 (i).

——— Transfer to Canada: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1293 (i).

Esquimalt and Halifax Garrisons, Equipment, of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1293 *See* 'Naval.'

Fortifications, Construction of, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6646 (iv).

Fredericton Military Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).

Gananoque Drill Shed: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).

Garrison Artillery, B.C., 5th Regiment, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5792 (iii).

Garrison Commons, Toronto, Date of Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 353 (i).

Generals, Apptmts. of Names and Qualifications: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5086 (iii).

Goderich Military Camp, Target Practices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 9712 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. MacLaren) 9779 (v).

Gratuities: in Com. of Sup., 13177 (vii).

Guelph Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7678 (iv), 13331 (vii).

Halifax Garrison, Coal Supply, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 10015 (v).

——— Disbandment of, &c: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1208 (i).

——— Discontent *re* Delay of Pay: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5659 (iii).

——— Occupation by Imp. Troops: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).

——— Retraction of Remarks of Min. of Fin.: Remarks (Mr .Taylor) 5784 (iii).

Halifax, Military Buildings (Wellington Barracks): in Com. of Sup., 7143 (iv).

Halifax Militia Supplies, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6405 (iv).

Hamilton Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7692 (iv).

Home Guards, N.W.T., Issue of Scrip for Services: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 2161 (ii).

Joliette Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).

Kentville Rifle Range, Ref. to in debate on Budget (Sir Frederick Borden) 5290 (iii).

Kingston, Artillery Park: in Com. of Sup., 7701 (iv).

——— Gun Shed: in Com. of Sup., 7700 (iv).

——— Military Buildings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).

——— Military Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv).

——— Military Magazine: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).

Lee-Enfield Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Ranges: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 10014 (v).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Lee-Enfield Rifles, Number purchased, Dates, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6644 (iv).
Lethbridge Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Lévis Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Lindsay Armoury: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10888 (vi).
——— Date of Construction: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1111 (i).
London, Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
——— Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv).
Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iii).
——— Pay and Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 12147 (vii).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 611 (i), 8871 (v), 12147 (vii).
——— Supplies, Provisions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iii).
Militia, Board of Officers, Rep. *re* Pay and Allowance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2165 (ii).
Militia Dept., and Civil Service Commissioner's Report; Stmnt. (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. of Sup., 12505 (vii).
——— Quebec, Hours for Work of Masons, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 10790 (vi).
——— Report; Presented (Sir Frederick Borden) 4494 (iii).
——— Threats *re* Officials: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13584 (vii).
Militia,—Memorandum of General Lake: M. to lay on Table (Sir Frederick Borden) 12770 (vii).
——— Pay, Arrears, &c., Reasons, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 8442 (v).
Militia Promotions, Names and Records, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 352 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 559 (i).
Militia Schools, Garrisons, &c., Amounts paid for Provisions, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1512 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3042 (ii).
Milltown and St. Stephen's Drill Sheds: Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 10897 (vi).
Minnedosa Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 10889 (vi).
Moir, Private, Shooting at Wolseley Barracks: Remarks (Mr. Beattie) 7322 (iv)
Moncton Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Montreal Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Naval Defences, Contribution by Canada to Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1118 (i).
Naval Instruction, Drilling of Canadian Seamen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1119 (i).
Naval Schools, *re* Cruisers: in Com. of Sup., 3222 (ii).
Naval Stations in Canada, Arrangements with G. B.. *re* Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1117 (i).
——— List of Places: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 3153 (ii).
Niagara Camp., Transportation of Troops, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 2163 (ii).
———Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) 9779 (v).
Niagara Falls, Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Niagara Land Sale, 13540 (vii).
Oakville Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 10887 (vi).
Pembroke Armoury: Remarks (Mr. White) in Com. of Sup., 10901 (vi).
Permanent Corps, Commission *re* Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1292 (i).
Petawawa Camp, Arrangements *re* Training of Troops: Ques. (Mr. White) 5791 (iii).
Peterborough Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Picton Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Plains of Abraham, Number of Acres leased to Ross Rifle Co.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1348 (i).
Port Arthur Armoury: in Com of Sup., 13332 (vii).
——— Properties: in Com. of Sup., 12148 (vii).
——— Provisions and Supplies: in Com. of Sup., 12150 (vii).
Quebec. Citadel Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv).
——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7431 (iv).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Rural Corps: Letter read (Mr. Blain) 8694 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 10292 (v).
——— Attendance of Veterans: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7448, 7998 (iv), 8695 (v).
——— Food Supply: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).
——— Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 8851 (v).
——— Number of Troops to be sent, &c.: Rearks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10259 (v).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Quebec Tercentenary, Protests from Regiments *re* Attendance: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7992 (iv).
——— Rep. of Commission: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7449 (iv).
——— Transportation of Troops: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 8377, 8384; City Corps, &c.: Remarks, 8386 (v).
Rankin, Col., Resignation of: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 11405 (vi).
Rations, Cost per Day, &c.: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
Rifle and Artillery Association Grants: in Com. of Sup., 12152 (vii).
Rifles purchased from other Companies than Ross Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1123 (i).
Rifles purchased by Govt. since 1896, Number, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5654
Rifle Ranges, Charlottetown,, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 6233 (iv).
Ross Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Range, Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 11494 (vi).
——— Advances to Co. *re* Contracts, Cor. with Bank of Montreal: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 4773 (iii).
——— Arsenal. Cor. with Ross Rifle Co. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7991 (iv).
——— Bayonets purchased for, &c., Contracts, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5476 (iii).
——— Bayonets, Adoption of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5786 (iii).
——— Bayonets, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6235, 8176 (iv).
——— Bayonets, Date of Contract, O. C., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paterson) 8442 (v).
——— Bayonets, Provisions *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3483 (ii).
——— Bonus, Loans, Services of the Govt., Employees, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 559 (i).
——— Consignment to N. W. Mounted Police, Manufacture, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5259 (iii).
——— Contract Price, Inspection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 8174 (iv).
——— Contracts *re* Supply of Rifles, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 557 (i).
——— Correction of Mr. S. Hughes' Speech: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bergeron) 9126 (v).
——— Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re* Defects: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5210 (iii).
——— Disposition of Manufactured Rifles, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3237 (ii).
——— Evidence before Pub. Accounts Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Worthington) 5914 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Ross Rifle, &c., Extension of Cove Field Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4401 (iii).
——— Factory, Pet. *re* Establishment on Plains of Abraham: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3903 (ii).
——— Inefficiency and Extravagance of Militia Dept.: Amt. (Mr. Worthington) on M. for Sup., 8902-8953; Neg. (Y. 18; N. 55) 9090
——— Inter-changeable parts with Lee-Enfield Rifles, Cor. with Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3898 (ii).
——— Negotiations with Vickers Maxim Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 178 (i).
——— Number reported unfit for Use: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3841 (ii).
——— Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' *re* Accident at Rockliffe Ranges: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 10515 (vi).
——— Payments to since Jan. 1, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7209 (iv).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* Mr. Bergeron's Denial of Stmnt., 9126, 9330 (v).
——— Rep. of British War Office *re* Cor., Disappearance from Library of H. of C.: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Fred. Borden) 4961 (iii).
——— Rep. of Col. Gaudet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9713 (v).
——— Rep. from Military Associations, &c., *re* Efficiency: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 557 (i).
——— Reports from Public Accounts Com., Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
——— Rifles delivered per Contract, Cost per Rifle: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8180 (iv).
——— Rifles, Number ordered, Payments, Total Number delivered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).
——— Ross Rifle Contract: in Com. of Sup., 13542 (vii).
——— Sealed Pattern, Discovery of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3237 (ii).
——— Services of Govt. Officials, Names, Rank, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 365 (i).
——— Number reported unfit for Use: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3841 (ii).
——— Target Practice, Suspensions by N.W. M. Police: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3847 (ii).
——— Tests in England, Reps., &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Frederick Borden) 8167 (iv).
——— Total Number in Use in Canada by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5786 (iii).
Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. John, Tenders *re* Supplie: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 5788 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Royal Military College: in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv), 10907 (vi), 12152, 13177 (vii).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* at R.M. C.; on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1019 (i).
St. Hyacinthe, Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 10890 (vi).
——— 84th Regiment, Amount of Pay still Due: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 844 (i).
St. John Fusiliers, 62nd Regiment, Payments *re* Annual Drill, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 847 (i).
St. John, Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
——— Military Stables: in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).
Sabourin, Maj., Cor. with Lt. Col. Malette and Dept.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bergeron) 3434 (ii).
Sarnia Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7439 (iv).
Sherbrooke Militia Corps, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
S. A. Veterans, Land Grants, to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 563 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Herron) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).
——— Land Scrip for Volunteers, &c.: Ques. Mr. S. Hughes) 1110 (i).
——— Medals for 3rd Contingent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1110 (i).
Stoney Creek Battlefield Monument: in Com. of Sup., 13177 (vii).
Stores and Arms for Rural Battalions, Care of: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Lalor) 5736 (iii).
Stores, Inspection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8181 (iv)
Strathcona Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Strathroy Armoury: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Sub-Target Company, Number ordered, Dates of Order, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 171 (i).
——— Papers referred to Com. of Last Session: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 945 (i).
——— Ref. to Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 312 (i).
Sussex Military Camp: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 9836 (v).
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Number, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 569 (i).
——— Contracts, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Worthington) 5476 (iii).
——— Contract *re* Additional Number: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5257 (iii).
MILITIA—*Con.*
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5206 (iii).
Thirteenth Hussars, General Service Medal: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13533 (vii).
Toronto Barracks, Approval of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7203 (iv)
Truro Armoury, Estimate for Heating and Electric Wiring: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3429 (ii).
Uniforms and Customs Refunds: Remarks (Mr. Worthington) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).
Valleyfield Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv), 10892 (vi).
Valleyfield Regiment, Organization of, Cor., &c., *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bergeron) 3434 (ii).
Vickers Maxim Co., Purchases from by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 356 (i).
Warlike and other Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 12149 (vii).
Western Rifle Associations, Pet. *re* Govt. Grant: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).
Winnipeg, Military Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
——— Military Building: in Com. of Sup., 10969 (vi).
——— Military Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 10955 (vi).
Woodstock Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Milk Adulteration: *See* 'B. No. 64..
Mill Settlement and Newcastle Creek Post Offices, Establishment of, Pets., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Wilmot) 2982 (ii).
Milltown and St. Stephen's Drill Sheds: Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 10897 (vi).
Mines, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 646 (i).
Mines and Geological Survey: in Com. of Sup., 12260 (vii).
Mining Regulations published in 'Yukon World and Official Gazette': M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 5801 (iii).
Mining Rights in Sections 17, 20, 21, &c., Applications, Leases, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Perley) 3851 (ii).
——— Sections 20, 28 and 32, Original Grantees, Transfers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3238 (ii).
Mining, Surface or Timber Rights, on Section 8, Applications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 3850 (ii).
Ministers' Travelling Expenses from March, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 562 (i).
See 'Travelling,' &c.
Ministers' Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the Presbyterian Church: *See* 'B. No. 23.'

Minnedosa Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 10889 (vi).
Mint Building, Imperfect Ventilation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 3036 (ii).
——— Date of Operation, Values of Coinage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11296 (vi).
——— Issue of Gold Coins: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 2593 (ii).
——— Sums expended, Apptmnts., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 232 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 557 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 938 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table, 941 (i).
Mint: *See* 'Public Buildings, Ottawa.'
Miscou Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Mission Reserve, Conditions of Sale to G.T. P. Ry. Co.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5256 (iii).
Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Moberley, Mr. H. J., Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3848 (ii).
Moir, Private, Shooting at Wolseley Barracks: Remarks (Mr. Beattie) 7322 (iv).
Moncton Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Moncton Car Shops, Lease, &c., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 1690 (i).
Moncton Car and Locomotive Shops: in Com. of Sup., 12250 (vii).
——— Payments to E. A. Wallberg: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 8892 (v).
Moncton-Truro, Additional Line: in Com. of Sup., 12760 (vii).
Moncton Wharf Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 11696 (vi).
Money-Lenders, Operating in Public Buildings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 1738 (i).
'Montague' Dredge, Amounts paid for Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 182 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8172 (iv).
Montague Moore, &c., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
'Montcalm,' Str., Amount expended *re* Supplies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Foster) 1886 (i).
——— Collision with C.P.R. Str., Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8086 (iv).
——— Investigation *re* Accident: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8171 (iv), 9715 (v).
——— Rep. *re* Accident: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10121 (v).
'Montcalm,' Str., Purchase Price, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8441 (v).
——— Services as Ice-breaker: Remarks (Mr. Paquet) in Com. of Sup., 2941 (ii).
Montmagny and Cap St. Ignace Wharfs, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).
Montmagny Electoral District, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 9263 (v).
Montmagny Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Montmorency Falls, Retaining Walls, Length, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12410 (vii).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Montreal Circuit Judges, Increase of Salary: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. on B. 206, 12552 (vii).
Montreal Directory, in Library of House: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 4764 (iii).
Montreal Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 7423 (iv).
——— Valuations, Reps., Cor., Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 698 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 3319 (ii).
Montreal Excise Officers, Increase of Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).
Montreal 'Gazette,' Building, Amount paid for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3900 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Amount of Expenditure *re* Cleaning, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 8888 (v).
——— Cement Contract, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 7199, 7499 (iv).
Montreal Harbour, Expenditure *re* Docks and Elevators: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Schaffner) 2170 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1683 (i).
Montreal Liquor Licenses, Attack of Hon. Mr. Scott: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Gervais) 4064; Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4065; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 4066; Appeal from Dep. Speaker to Speaker, 4071; Ruling, Agreed to (Y. 59; N. 23) 4071 (ii).
Montreal Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 47.'
Montreal Pneumatic Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 5703 (iii).
Montreal Post Office Addition, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6922 (iv).
——— Settlement of Strike: Remarks (Mr. Verville) 8608 (v).
Montreal Post Office, Clerks, Pay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9112 (v).
——— Defalcations, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7197 (iv).
——— Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 7410 (iv).
Montreal Postal Service, Irregularities of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9274 (v).
Montreal Postal Station B: in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
——— Station C: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Montreal and Quebec Ports, Expenditure for the last Fifty Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 3482 (ii).
Montreal 'Star,' Advertisements in, &c.: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7479 (iv).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3436; Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3442; Agreed to (Y. 108; N. 53) 3464 (ii)

—— Amounts collected and expended, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 1688 (i).

—— Bonds, Payment of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2979 (ii).

—— Claim of Govt., &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3465 (ii).

—— Indebtedness, Payments, Audit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1931 (i).

—— Rep. of Aud. Gen. J. Fraser: M. for Copy* (Mr. Monk) 2983 (ii).

See 'Toll Gates.'

Monuments to Sir L. H. Lafontaine and Robt. Baldwin: in Com. of Sup., 11118 (vi).

Monuments to McGee and Brown: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 13352 (vii).

Moose Jaw Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vii).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch, C.P.R., Extension, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 7654 (iv).

Moose Jaw Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).

Moose Mountain Buffalo Herd: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10102 (v).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9477; Amt. (Mr. Lake) 9494 (v).

Mortgages as Securities by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 204.'

Motions, Unopposed: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8839 (v).

—— Business of the Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8896 (v).

Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).

Mulgrave Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).

Murray Canal, Bridgemen's Houses: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).

Murray Harbour Branch Ry., Improved Service, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 6239 (iv).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. A. Martin) 10123 (v).

Museum: *See* 'Public Works—Ottawa.'

Muskoday Indian Reserves, Negotiations *re* Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5082 (iii).

Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co., Govt. Deposit, &c.: Ques.: (Mr. Gauvreau) 3485 (ii).

National Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. Nos. 111 & 219.'

See 'Battlefields.'

National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.'

Naturalization Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 130.'

See 'Can. Naturalization.'

Naval Defences, Contribution by Canada to Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1118 (i).

Naval Instructions, Drilling of Canadian Seamen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1119 (i).

Naval Schools *re* Cruisers: in Com. of Sup., 3222 (ii).

Naval Schools, Establishment of, List of Places: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 3153 (ii).

—— Arrangements with G.B. *re* Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1117 (i).

Neepawa Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8536 (v), 13335 (vii).

Negro Point Submarine Signal, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5202 (iii).

'Neptune,' Cruise in Hudson Bay, on Order for Reps.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 850 (i).

N.B. Coal and Ry. Co.'s Claim against Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 9714 (v).

—— Claims *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 9270 (v).

N.B. Cold Storage Bait Co., Ministerial Connections *re*: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Foster) 9283; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 9415 (v).

See 'Cold Storage.'

N.B. Cold Storage Plants, Bonuses by Govt., Ques. (Mr. Porter) 9272 (v).

N.B. Credit, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1937 (i).

N.B. Elections and Govt. Employees: Telegram read (Mr. Foster) 3229 (ii).

—— I.C.R. Employees: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3317 (ii).

N.B. Elections, Interference of Govt. Officials: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3579 (ii).

—— Mr. Pugsley's Political Connection, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7130 (iv).

N.B. Inland Waters Wharfs, Construction Policy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 5465 (iii).

N.B. Post Offices, Closing of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).

N.B. Post Office Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 13153 (vii).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt.: M. (Mr. Foster) to Adjn., 3657 (ii).

N.B. Ry. Mail Service, Vacancy, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9107 (v).

N.B. Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 53.'

New Glasgow Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12230 (vii).

New Glasgow Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11257 (vi).

New London Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11292 (vi).

Newmarket Canal, Extension to Devil's Elbow: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 10306 (vi).

—— Reps., Surveys, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10315 (vi).

See 'Canals—Trent.'

New Mills Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
Newspapers in Alberta, Amounts paid to by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 1690 (i).
Newspapers, Amounts paid for Advertising, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 509 (i).
Newspaper Mail Regulations, Complaints *re* Delivery: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 11298 (vi).
Newspapers, Payments to from 1904 to 1908: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1511 (i).
——— Postal Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6460 (iv).
——— Rates, List of Publications: M. for Copy* (Mr. Cockshutt) 1295 (i).
See 'Public Works—Advertising,' 'Tenders,' &c.
New York Central Ry., Discrimination by Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10328 (vi).
Niagara Falls Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Niagara Falls, Rep. of Dr. Spencer, Cost, Criticism, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 6054 (iii).
Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.: *See* 'B. No. 48.'
Niagara Land Purchase: in Com. of Sup., 13540 (vii).
Niagara Military Camp: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) 9779 (v).
——— Transportation of Troops, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 2163 (ii).
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 82.'
Nicolet County, Govt. Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Turcotte) 12775 (vii).
Nicolet Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1283 (i).
Nicolet Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Nicolet Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7428 (iv).
Nicolet Post Office, Completion of, Postmaster's Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
——— Contract and Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3838 (ii).
——— Emplymt. of Mr. S. Rivard: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
Nicolet River Dredging, Emplymt. of Narcisse Jutras: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
——— Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3840 (ii), 4588 (iii).
——— Protection Walls, Repairs, Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 4588 (iii).
——— Wharf, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3478 (ii).
Nipigon Ry. (Branch Lines) Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).
Nipissing Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 170.'
Nixon, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 12390 (vii).
Noble, Mr. James, Conviction *re* Fishery Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5650 (iii).
See 'Georgian Bay.'
Nolan, Wm. Howard, Issue of Land Patents to: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 8182 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts paid and Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 167 (i).
——— Financial Relations with Govt.: Remarks on M. for Sup., 770 (i).
——— Ref. to Mr. Blair's Letter *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2392 (ii).
North Bay P. O. Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).
North Bay Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7712, 7810 (iv), 13332 (vii).
North East Harbour Wharf, Total Length: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11019 (vi).
North Empire Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 7.'
Northern Crown Bank of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Northern Empire Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
North Grove Post Office, Letters, Pets. *re* Establishment: M. for Copies* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4773 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5490 (iii).
North Sydney Improvements, I.C. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Northwest Gold Dredging Co., Leases assigned, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 11702 (vi).
N.W.M. Police, Compensations *re* Injuries: in Com. of Sup., 8870 (v).
——— Pensions: in Com. of Sup., 8870 (v).
——— Salaries and Pay of Force: in Com. of Sup., 8862 (v).
Northwestern Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 54.'
N.W.T. Act (jurisdiction) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 210.'
N.W.T. Govt., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10116 (v).
N.W.T. School Grants: in Com. of Sup., 11117 (v).
Notre Dame de Portage Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6400 (iv).
N.S. Prisons, &c., Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Oakville Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 10887 (vi).
Oaths of Office: See 'B. No. 1.'
Oats, Standards of: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
Observatories: in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
Observatory: *See* 'Astronomical.'
Obstructions in Navigable Streams, Removal of: in Com. of Sup., 3156, 3211 (ii).
Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Owen) on M. for Sup., 9894 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10016 (v).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 10023; (Mr. Speaker) 10024 (v).

Obstruction *re* Supply, Ques. of Order, (Mr. Foster) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Ross) 10024: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 10031 (v).
Obstruction Tactics, Discussion of: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Foster) 9220 (v).
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i), 2941, 2949, 3147, 3195 (ii), 5763 (iii).
Ocean SS. Subsidies: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Occidental Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 131.'
Official Cars, Number and Maintenance: Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 10330 (vi).
Office Specialty Co., and Eclipse Mfg. Co., Amounts paid to: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4244 (iii).
Office Specialty Co., Quantity of Goods supplied to Govt.: Ques. (Br. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 3242 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bennett) 3581 (ii), 5785 (iii).
Oil Borings, Geological Survey: in Com. of Sup., 13162 (vii).
Old Age Pensions: *See* 'B. No. 120.'
Old Age Pensions: M. for Sel. Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2786 (ii).
—— M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2398 (ii).
—— M. (Mr. Fielding) to wthdrw., 3654 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 7722 (iv).
Old Age Pensions Com., Progress *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12660 (vii).
Old Man's River: in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).
Olympic Games Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13167 (vii).
Ont., Judges of: *See* 'B. No. 206.'
Ontario North, Division of Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 8294 (v).
Opium, Amount received *re* Customs Duties, Pet. from B.C. *re* Prohibition: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 8614 (v).
Opium, Prohibition of: *See* 'B. No. 205.'
Orangemen and Quebec Provincial Elections, Speech of Hon. Mr. Brodeur at Montreal: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 10123 (v).
Orange Order and Quebec Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 10355 (vi).
Orangeville Post Office Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 7482 (iv).
Order Paper, Differences between English and French Editions: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6740, 6850 (iv).
—— Printing in French: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 5407 (iii).
Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re*, 'Bourinot' quoted, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4103 (ii).
—— Appeal to Speaker from Mr. Chairman's Ruling (Mr. Taylor) Agreed to (Y. 84; N. 1) 4188 (ii).
Ordnance Lands, Sale of: *See* 'B. No. 218.'
Oriental Immigration, B.C., Legal Expenses *re* Commission: in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Original Documents and Returns: *See* 'Documents.'
Oromocto Shoals, Contract *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11496 (vi).
O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
—— Emplymt. *re* Nicolet Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
—— Issue of Pass on I.C.R. Express: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
Otonabee Power Co., Amount of Payment *re* Horse Power: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5471, 5656 (iii).
—— Incorrect Answer: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5566 (iii).
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 74.'
Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
—— Archives Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5700 (iii).
—— Elevator Attendants: in Com. of Sup., 11011 (vi).
—— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii).
—— Improvements, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5707 (iii).
—— Lighting, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11011 (vi).
—— Renewing Skylights: in Com. of Sup., 7816 (iv).
—— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (iii), 10983 (vi).
—— Repairs, Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10981 (vi).
—— Sussex Street: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii), 13478 (vii).
—— Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 11012 (vi). *See* 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Ottawa Grounds, Circular of C. S. Ass'cn: Read (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 11012 (vi).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Amount expended to Jan. 1st, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11499 (vi).
Ottawa Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (iii).
—— Completion of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 3842 (ii).
Ouelle River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Retirement of: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 516 (i).
—— O.C. *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Lanctot) 557 (i).
Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 83.'

Owen Sound to Meaford Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).
Owen Sound Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7817 (iv).
——— Inspector, Apptmt. of Mr. Foster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
——— Contract *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
——— Sub-letting of Contract by Leslie: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
Owen Sound Dredging, Inspector Telford, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3038 (ii).
Owen Sound Dredging Co., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2792 (ii).
Owen Sound Strike, Settlement of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8606 (v).
Oyster Pond Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11258 (vi).
Pacaud, Benjamin, Apptmt. to Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5200 (iii).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 138.'
Pacific Coast Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 40.'
Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 10157 (v).
Pakenham Mail Bags, Throwing off of Train: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1425 (i).
Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, Releases since 1896, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2822 (ii).
See 'Blunden.'
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 9579 (v).
——— Explanation (Mr. Aylesworth) 13081 (vii).
Parker's Cove Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11258 (vi).
Park Hill Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Park Reservations: in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 609 (i).
Parliament, Opening: Mess. from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Parrsborough Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11259 (vi).
Parrsborough Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vii).
Partridge Island Stores, Emplymt. of Ferry Service, Rate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1120 (i).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 12729, 12737 (vii).
Passages of Immigrants to Canada, Number rejected by SS. Companies: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5468 (iii).
Passenger Ticket Act: *See* 'B. No. 90.'
Passes on Steamers to Members, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
Patent Medicines: *See* 'B. No. 146.'
Patent Medicines, Committee of Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3899 (ii).
Patent Medicines, Govt. Intention *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 356 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 608 (i), 2594 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) *re* Apptmt. to Special Com., 10689 (vi).
Patent of Eugene Francois Giraud: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
Patent of Frederick C. Rehm, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 110.'
Patents of General Chemical Co.: *See* 'B. No. 174.'
Patents of Goodwin Car Co.: *See* 'B. No. 60.
Patents of Metal Shingle and Siding Co.: *See* 'B. No. 207.'
Patents of Montague Moore, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
Patents of the Sutherland Rifle Sight Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 63.'
Patent of Wm. B. Smith: *See* 'B. No. 198.'
Patents of the Windsor Pump and Foundry Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 72.'
'Patent Record': in Com. of Sup., 672 (i).
Patterson, J. W., Govt. Lands in B.C., Sale to: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6002 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6241 (iv).
Patronage *re* Civil Service: M. (Mr. Foster, to Drop, 6243 (iv).
See 'Civil Service System.'
Paulding, Ada Katurah Stewart, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 176.'
Peace River Exploratory Surveys, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 3834 (ii).
Peace River Timber Limits, Cor., &c., *re* Granting: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 3851 (ii).
Peace River Valley and Land Co., Cancelling of Grants: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 11018 (vi).
——— Homesteads leased, sold, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Hughes) 1295 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2769 (ii), 6010 (iii).
——— M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 10403 (vi).
——— Survey of Lands: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).
——— Terms and Regulations *re* Sale, &c., Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1111 (i).
Peace Union, Parliamentary, Meeting at Ottawa: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13581 (vii).
Peat for Fuel Deposits, Development of in Canada: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 515 (i).
Peat Industry, Emplymt. of Mr. Erik Nystrom, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 1122 (i).
Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, Seizure of Schr. 'Carlotta G. Cox': on M. for Sup. (Mr. Sloan), 3934 (ii).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. Sloan) 3156 (ii).

Pelican Lake Channel, Opening of: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1940 (i).
Pembroke Armoury: Remarks (Mr. White) in Com. of Sup., 10901 (vi).
Penitentiaries: in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii), 12265 (vii).
Penitentiaries B.C., Land Purchases: in Com. of Sup., 12918 (vii).
Pension Fund of I.C.R. & P.E.I. Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 117.'
Pepin, J. A., Emplymt. at Windsor Customs: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
Perdue, Mr. M. B., Apptmt. as Inspector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 173 (i).
Personal Explanation *re* Land Deals (Mr. Turriff) 1927 (i).
Petawawa Camp, Arrangements *re* Training of Troops: Ques. (Mr. White) 5791 (iii).
Petawawa Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12133 (vii).
——— Ques. (Mr. White) 685 (i).
Peterborough Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Peterborough Steamboat Landing: in Com. of Sup., 12133 (vii).
Petite Decharge, Lac St. Jean, Removal of Rock: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Petition: M. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Present, 1682 (i).
Petit Rocher Breakwater, Contracts, O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Taylor) 1294 (i).
——— Incomplete Return: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 5723 (iii), 9716 (v).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Taylor) 6464, 7107 (iv).
——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 10402 (vi).
Petit Rocher Spur Line I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12759 (vii).
'Petrel,' Str., Supplies, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 7937 (iv).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 7937 (iv).
Petroleum Bounties: *See* 'B. No. 199.'
Phœnix Assurance Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 167.'
'Phœnix,' Saskatoon, Number ordered, Payment to: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6920 (iv).
Pianos rented for Speaker's Rooms: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 563 (i).
Piche Point (Lake Temiscaming) Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Picton Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Pictou Engine House, I.C.R., Contract *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1683 (i).
Pictou Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5558 (iii), 12230 (vii).
Pictou Post Office Building, Concrete Sidewalk. Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10518 (vi).
Piegan Indian Reserve, Shipping and Weighing of Cattle: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 632 (i).
Piggeries at Experimental Farm: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vii).
Pilotage and Pensions: in Com. of Sup., 5046 (iii), 13324 (vii).
Pinette Harbour, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 685 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9474 (v).
Pisquid Post Office, Removal of, Cor., Tels., Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 4588 (iii).
Plains of Abraham, Battle of: *See* 'Nos. 111 & 219.'
Plains of Abraham, Number of Acres leased to Ross Rifle Co.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1348 (i).
See 'Militia—Ross Rifle.'
Playgreen Lake, Conditions *re* Lease, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6403 (iv).
Plessisville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Pointe aux Trembles Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Pointe aux-Trembles Wharf, Contract of Messrs. Dusseault & Pageau, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8838 (v).
——— Date of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9267 (v).
——— Tenders, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1734 (i), 2394 (ii).
Point Edward Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5713 (iii).
Point Pelee Lightship: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vii).
Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Completion of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3898 (ii).
Point St. Charles, Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Poirierville Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 11260 (vi).
Pontiac Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 155.'
Pork, Fresh, Quantity imported for Home Consumption: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5650 (iii).
Portage la Prairie, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Port Arthur Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Port Arthur and Fort William Dredging, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8617 (v).
Port Arthur Harbour, Dredging Contracts, Securities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 697 (i).
Port Arthur and Fort William Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12144 (vii).
See 'Dredging.'
Port Arthur Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Port Bruce Harbour, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2389 (ii).
Port Burwell Harbour, Contracts, Payments, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Marshall) 556 (i).

Port Burwell Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12135 (vii).
Port Colborne Elevator and Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12146, 12211 (vii).
Port Colborne Elevator, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
Port Colborne, Total Expenditure *re* Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4403 (ii).
Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10513 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Port Dufferin Dredging, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4828 (iii).
Porte au Pique Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3232 (ii).
Porter's Lake, Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11260 (vi).
Port Hastings Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11265 (vi).
Port Hillford Breakwater, Protection: in Com. of Sup., 11267 (vi).
Port Hood Harbour, Closing Northern Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 11268 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10255 (v).
Port Hood Fishery Officer, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10254 (v).
Port Hope, Inland Revenue Office, Apptmts. of Collector: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 895 (i).
Port Hope Pier Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12135 (vii).
Port Joli West, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Port Maitland Piers, Amount of Mr. Battle's Tender: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 690 (i).
——— Apptmt. of W. W. Krick as Inspector: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 6919 (iv).
Port Maitland Entrance Pier, Renewal: in Com. of Sup., 5673 (iii).
——— Tenders, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lalor) 1294 (i).
Port Medway and Medway Station Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11300 (vi).
Port Mulgrave, N.S., Preventing Boats landing Cargoes: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9274 (v).
Port Royal (Madame Island) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11278 (vi).
Port St. Francois Wharf, Construction, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3423 (ii).
Port South Bar, C.B., Vessels entered for Customs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9271 (v).
Port Stanley Breakwater, Contractors, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 239 (i).
Port Stanley Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Portuguese Cove Breakwater Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Port Vernon Bridge, P.E.I., Completion of Work, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4404 (iii).
Postage Stamps, Designs for Quebec Tercentenary, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7934 (iv).
See 'Post Office.'
Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., Re-arrangement of: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3040 (ii).
——— Statement (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for Sup., 3159 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3885 (ii).
Postal Note Business, Commissions, Expenditure *re* Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9279 (v).
Postal Rates on Letters at Confederation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 8175 (iv).
Postal Rates on N.S. Weekly Newspapers, Tel. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3484 (ii).
Postal Regulations *re* Weekly Newspapers, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5901 (iii).
Postal Revenue *re* One-Cent Rate on Letters Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 8381 (v).
Postal Service, Complaints *re* Inadequacy: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 352 (i).
——— Deficiency, &c., Complaints *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 559 (i).
——— Delays, &c., Complaints *re* Ret.: on M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. Armstrong) 7257 (iv).
Postal Service, H. of C., Delay in delivering: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 570 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).
Postal Service, Improvements in, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8891 (v).
——— Ret.: Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 4832 (iii).
Postal Stamps, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 9111 (v).
——— Special Issue *re* Tuberculosis: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).
Posters, Prohibition of Indecent Bills, Enforcement of Tariff Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 6461 (iv).
Postmasters' Assessment, Amount collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6458 (iv).
Post Office Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 162.'
POST OFFICE:
Annapolis and Digby Mail Service, Amounts paid: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 12653 (vii).
Arnprior Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iv).
Atlantic Steamers Mail Service, Cost per Annum: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5656 (iii).
See 'Mail Service,' &c.
Belleville Post Office, Excessive Postage: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 7933 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Bell Rapids P. O., Establishment of: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 8883 (v).

Bonanza Post Office Theft, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1291 (i).

Bonn Post Office, Application *re* Establishment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 10516 (vi).

Brampton Post Office, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7480 (iv).

Brass, Mr. Albert, Postmaster at Rusagnoris, Charges *re* Political Activity: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 6642 (iv).

Brewster and Park Hill Mail Route, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6404 (iv).

Calgary, P. O. and Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8578 (v).

Chambly Canton, Complaints *re* Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5653 (iii).

Copper Cliff Postmaster, Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 658 (i).

Denis, Mr. Gaspard, Postmaster at St. Michel des Saints, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 9474 (v).

Digby to Westport Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7203 (iv).

Drop Letter One-Cent Rate: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 3158 (ii).

Egypte and St. Ephrem d'Upton, Mail Contract, Renewal of: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5257 (iii).

Farnell, Gordon, Contractor for Halifax Mails: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7731 (iv).

Farnham Post Office, Vote *re* Improvement: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).

Glencoe Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3846 (ii).

Guelph-Goderich Mail Service, Arrangements with C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. A. F. MacLaren) 184 (i).

Hamilton Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7696 (iv).

Hull Post Office, Total Revenue for 1906, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 11704 (vi).

'La Gazette d'Arthabaska.' Postal Privileges *re*: Ques. (Mr. L. Lavergne) 6058 (iii).

Letter Carriers, Boots, Uniforms, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8872 (v).

—— Hours of Service, Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7728 (iv).

Literature, &c., distributed through Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 9095 (v).

Londonderry and Bass River Mail Service, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2980

Mackinnon Post Office, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 10516 (vi).

Macleod Post Office, Report *re* Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

McDonald, Archibald, Dismissal from Whim Road P. O.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Martin) 5087 (iii).

McLeod, Alex., Dismissal from Valleyfield, P.E.I. Post Office: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5087 (iii).

Mails from Canada to Europe, Quantity arrived: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 12653 (vii).

Mail Matter lost in C.P.R. Accident at Kenora, Rep. *re*: (Mr. Lake) 9281 (v).

—— Mail Matter delayed in Transmission by C.P.R. Accident: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 9724 (v).

Mail Matter, Fraudulent Weighing, Inspection *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4827 (iii).

Mail Matter mutilated in Transmission, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2214 (ii).

Mail Service in B.C., Improvements *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3754 (ii)

Mail Service between Darnley and Kensington, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4828 (iii).

Mail Service, Irregularity of in Argenteuil County: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 9119 (v).

Mail Service in N.B. and N.S., Number of Post Offices, Postal Revenue, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 852 (i).

Mail Service, Soulanges County, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).

Mail Service by Steamers via Coteau Landing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).

Mail Steamer, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4827 (iii).

Mail Subsidies to Steamships, Total Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).

Mail Tenders at Rimouski, Complaints *re* 'Rhoda': Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5799 (iii).

Mattawa Postmaster, Place of Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. White) 7199 (iv).

Mill Settlement and Newcastle Creek Post Offices, Establishment of, Pets., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Wilmot) 2982 (ii).

Montreal Pneumatic Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 5703 (iii).

Montreal Postal Service, Irregularities of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9274 (v).

Montreal Postal Station B: in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).

—— Station C: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).

Montreal Post Office, Addition, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6922 (iv).

—— Clerks, Pay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9112 (v).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Montreal Post Office, Defalcations, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7197 (iv).
——— Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 7410 (iv).
N.B. Post Offices, Closing of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).
——— Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 13153 (vii).
N.B. Ry. Mail Service, Vacancy, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9107 (v).
——— Postal Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6460 (iv).
Newspaper Rates, List of Publications: M. for Copy* (Mr. Cockshutt) 1295 (i).
——— Regulations, Complaints *re* Delivery: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 11298 (vi).
See 'Weekly Newspapers.'
Nicolet Post Office, Completion of, Postmaster's Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
——— Contract and Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3838 (ii).
——— Emplymt. of Mr. S. Rivard: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
North Bay P. O. Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).
North Grove Post Office, Letters, Pets. *re* Establishment: M. for Copies* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4773 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5490 (iii).
Orangeville Post Office Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 7482 (iv).
O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. *re* Nicolet Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
Ottawa Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (iii).
——— Completion of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 3842 (ii).
Pakenham Mail Bags, Throwing off of Train: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1425 (i).
Pisquid Post Office, Removal of, Cor., Tels., Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 4588 (iii).
Point St. Charles Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Port Medway and Medway Station Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11300 (vi).
Porte au Pique Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3232 (ii).
Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., Re-arrangement of: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3040 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3885 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 4832 (iii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Postal Arrangements between Can. and U.S.: Re-arrangement of: Statement (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for Sup., 3159 (ii).
Postal Note Business, Commissions, Expenditure *re* Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9279 (v).
Postal Rates on Letters at Confederation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 8175 (iv).
Postal Revenue *re* One-Cent Rate on Letters: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 8381 (v).
Postal Service, Complaints *re* Inadequacy: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 352 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 559 (i).
——— Improvements in, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8891 (v).
Postmasters' Assessment, Amount collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6458 (iv).
Post Office Buildings built since 1904, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 4761 (iii).
Post Office Dept., Clerical Assistance: in Com. of Sup., 8872 (v).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 93 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5561 (iii), 8872 (v).
——— Outside Service: in Com. of Sup., 9092 (v), 13152 (vii).
——— Returns, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6405 (iv).
——— Ret.: Inquiry for (Mr. Crocket) 6288 (iv).
Post Office Inspectors, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).
——— Uniforms, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9092 (v).
Post Office Irregularities in Western Canada: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 8873 (v).
P.E.I., Post Offices in Queens County, Complaints *re* Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 355 (i).
——— Delays in Distributing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 9092 (v).
Printing for Postal Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5472 (iii).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry., &c., Cost of Mail Service: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1130 (i).
Quebec Terentenary Postage Stamps, French and English Printing: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7935 (iv).
——— Designs for, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7934 (iv).
——— New Series, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6397 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8895 (v).
——— Postage Stamps, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. McColl) 12414 (vii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Ry. Mail Clerk at Edmonton, Expenses *re* Trial: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9108 (v).
Regina Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8602 (v).
Rimouski Mail Contracts, Payments to Str. 'Rhoda': Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8176 (iv).
Rivard, Mr. S., Emplymt. on Nicolet Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (v).
Riviere du Loup Postmaster, Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
Round Bay, N.S., Removal of Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11297 (vi).
Rural Postmasters, Salary, Increases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 183 (i).
Ryan, Mr. G. M., Apptmt. of Successor as Ry. Mail Supt.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 7504 (iv).
St, Francois Xavier Post Office, Apptmt. of Postmistress, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 5797 (iii).
St. Gabriel de Brandon Post Office Savings Bank Opening, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 4589 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4828 (iii).
St. Henri Post Office Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7439 (iv).
St. Irene des Bains, Apptmt. of Mr. Geo. Girard as Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 5795 (iii).
St. John's Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).
St. Mary's Post Office, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 12735 (vii).
——— Items *re* Expenditure of $658.03: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 11937 (vi).
——— Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 11019 (vi).
St. Paschal and Kamouraska Mail Contracts, Tenders, Bondsmen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3236 (ii).
St. Peter's Bay, Mail Contract with H. B. Finlay, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1686 (i).
St. Peter's Bay Post Office, Dismissal of Mrs. Mary Finlay, Letters, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 2170 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1687 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. Martin) 2786 (ii).
Sacred Heart Post Office, Establishment of Six Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5472 (iii).
Sandwich Post Office Site, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
Sandy Cove, N.S., Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8891 (v).
Savings Banks, Increase of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 691 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Scotch Hill East, Establishment of Post Office, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2793 (ii).
Southvale, N.S., Removal of Post Office, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4829 (iii).
Stamps, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 9111 (v).
——— Special Issue *re* Tuberculosis: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).
See 'Quebec,' &c.
Suburban Mail Delivery: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3276 (ii).
Thessalon Post Office, Charges *re* Postmaster: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).
Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2594 (ii).
Trent Bridge Post Office, Re-Opening of: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 609 (i).
Valleyfield, Clock in Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7115 (iv).
Valleyfield, P.E.I., Change of Mail Route: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 11297 (vi).
Victoria Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
Weekly Newspapers, Postal Rates in N.S., Tel. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3484 (ii).
Weekly Newspapers, Postal Regulation *re*, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5201 (iii).
Winnipeg Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8575 (v).
Winter Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 3216 (ii).
Woodstock, N.B., Mr. C. L. Smith, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2794 (ii).
——— Interference in Eelctions: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 2886 (ii).
Yukon Mail Service, Complaints *re* (Mr. Thompson) 2022 (ii).
Pound Net Licenses granted in 1905, Cor. with A. E. Dyment, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 2795 (ii).
Prefontaine, Hon. R., Date of Sailing, Acting Minister of Marine: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7732 (iv).
Prescott Light Station, Presentation to Dr. W. C. Brown: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 983 (i).
Presbyterian College of Halifax: *See* 'B. No. 154.'
Presbyterian Ministers' Widows and Orphans Fund: *See* 'B. No. 23.'
Preston, W. T. R., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 360 (i).
Prince Albert Penitentiary Building: in Com. of Sup., 8601 (v).

Prince Albert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vii).
P.E.I. Fisheries Protection Service, Annual Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 359 (i).
P.E.I. Fishing Bounties, Stmnt. of Payments: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Martin) 1295 (i).
P.E.I. and G.B. SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 12264 (vii).
P.E.I. Harbours and Rivers, Expenditures: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
P.E.I. Ice-breaker, Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 8444 (v).
——— Date of Signing of Contract: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 10254 (v).
——— Progress *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 365 (i).
P.E.I. Life Saving Station, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 681 (i).
——— Lighthouses, Supplies, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 358 (i).
P.E.I. and Nova Scotia SS. Service, Re-establishing of: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8383 (v).
P.E.I., Post Offices in Queens County, Complaints *re* Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 355 (i).
P.E.I. Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1686 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2171 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8696, 9893 (v).
P.E.I. Ry., Alma Station, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 6642 (iv).
——— Bear River Station-master's Dwelling, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1737
P.E.I. Branch Lines: *See* 'B. No. 202.'
P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, Construction, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. Martin) 3242 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on B. 215, 13482 (vii).
P.E.I. Ry., Complaints *re* Excessive Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1123 (i).
——— Construction of Freight Sheds, &c., Specifications, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5086 (iii).
——— Dundas and Avondale Extension, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8383 (v).
——— Freight Rates, Delegates from P.E.I., Reps. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 6240 (iv).
——— Harmony-Elmira Branch, Construction: Prop. Res. (Mr. Graham) 12052 (vii).
——— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* M. J. Haney's Claims: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) on M. for Sup., 2740 (ii).
——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Foster) 2882 (ii).
——— remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 7100 (iv).
——— Mail Service, Delays in Distributing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com of Sup., 9092 (v).
P.E.I. Ry., Montague Branch. Claims of James Maher, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 3834 (ii).
——— Montague Branch Extension: M. to dsch. Bill (Mr. Graham) 11405 (vi).
——— Murray Harbour Branch, Expenditure and Earnings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 848 (i).
——— Stanley Bridge Branch, Surveys, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. A. A. McLean) 850 (i).
——— Stanley Bridge Extension, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4829 (iii).
——— Station Agents, Salaries, Pets., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3236 (ii).
——— Subsidy, Deductions *re* Hillsborough Bridge: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5079 (iii).
——— Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12764 (vii).
——— Tenders *re* News Agency: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8444 (v).
——— Time-Table, Protest *re* Changes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1123 (i).
——— Train Service between Charlottetown and Murray Harbour: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 568 (i).
P.E.I. Steam Communication with G.B.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 13353 (vii).
P.E.I., Terms of Union with Dom., Nonfulfilment of, &c., Memorials, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5801 (iii).
P.E.I., Telegraphic Communication, Com. from Commercial Cable Co. *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 8515 (v).
P.E.I. Tunnel Construction, Reps., &c.: M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 4589 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 9893 (v).
——— Information *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 562 (i).
P.E.I., Winter Communication, Contract *re* Construction of Steamer: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2546 (ii).
——— Freight carried, Freight Rates, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Martin) 936 (i).
——— Georgetown and Cape George Route, Tests *re*: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) 895 (i).
——— Removal of Steamers from Georgetown Route, Discussion of: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1109 (i).
——— Withdrawal of Steamer from Georgetown, Discussion: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1207 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 1513 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Service, Ice-Breaker Str., Rep. *re* Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4583 (iii).
——— Mail Service, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. A. Martin) 1203 (i).

P.E.I., Progress *re* Construction of Ice-breaker: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 5796 (iii).
—— Winter Communication: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 4496 (iii).
P.E.I Winter Service, Str. 'Stanley,' Route, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 172 (i).
—— Total Quantity of Freight, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 843 (i).
Prince Rupert, Customs Collectors, Transfer of Mr. B. R. McDonald: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 6401 (iv).
Printing Bureau, Electric Motor Machines: in Com. of Sup., 7817 (iv).
Printing and Lithographing done outside of Canada, Amounts expended: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1732, 1931 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 2397 (ii).
See 'Lithographing.'
Printing of Parlt., Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 312 (i).
Printing of Parlt., 5th Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Parmelee) 10915 (vi).
Printing for Postal Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5472 (iii).
Printing and Stationary Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
Printing in 'Sun,' &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 5661 (iii).
Printing, Supt., Apptmt. of a Frenchman: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12411 (vii).
Prisons and Reformatories Act *re* N.S.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Prisoner, Released: *See* 'Pardoning Power.'
Private Bills Com., Extension of Time: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 891 (i).
Private Bills Fees, Discrepancy between Senate and H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10122 (v).
Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' *re* Attack on French Canadian Ministers: (Mr. Talbot 4221 (iii).
—— Ques. of *re* Registrar of Grey County (Mr. Telford) 11302 (vi).
Privy Council, Promotions: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vii).
—— Office, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 610 (i).
Prohibition Vote in Quebec Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen. Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 13580 (vii).
—— Mess. from Senate: Read (Mr. Speaker) 13587 (vii).
—— Speech from Throne, 13590 (vii).
Protection Tariff, ref. to in Debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 74 (i).
Provincial Elections and Federal Ministers' Speeches: Remarks (Mr. Robitaille) 8850 (v).
Provincial Subsidies, Amount paid before and after Adjustment: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8616 (v).
Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid under present Agreement and Previously: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 315 (i).
—— Dates of last Payments, &c., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 237 (i).
—— Dates of Payments, Sums owing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 564 (i).
—— Increased Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 173 (i).
—— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 79; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 61 (i).
Provincial Voters' Lists: in Com. of Sup., 10508 (vi).
See 'Man.,' &c.
Public Accounts Com., Evidence *re* Investigation, Freedom of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Bain) 3070; Neg. (Y. 49; N. 103) 3145 (ii).
—— Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3083; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3085 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 945 (i).
—— Meetings and Adjournments: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1439 (i).
—— Meetings concurrently with Sittings of Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9504 (v).
—— Production of Original Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 4495 (iii).
Public Accounts Rep. and Aud. Gen.'s Rep.: M. to ref. to Public Accounts Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 311 (i).
Public Accounts Com.: M. (Mr. Clarke) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 2159 (ii); M. (Mr. Johnston) to conc., 9890 (v).
—— Production of Original Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 1383 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Sittings concurrently with Hse.: M. (Mr. Finlayson) 9579 (v).
Public Accounts Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6 (i).
Public Bills and Orders, Govt. Business: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 13493 (vii).
—— Precedence of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3405 (ii).
See 'Business of the House.'
Public Buildings constructed since 1897, Amounts expended, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1130 (i).
—— Policy of Erection, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7189 (iv).
—— Works, Initiated since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bovce) 2170 (ii).
Public Lands Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 181.'
Public Lands of Dom., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 70 (i).
Public Works Expenditure in Mar. Provs., since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 555 (i).
Public Works in Harbours and Rivers., Ont., Tenders, Amounts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 559 (i).
Public Works, Labour Hours: *See* 'B. No. 97.'

PUBLIC WORKS:
Actonvale Public Building, Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6232 (iv).
Advertisements for Tenders *re* Govt. Works, Supplies, &c.: Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4702; Neg. (Y. 59; N. 95) (iii).
Annapolis Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11207 (vi).
Anse a la Barbe Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12028 (vi).
Anse a l'Ilot Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Antigonish Public Building: in Com, of Sup., 7110 (iv).
Architects on Public Works, Payments, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).
Arthabaskaville Public Buildin: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Ashouapmouchouan, Peribonka Training Dykes: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Aylmer Drill Shed: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
Baddeck Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11219 (vi).
Baie St. Paul Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Barachois Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 11223, 12029 (vi).
Batiscan River, Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Batiscan Wharf Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8576 (v).
Bay St. Lawrence Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Beaver Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Beaverton Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).
Becancour, &c., Counties, Dredging at during 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3040 (ii).
Becancour Harbour Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2392 (ii).
Belle River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).
Belle River Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 685 (i).
Belleville Floods, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 4744 (iii).
Belleville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7678 (iv).
Berthier Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Bic Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
——— Material supplied, Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 9713 (v).
Big Lorraine Harbour, Dredging Entrance Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Blanche River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).
Blind River Wharf Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12091 (vii).
Bonaventure River Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Boone, C. S., Co., Amounts paid for Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4244 (iii).
See 'Dredging,' &c.
Brantford Public Building Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).
Braund, Samuel, Apptmt. as Inspector of Port Maitland Pier: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 5674 (iii).
Breton Cove Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vii).
Bridgewater Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7135 (iv).
Brighton Wharf, Repairs *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 5913 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Owen) in Com. of Sup., 12133, 12138 (vii).
Bronte Harbour, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii).
——— Pier Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12091 (vii).
Buctouche Channel, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
Burlington Channel Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12092 (vii).
Burlington Channel Repairs, Apptmt. of Foreman, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 4403 (iii).
Buildings, Administrative, Erection of: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).
Buildings, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi). 13338 (vii).
Buildings constructed since 1897, Amounts expended, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1130 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12661 (vii).
——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 12771 (vii).
Buildings Generally: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
——— Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11007 (vi).
——— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10981 (vi).
——— Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Buildings, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 10953 (vi), 13335 (vii).
——— Man. and N.W.T., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8517 (v).
Buildings in Man. and N.W., Amounts paid by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 698 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Buildings, N.B.: in Com. of Sup 7186 (iv), 13328 (vii).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7110 (iv), 13326 (vii).
———Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7467 (vi), 13331 (vii).
Buildings, Policy of Erection, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7189 (iv).
Buildings and Public Works, Initiated since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 2170 (ii).
Buildings, P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 7183 (iv).
——— Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
——— Saskatchewan and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Campbellton Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Campbellton Harbour, Gas Buoys, Tender *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 8612 (v).
Campbellton Wharf, Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi).
——— Tender *re* Piling Supply, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 8612 (v).
Cap St. Ignace Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
Cape St. Mary Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Caraquet Wharf, Ice-breakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi).
Caribou Island Causeway: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Cascumpec Harbour Buoys, Tenders for Placing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 681 (i).
Chapel Point Ferry Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 513 (i).
Charlemagne and Terrebonne Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 685 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 853 (i).
Charlos Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Charlotte County Wharf, Pet. *re* Erection: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 5202 (iii).
Chase's Point, N.B., Pet. *re* Wharf: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7937 (iv).
Chateauguay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
Chicoutimi Boom, Payments from Pulp Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 8174 (iv).
Chicoutimi Dredging Contract, Tenders *re*: Que. (Mr. Bennett) 7203 (iv).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup. 12030 (vi).
——— Public Works, Expenditures, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Church Point Wharf, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Chute a Blondeau Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12092 (vii).
Clarke City, Seven Islands: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
——— Expenditure *re* Public Works: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2394 (ii).
Clerks of Works on Public Buildings: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).
Clifton Breakwater, N.B., Amount of Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 695 (i).
Clifton Wharf Repairs, Extension of Contract: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4831 (iii).
Cobourg Harbour, Amount expended *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 359 (i).
——— Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii).
Colborne Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii)
Colchester Point, Essex County Pier, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 12652 (vii).
Collingwood Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12096 (vii).
Coteau Landing Wharf, Repairs to, &c.: Ques. (Mr Monk) 9277 (v).
Cow Bay (Port Morien) Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Cranbrook Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Cumberland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi).
Dauphin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).
——— Valuation of Site: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi).
Dawson City, Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Deschambault Wharf, Tenders *re*, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5464 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 5801 (iii).
Digby Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11226 (vi).
Docks, Piers, &c., Constructed at Bayfield, Grand Bend, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 2397 (ii).
Dorchester Wharf Addition: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Dorval, Dredging at St. Lawrence Yacht Club: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 13060 (vii).
Dover Wharf on Petitcodiac River: in Com. of Sup., 11692 (vi).
Dredging Contracts, Basis of Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9710 (v).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9773, 10259 (v).
——— Midland, &c., Renewals without Tender, O.Cs. *re*: M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 6741 (iv).
——— Payments to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1736 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Dredging Contracts, Quebec Harbour: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7104 (iv).
—— Renewal without Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6633 (iv).
See 'Midland,' &c.
Dredging at Fort William, Amount paid to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8839 (v).
Dredging at Midland, &c., Advertisements *re* Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 7195 (iv).
Dredging Works at Nicolet River, &c., Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3896 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 4247 (iii).
Dredging, Ont. and Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Dredging in Ontario Harbours, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 1129 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 9276, 10008 (v).
Dredging Plant (new) for Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).
Dredging Plant for St. Lawrence River (lower): in Com. of Sup., 4754 (iii).
Dredging in Quebec Counties in 1907, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3240 (ii).
Dredging in Quebec Province, Claims Pending, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7200 (iv).
Dredging at Rigaud River, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boyer) 6240 (iv).
Dredging in Vaudreuil County, Supt.'s Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii)
East Templeton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Edmonton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (iii), 8579 (v), 13336 (vii).
Elmwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).
Emerson Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8534 (v), 13335 (vii).
Escoumains Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Estevan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8581 (v), 13336 (vii).
Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Father Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Fernie Public Building, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (iii), 10866 (iv).
'Fielding,' Dredge, Number of Days Working, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7199 (iv).
Garthby Wharf, Inspection by Midraud, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3844 (ii).
Gatineau Point Bridge, Sums contributed by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 355 (i).
Georgetown Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7182 (iv).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Glace Bay, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7139 (iv).
Glencoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7486 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Gobeil, Mr., Dep. Min. of Public Works, Retirement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1452 (i).
Goderich Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Goderich Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
—— Claims of Smeeth & McGillicuddy: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Godfroi River Wharf, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3423 (ii).
Gore's Landing Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Grand Bend Pier, Final Estimate of Chief Engineer Lafleur: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8892 (v).
—— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5085 (iii).
See 'Wharfs.'
Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Grand Forks Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Grand Marais Harbour, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 12140 (vii).
Grand Mechins Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Grand Mere Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Grandes Piles Dam, Amount voted, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 13059 (vii).
Grande Riviere Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Grand River Wharf, Tenders, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8382 (v).
Graving Docks, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).
Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup. 13338 (vii).
Halifax, Dominion Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7140 (v).
Hall's Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
Hamilton, Public Works Employees at, Delay in Payment: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10015, 10119 (v).
Harbours and Rivers, Generally, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11693, 12031 (vi).
—— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii).
—— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
—— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).
—— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 133350 (vii).
Harbours and Rivers, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers, P.E.I., General Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11292 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
—— Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
Harvey Bank Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Higgin's Shore Pier Wharf, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 694 (i).
Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Holland River Dredging, Contract with Lake Simcoe Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2980 (ii).
—— Divisional Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4767 (iii).
—— Name of Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3037 (ii).
Howard's Cape Wharf, Pet. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 11702 (vi).
Hudson, Dredging, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
Humboldt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8582 (v).
Hunter, J. B., Apptmt. as Dep. Min. of Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 1452 (i).
Inverness Harbour, Purchase of McIsaac's Pond: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5792 (iii).
Inverness Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7172 (iv).
—— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5997 (iii).
Jesus River Dredging, Payments to Mr. Morgan: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 6980 (iv).
Juniper Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Kincardine Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7698 (iv).
'King Edward' Dredge, Emplymt. in Lunenburg Harbour: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 13063 (vii).
Knowlton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Lachine Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 12097 (vii).
Lachute Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
'Lady of the Lake,' Str., purchased by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3434 (ii).
Ladysmith Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Ladysmith Wharf, B.C., Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8176 (iv).
Lake Ainslie Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Lake Aylmer, Wharf at Garthby: in Com. of Sup., 12032 (vi).
Lake Dauphin, Lowering Lake: in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).
Lakefield Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Lake Francois Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
Lake Megantic Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12032 (vi).
Lake Megantic Public Works, Total Cost to Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 11299 (vi).
Lake St. Francis Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. John Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. Peter Piers: in Com. of Sup., 4752 (iii).
Lakeville Harbour Opening: in Conc., 13568 (vii).
Lavaltrie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7705, 7815 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Lennox Island Wharf, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8444 (v).
Leonardsville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
—— Report *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Les Eboulements Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lesser Slave Lake, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5719 (iii).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
Little Current Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Little Sands Wharf, Repairs, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 2397 (ii).
Loggieville, Dredging, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9472 (v).
Longueuil Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7304 (iv).
Lorneville Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Lotbinière Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lower Newcastle Wharf on Miramichi River: in Com. of Sup., 11695 (vi).
Lunenburg Public Building Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vii).
McGregor's Creek, Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
McPherson's Cove Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11229, 11292 (vi).
Madawaska River, Extension Dyke: in Com. of Sup., 11696 (vi), 13344 (vii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Magdalen Islands, Breakwater and Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).

Magnetawan River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).

Magog Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv), 13329 (vii).

Malbay (Gaspé) Boat Shelter: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).

Maple Creek, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8600 (v), 13337 (vii).

Margaree Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 11229 (vi).

Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).

Mar. Provs. Harbours and Rivers, Creosoted Timber: in Com. of Sup., 12028 (vi).

Markham Public Building: in Com of Sup., 7709 (iv), 13331 (vii).

Maskinonge River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).

Matane Breakwater and Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).

Matchedash Bay, Dredging at Fesserton, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 566 (i).

Meaford Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).

Medicine Hat Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8601 (v).

——Contract *re* Heating System: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 10791 (vi).

Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).

Michipicoton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).

Middle River, Shear Dam Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11229 (vi).

Midland Harbour, Tenders for Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3239 (ii), 8893 (v).

Midland and Tiffin Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).

—— Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3428 (ii).

Midland, Tiffin and Victoria Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8181 (iv).

Milford Haven, N.S. Wharf, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 13060 (vii).

Miscou Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).

Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).

Moncton Wharf Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 11696 (vi).

'Montague' Dredge, Amounts paid for Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 182 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8172 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Montmagny and Cap St. Ignace Wharfs, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).

Montmagny Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).

Montmorency Falls, Retaining Walls, Length, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12410 (vii).

Montreal Harbour and St. Lawrence River, Dredging and Elevator Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1683 (i).

Montreal and Quebec Ports, Expenditure for the last fifty Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 3482 (ii).

Moose Jaw Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vii).

—— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).

Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).

Neepawa Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8536 (v), 13335 (vii).

N.B. Inland Water Wharf, Construction Policy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 5465 (iii).

New Glasgow Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11257 (vi).

New London Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11292 (vi).

New Mills Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).

Nicolet County, Govt. Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Turcotte) 12775 (vii).

Nicolet Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).

Nicolet Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7428 (iv).

Nicolet River Dredging, Emplymt. of Narcisse Jutras: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).

—— Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3840 (ii), 4588 (iii).

Nicolet River Protection Walls, Repairs, Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 4588 (iii).

Nicolet River Wharf, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3478 (ii).

North Bay, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7712, 7810 (iv), 13332 (vii).

North East Harbour Wharf, Total Length: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11019 (vi).

Notre Dame de Portage Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).

—— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6400 (iv).

Old Man's River: in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).

Oromocto Shoals, Contract *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11496 (vi).

Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Ottawa Buildings, Archives Fitting, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5700 (iii).
——— Canadian Building, Rental, Space, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5207 (iii).
——— Corry Building, Total Rental per Annum, Taxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 11938 (vi).
——— Eastern Block Extension: in Com. of Sup., 1504 (i).
——— Elevator Attendants: in Com. of Sup., 11011 (vi).
——— Experimental Farm Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii).
——— Improvements, Repairs, &c.: in Com of Sup., 5707 (iii).
——— Langevin Block Basement, Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3483 (ii).
——— Lighting, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11011 (vi).
——— Mackenzie Avenue: in Com. of Sup., 1505 (i).
——— Major's Hill Park: in Com. of Sup., 11015 (vi).
——— Mint, in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
——— Mint Building, Imperfect Ventilation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 3036 (ii).
——— Renewing Skylights: in Com. of Sup., 7816 (iv).
——— Rentals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (iii), 10983 (vi).
——— list read (Mr. Pugsley) 10998 (vi).
——— Repairs, Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10981 (vi).
——— Rideau Hall, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11005 (vi).
——— Rideau Hall Improvements, Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5467 (iii).
——— Sussex Street Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii), 13478 (vii).
——— Sussex Street Property Purchase, Payments to Jos. Riopelle: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3844 (ii)
——— Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 11012 (vi).
——— Victoria Memorial Museum: in Com. of Sup., 1489 (i), 13477 (vii).
——— progress *re* construction: Remarks (Mr. Blain) on conc., 13568 (vii).
——— Western Block Extension, Total Cost, Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 512 (i).
Ouelle River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Owen Sound Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7817 (iv).
——— Contract *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Owen Sound Public Building, Sub-letting of Contract by Leslie: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
Owen Sound Building Inspector, Apptmt. of Mr. Foster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
Owen Sound Dredging Co., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2792 (ii).
Oyster Pond Breakwater Extension: in Com of Sup., 11258 (vi).
Parker's Cove Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11258 (vi).
Park Hill Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Parrsborough Harbour Improvements: in Com., of Sup., 11259 (vi).
——— Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vii).
Pelican Lake Channel, Opening of: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1940 (i).
Petawawa Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12133 (vii).
——— Ques. (Mr. White) 685 (i).
Petite Descharge, Lac St. Jean, Removal of Rock: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Petit Rocher Breakwater, Contracts, O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Taylor) 1294 (i).
——— Incomplete Return: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 5723 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Taylor) 6464 (iv).
——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 10402 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7107 (iv).
——— Stmnt. as to Missing Letters: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 9716 (v).
Piche Point (Lake Temiscaming) Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Pictou Post Office Building, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10518 (vi).
Pinette Harbour, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 685 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9474 (v).
Plessisville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Point Edward Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5713 (iii).
Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Completion of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3898 (ii).
Pointe aux Trembles Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
——— Contract of Messrs. Dusseault & Pageau, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8838 (v).
——— Date of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9267 (v).
——— Number of Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1734 (i), 2394 (ii).
Poirierville Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 11260 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Portage la Prairie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).

Port Arthur and Fort William, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12144 (vii).

——— Dredging, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8617 (v).

Port Arthur Harbour, Dredging Contracts, Securities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 697 (i).

Port Arthur Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).

Port Burwell, Harbour Improvement: in Com .of Sup., 12135 (vii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2389 (ii).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Marshall) 556 (i).

Port Colborne Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12146 (vii).

Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10513 (vi).

——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).

Port Dufferin Dredging, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4828 (iii).

Porter's Lake Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11260 (vi)

Port Hastings Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11265 (vi).

Port Hilford Breakwater, Protection: in Com. of Sup., 11267 (vi).

Port Hood Harbour, Closing Northern Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 11268 (vi).

——— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10255 (v).

Port Hope Pier, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12135 (vii).

Port Joli West, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).

Port Maitland Piers, Tenders, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Lalor) 1294 (i).

——— Amount of Mr. Battle's Tender: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 690 (i).

——— Apptmt. of W. W. Krick as Inspector: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 6919 (iv).

——— Entrance Pier, Renewal: in Com. of Sup., 5673 (iii).

Port Royal (Madame Island) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11278 (vi).

Port St. François Wharf, Construction, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3423 (ii).

Port Stanley Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).

——— Breakwater, Contractors, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 239 (i).

Portuguese Cove Breakwater Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).

Port Vernon Bridge, P.E.I., Completion of Work, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4404 (iii).

Post Offices, Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11007 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Prince Albert, Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vii).

——— Penitentiary Building: in Com. of Sup., 8601 (v).

P.E.I. Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1686 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 9893 (v).

Public Works Dept., Architectural Branch, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11096 (vi).

——— Clerical and Temporary Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 11099 (vi).

——— Ass't Dep. Minister, Apptmt. of : in Com. of Sup., 5698 (iii).

——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Pugsley) 7 (i).

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 638 (i), 12917 (vii).

——— Engineering Branch, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11093 (vi).

——— Estimates, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 5661 (iii).

——— Estimates, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5730 (iii).

——— Gratuities to Public Works Officials: in Com. of Sup., 5730 (iii).

——— New Appointments: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 13061 (vii).

——— Ret.: on Inquiry for (Mr. Pugsley) 6223 (iv).

——— Technical Books of Reference : in Com. of Sup., 11100 (vi).

——— Telegraph Branch, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11097 (vi).

——— Unprovided Items: in Com. of Sup., 11119 (vi).

Public Works, Estimated Cost, Extravagant Expenditure, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 7145 (iv).

Public Works Expenditures : Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4868, 4886; Neg. (Y. 43, N. 99) 4959 (iii).

Public Works Expenditure in Mar. Provs., since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 555 (i).

Public Works in Harbours and Rivers, Ont., Tenders, Amounts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 559 (i).

Pugwash Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).

Quebec County, Expenditures by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 3847 (ii).

——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Robitaille) 3853 (ii).

Quebec Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).

Quebec Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12144 (vii).

——— Specifications, Stmnt. of Expenditure, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 5802 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Quebec Port, Sums expended for Improvements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 697 (i).
Quesnel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10867 (vi).
Rainy River, Long Sault Rapids: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Raquette River Dredging, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (ii).
——— Correction of Answer (Mr. Pugsley) 5658 (iii).
Red Head Wharf, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11019 (vi).
Renfrew Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Revelstoke Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Richelieu River Ice Piers, St. John : in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Richibucto, Extension of Piers: in Com. of Sup., 11698 (vi).
——— Wharf, Length, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 12412 (vii).
Rimouski County Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10013 (v).
Rimouski Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Rivière a la Graisse Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 686 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 853 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bergeron) 3689 (ii).
Rivière du Lievre, Lock and Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Rivière du Loup Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 6462 (iv).
Rivière du Loup Post Office, Improvement to Grounds: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
Rivière du Loup Wharf, Total Expenditure *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 6462 (iv).
Rivière du Loup (Fraserville) Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Roberval, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Roche's Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Rossport Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Round Hill Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11282 (vi) .
Ruscombe River Works, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1122 (i).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11293 (vi).
St. Alphonse (de Bagotville) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
St. Andrew's Rapids, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii), 12011 (vi), 12145 (vii).
St. Anicet Wharf, Apptmt. of Mr. Dupuis, Revenues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3230 (ii).
——— Expenditure and Collections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1935 (i).
——— Expenditure by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3479 (ii).
Ste. Anne de Monts Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Boniface Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8566 (v).
——— Contract Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4246 (iii).
——— Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5999 (iii).
St. Francis River, Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
——— Melbourne Pier, Rock Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6918 (iv).
——— Piers at Richmond, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6641, 6918 (iv).
St. Francois Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Fulgence Pier, Signatures on Paymaster's List: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1115 (i).
——— Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bergeron) 1130 (i).
St. Hyacinthe Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).
St. Ignace de Loyola Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Jacques River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Jean, Island of Orleans Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. John, Dom. Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
St. John Harbour Improvements, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii), 12011 (vi).
——— Contracts with Dom. Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11700 (vi).
——— Dredging Contracts, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11496 (vi).
St. John River, Removal of Snags, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 3477 (ii).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
——— Tidal Waters Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12000 (vi).
——— Tributaries: in Com. of Sup., 11698 (vi).
——— Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
St. Joseph's Wharf, Ont., Tenders, &c., *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8890 (v).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

St. Laurent Wharf: Expenditure *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 895, 1121 (ii).

St. Laurent Wharf, Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).

St. Louis River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).

St. Mary's Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7826 (iv).

St. Mary's River, Kaministiquia, Port Arthur, &c., Dredging Contracts, Expenditure *re*, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 853 (i).

St. Maurice, Dam at Grande Piles: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).

St. Omer Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).

St. Pierre les Becquets Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).

St. Rochs Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7433 (iv).

St. Simeon Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).

St. Thérèse Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).

Saguenay River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).

——— Purchase of Coal: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8380 (v).

——— 'Storm King,' Tug, Emplymt. of: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8381 (v).

Sarnia Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7829 (iv).

Saskatoon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8602 (v), 13337 (vii).

Sault Ste. Marie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).

Scotch Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).

Scotch Town Wharf, Application: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7202 (iv).

Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).

Seal Cove Dredging, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).

Selkirk Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8547 (v).

Seven Islands, Public Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2394 (ii).

Severn River, Improvement of Waterway: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).

Shawenegan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).

Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7173 (iv).

Shellmouth River Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 12143 (vii).

Sherbrooke Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Shippegan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12027 (vi).

Simcoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7830 (iv), 13333 (vii).

'Sir Wilfrid Laurier,' Dredge, Completion, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5207 (iii).

Skinner's Cove, Pier Protection: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).

——— Boat Channel, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10012 (v).

Slides and Booms Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 11071 (vi).

Snag Boat, Red River, Construction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 567 (i).

Sorel, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).

Souris Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).

——— Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1685 (i).

Souris Harbour Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1939 (i).

Souris Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).

Souris Wharf, Permission to Build, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7728 (iv).

Southampton Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).

Spanish River Dredging, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4764 (iii).

Spillumcheen River Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).

Spry Bay Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2391 (ii).

Stanley Island Wharf and Pier, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5720 (iii).

Strathcona Horse, Barracks, Stables, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10975 (vi).

Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).

Sudbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).

Summerside Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13343 (vii).

Surveys, Slides and Booms: in Com. of Sup., 11071 (vi).

Sydney Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11230 (vi).

Taché, J. C., Apptmt. in Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8180 (iv).

Tancook Island Breakwater :in Com. of Sup., 11230 (vi).

Tatamagouche Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).

Tatamagouche Dredging, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 11701 (vi).

Temiskaming Wharf, Montreal River: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).

Thames River Wharf, Damages to: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 7506 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Thompson River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Three Rivers, Deep Water Coal Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
——— Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
——— Dredging, Tenders *re* Owen Sound Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8892 (v).
Tiffin Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5709 (iii), 13351 (vii).
Tignish Breakwater, P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
——— Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Leurgey) 682 (i).
——— Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3229 (iii)
Tilbury Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vii).
Tilsonburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Tobermory Harbour Booms: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Toney River Boat Harbour, Amount of Contract, Extras, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9711 (v).
Toronto Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Toronto (eastern gap) Harbour, Amount of Dredging, &.: Ques. (Mr. Madonell) 354 (i).
——— Contract, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 10014 (v).
——— Date of Murray & Cleveland's Contract, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1507 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 2397 (ii).
Toronto (western gap) Harbour, Construction of Entrance: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 354, 518, (i), 4587 (iii).
——— Delay in Contract: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 5915 (iii).
Toronto Island Tunnel, Deputation *re* Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5564 (iii).
Tracadie Harbour Breakwater, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5472 (iii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, Laundry, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7187 (iv).
Tracadie Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
Uxbridge Public Building: Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Vancouver, Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10868 (vi).
Varennes Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Vaudreuil County, Dredging, Supt.'s Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
Vernon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10870 (vi), 13339 (vii).
Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I., Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5471 (iii).
Victoria Beach Piers, Amounts expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 237 (i).
Victoria Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Victoria Harbour, Tenders for Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8893 (v).
Walkerville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Waterloo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Welchpool, N.B., Wharf, Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 7935 (iv).
Welland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7830 (iv).
Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Westville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7179 (iv).
——— Total Amount of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9474 (v).
Wetaskiwin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Wharfs and Bridges in Quebec, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Wharfs, Piers, Amount of Revenue collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2391 (ii).
Wharfs, Piers and Harbours, Expenditure since 1895: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5078 (iii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 5476 (iii).
——— Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 5800, 5802 (iii).
Wharfs, Piers, &c., and other Public Works, Expenditure since Jan. 1st, 1897, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1130 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4867 (iii).
Whitby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7833 (iv).
White Head Wharf, Report *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Wiarton Dredging, Payments to Mr. Bowman: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6407 (iv).
——— Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6236 (iv).
Winfield Basin Dredging, Tender, Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6461 (iv).
William's Head Quarantine Station Building: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
Winnipegosis Lake Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).
Winnipeg River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vii).
Yamaska River Dredging: in Com of Sup., 5708 (iii), 12043 (vi).
Yamaska River Lock: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
Yarmouth, N.S., Dredging Contracts, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11500 (vi).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11291 (vi).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7180 (iv).
Pugwash Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Pulp Wood Exported to U.S., Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1511 (i).
Pulp Wood Export Duty: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4774 (iii).
See 'Wood.'
Quahaug and Clam Fishing, Contemplated Change: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1940 (i).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry., &c., Cost of Mail Service: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1130 (i).
——— Last Deficit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6459 (iv).
Quarantine Lands, Sask., Sale of, &c.: Ques (Mr. Ames) 3481 (ii).
Quarantine Public Health: in Com. of Sup., 5504 (iii).
Quarantine Stations: in Com. of Sup., 11008 (vi).
Quarter Sections, 35, 31, 6, &c., Public and Private Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 8176 (iv).
Quebec Battlefields: *See* 'B. Nos 111 and 219.'
Que. Bridge and Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 217.'
Quebec Bridge Accident, Apptmt. of Engineer Hoare: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 8173 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Bank Claims, &c.: Corrected Information (Mr. Fielding) 6059 (iii)
——— Change of Plans *re* Height: Ques. (Mr Armstrong) 5202 (iii).
——— Construction Materials, Customs Duties collected: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5793 (iii).
——— Cor., Plans, Specifications, O.Cs., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 605 (i).
——— Dom. Govt. Guarantee, Amount, &c. Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2394 (ii).
——— Govt. Grants, Investigation *re*: M. for Sel. Com.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2547 (ii).
——— G.T.P., Agreement *re* Rentals: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13227 (vii).
——— Horse and Vehicle Traffic: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 10739 (vi).
——— Material, Customs Duties collected &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5200 (iii).
——— Material on Hand, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1290 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Moneys contributed *re* Finances, Estimated Cost of Completion: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5566 (iii).
——— Names of Jurymen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 7991 (iv).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Commission: in Com of Sup., 12769 (vii).
Quebec Bridge, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 30; (Mr. Monk) 535 (i).
——— Report, Distribution of Printed Copies: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5914 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) 10302 (vi).
——— Evidence, &c.: M. (Mr. Maclean) to ref. to Special Com., 10401 (vi).
——— Inquiry for Report (Mr. R. L. Borden) 946, 1739 (i), 3043 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 3043, 4494 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Haggart) 6223 (iv).
——— Report: Presented (Mr. Graham) 4566 (iii), 10915 (vi).
Quebec Bridge, Commission's Report, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6924, 7099, 8171 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) 8608 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Barker) 3901 (ii).
Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Special Com.: M. (Mr. Chisholm) to conc., 13353, Amt. (Mr. Monk) 13363, Neg. (Y. 52; N. 103) 13414 (vii).
Quebec Bridge, Salaries to Officials: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13517 (viii).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy, Apptmt. of Committee, 8440 (v).
Quebec Canals, Steam Road Rollers: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
Quebec, Citadel Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv).
——— Cliff Walls, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12148 (viii).
Quebec Conty, Expenditures by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 3847 (ii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Robitaille) 3853 (ii).
Quebec, Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7431 (iv).
——— Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12144 (vii).
——— Specifications, Stmnt. of Expenditure, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 5802 (iii).
Quebec Immigrant Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
——— Immigrant Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
Quebec Judges, Apptmt. to Superior Court: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 11825 (vi), 12190 (vii).
——— Additional Apptmts.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. on B. 206, 13048 (vii).
——— Apptmt. of Additional Judge: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).

Que. and N. B. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 128'
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13290 (viii).
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry., Branch Lines Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).
Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.'s Bridge Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).
Quebec Port Improvements, Expenditure since Confederation, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 697 (i).
Quebec Ry. Light and Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 73.'
Quebec Religious Feuds, Letter of Rev. Mr. Dumesnil to Papal Ablegate, Signed 'P.M. G.': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lemieux) 11501 (vi).
Quebec Port, Sums expended for Improvements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
Quebec Reviews, Expenditure: in Com. of Sup. 13176 (vii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Rural Corps: Letter Read (Mr. Blain) 8694 (v).
—— Attendance of Veterans: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7998 (iv), 8695 (v).
—— Battlefields: *See* 'B. Nos. 111 and 129.'
—— Food Supply: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).
—— Joint Meeting of Members and Senators: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 6061 (iii).
—— Legal Holidays: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7934 (iv).
—— Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 8851 (v).
—— Number of Troops to be sent, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10259 (v).
—— Par. in 'Le Canada': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4669 (iii).
—— Protests from Regiments *re* Attendance: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7992 (iv).
—— Rep. of Commission: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7449 (iv).
—— Rural Corps, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 10292 (v).
—— Transportation of Troops: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 8377, 8384; City Corps, &c. (Mr. S. Hughes) 8386 (v).
Quebec Tercentary Postage Stamps, French and English Printing: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7935 (v).
—— Issue of: Ques. (Mr. McColl) 12414 (vii).
—— Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8895 (v).
Quebec Tercentenary, Visit of Prince of Wales, Par. in Halifax 'Chronicle': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 5209 (iii).
Quesnel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10867 (vi).
Questions, Answering of, Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) 234; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 234 (i).
—— Precedence of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 350 (i).
Ques. of Privilege, Anti-Catholic Article in 'Leader' (Mr. Bergeron) 8604 (v).
—— *re* Doukhobors: (Mr. S. Hughes) 7321
—— Hunter, Mr., and French Canadians (Mr. Robitaille) 8465 (v).
—— Par. in 'La Presse' *re* Vote on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 2022 (ii).
—— *re* Stmnts of Mr. Conmee (Mr. Boyce) 7995 (iv).
Quilty, H. A., Examination *re* Train Despatcher: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13225 (vii).
Ry. Act. Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 85 and 100.'
Ry. Act, B. 3: Ques. of Order, ref. to debate in Senate: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 577 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on Order for 2° (remarks) 938 (i).
—— B. No. 27 (Mr. Macdonald) on Order for 2°: Remarks (Mr. Johnston) 5211 (iii).
Ry. Act (construction) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 4.'
—— (demurrage) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
—— (8-hour day) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 157.'
—— (employees' liability) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
—— (expropriation) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
—— (fire damages) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 18.'
—— (level crossings) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
—— (mileage books) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 90.'
—— (ry. commission) Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 & 112.'
—— (ry. commission) Amt. B. No. 118 (Mr. Graham) rsmg. adjn. debate on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3° (Mr. Aylesworth) 11590; Amt., Neg. (Y. 36, N. 77) 11600; Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 11602; Amt. (Mr. (Mr. Monk) 11603; Neg. (Y. 36, N. 89) 11608 (vi); Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11614, 11619; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 74) 11631; Amt. (Mr. Macdonell) 11632 (vi).
—— (securities) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 204.'
—— (telegraphers, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 118.'
—— (trains on time) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
—— (wires, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 43.'
—— (working hours) Amt. B. No. 157 (Mr. R. Smith): Remarks (Mr. Monk) 10120 (v)
Railway Commission, Applications *re* Crossing of Tracks, by Water Mains, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 1294 (i).
—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
—— Increase of. *See* 'B. No 112.'
—— Jurisdiction of: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 and 118.'
—— Legal Expenditures: in Com. of Sup., 10362 (vi).
—— Salaries and Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 10385 (vi).
—— Total Expenditure in Counsel Fees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10256 (v).
Ry. Mail Clerk at Edmonton, Expenses *re* Trial: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9108 (v).

Ry. Subsidies: *See* 'B. No. 215.'
Railway Surveys, Colchester County, Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2980 (ii).
——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 5046 (iii).
Railway Tracks, Crossing by Water Mains, Applications to Board, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 1109 (i).
Rails purchased from Govt. by N. B. Coal and Ry. Co., Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 9269 (v).
RAILWAYS :
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Subsidies, Reports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 892 (i).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G.T. Ry. Co.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Northrup) 2796 (ii).
Brockville and Ottawa, Ry. Connections, Charges against Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 1429 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn. Hse., 186 (i).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) 9 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 432 (i).
See 'G.T.R..' &c.
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ontario Ry. Co., Exercise of Powers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 236 (i).
Canada Eastern Ry., Cattle killed, Compensation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).
Canadian Northern Ry., Rep. of Engineer *re* Erwood and Pas Missions: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 13475 (vii).
C. P. Ry., Compensation *re* Right of Way: in Com. of Sup., 5561 (iii).
——— Land Taxation, Test Cases, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2170 (ii).
——— Saskatchewan Bridge Subsidy: in Com of Sup., 13305 (vii).
——— Taxation Cases: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 5049 (iii).
Central Ry. of Canada, Charter Grant, Deposit *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4767 (iii).
Falconer, K., Payments by Ry. Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).
Freight Rates, Discrimination *re* City of St. John, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr Crocket) 2397 (ii).
French Language on Ry. Crossings, &c. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2021 (ii).
Govt. Railways System: *See* 'I.C.R., &c.'
G.T. Ry., Connection at Brockville: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) 9 (i).
——— Connections at Prescott: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 433 (i).
See 'Brockville,' &c.
G.T. Ry. and C.P.R. Connection at Wingham: Remarks (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) 191 (i).
RAILWAYS—*Con.*
G.T. Ry., Entrance into Toronto, O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 556 (i).
G.T.P. and N.T. Ry., Disputed Questions: (Mr. Barker) 6235 (iv).
Hudson Bay Railway, Construction, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Knowles) 6291 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Borden) on Financial Review, 13467 (ii).
——— Proposition *re* Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W .J. Roche) 5789 (iii).
——— Railway Building to Fort Churchill, &c., Cor., Documents, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Schaffner) 1689 (i).
——— Surveys, Locations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12764 (vii).
Indiantown and Blackville Branch Ry., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12258 (vii).
International Ry., N.B., Directors, Amount of Stocks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4246 (iii).
Inverness County, Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. McLennan) 12233 (vii).
Labour Organizations *re* Ry. Employees, Par. in Halifax 'Herald': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 8289 (v).
Land Grants, Amounts and Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4766 (iii), 9271 (v).
Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and N. W. Ters., Areas reserved on July 1st, 1896; Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 13512 (vii).
Land Grants in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Total Acreage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 6920 (iv).
Land Grants to Rys. prior to 1896, Total Acreage: Ques. (Mr. W. McIntyre) 8182 (iv).
Land Subsidies to Rys., Areas granted from 1892-06: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8613 (v).
National Transcontinental: *See* 'G.T.P.'
N.B. Coal and Ry. Co., Balance of Subsidy, Claims *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 9270 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 9714 (v).
New York Central, Discrimination by Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10328 (vi).
Rails purchased from Govt. by N. B. Coal and Ry. Co., Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 9269 (v).
Railway Arbitrations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10329 (vi).
Railway Bridge Subsidies: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. on Res., 13309 (vii).
Ry. Charters and Land Grants, Renewals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 9271 (v).
Railway Connections, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) 434 (i).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
——— Extra Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 10342

RAILWAYS—*Con.*
Railway Estimates, Obstruction in Sup.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10129 (v)
——— Vote for: Remarks (Mr. Graham) 10007 (v).
Railways Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 10341 (vi).
Railways, Litigation Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 10357 (vi).
Railways and Municipalities, Agreements, Penalties *re* Violations: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 6987 (iv).
Railways Statistical Branch: in Com. of Sup., 10328 (vi).
Railway Statistics Report: Presented (Mr. Graham) 1346 (i).
Ry. Subsidies, Applications for, Memorandum: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).
Ry. Subsidies: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12771 (vii).
Toronto and Schomberg Ry. Blockade: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3901 (ii).
White Pass Ry. Co., (Appeal of Dawson Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 10736 (vi).
Rainy River. Long Sault Rapids: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Rama Indian Fund, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 8610 (v).
Ramsland Homestead Entry, Improvements, &c,: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5209 (iii).
Ranchvale Homestead Entries, Receipts, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5258 (iii).
Ranchvale Sub-land Agency, Closing of: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4829 (iii).
Rankin, Col., Resignation of: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 11405 (vi).
Raquette River Dredging, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
——— Correction of Answer (Mr. Pugsley) 5658 (iii).
Rattenbury & Co., Purchase of Seed Oats, Assignment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 12392 (vii).
Receiver-General's Office: in Com. of Sup., 12160 (vii).
Red Ensign Flying from Merchant Vessels, Authority for: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 12775 (vii).
Red Head Wharf, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11019 (vi).
Reformatories Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Regina Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8602 (v).
Rehm, Frederick C., *et al*, Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 110.'
Reinhardt, Mr. Paul, Emplymt. by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 10361 (vi).
Reinhardt, Mr., Interference in Quebec Provl. Elections: Cor., &c., read (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10986 (vi).
See 'Caron.'
Renfrew Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Representation from Mar. Provs.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Daniel) 9891 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Fielding) 9892 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 9892 (v).
Representation in H. of C. for the Mar. Provinces: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Daniel) 9780 (v).
Restaurant of H. of C. and Senate : M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Joint Com., 13224 (vii).
——— 1st Rep.: Presented (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 13510 (vii).
Restraint of Trade, Conspiracy in: *See* 'B. No. 96.'
Returns delayed: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13082 (vii).
Returning Officers, Apptmnt. of: Remarks (Mr. Telford) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).
Returns, Detention of by Members: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5048 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 2024 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Bergeron) 13081 (vii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2384 (ii), 6847 (iv).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Boyce) 2384 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 1018 (i), 3318, 2309 (ii), 4223, 4832, 6010 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 4495 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Macdonell) 569 (i), 2885 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. A. Martin) 5491 (iii), 7722 (iv).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8516 (v).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Taylor) 2738 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Worthington) 2024 (ii).
Returns ordered, Lost, &c., Placed in Record Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2882 (ii).
Returns, Questions, &c., ordered by House, Time to Complete, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 4242 (iii).
———Retention by Members: Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in Toronto 'Globe' (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4660 (iii).
See 'Documents,' &c.
Returns unopposed: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5914 (iii).
Revelstoke Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Revised Statutes, Completion of French Edition: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 6983 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 357 (i).
Rhindress, Dr. Horace, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 6000 (iii), 6232 (iv).
Richard, Mr., Emplymt. on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
Richelieu River Ice Piers, St. John's: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).

Richibucto, Extension of Piers: in Com. of Sup., 11698 (vi).
Richibucto Wharf, Length, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 12412 (vii).
Rideau Canal, Buoys between Merrickville and Edmond Rapids, Contract *re* Lighting: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8613 (v).
See 'Canals.'
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
Rideau Hall Improvements, Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5467 (iii).
——— Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11005 (vi).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Applications for Homesteads: Letter from Mr. Seaman read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 9992 (v).
——— Timber Reserve, Preservation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) on M. for Sup., 7653 (iv).
——— Squatters' Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 175 (i).
Rifle and Artillery Association Grants: in Com. of Sup., 12152 (vii).
Rifles purchased by Govt. since 1896, Number, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5654 (iii).
Rifles purchased from other Companies than Ross Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1123 (i).
See 'Ross Rifle.'
Rifle Ranges, Charlottetown, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 6233 (iv).
Rimouski County Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10013 (v).
Rimouski, Dredging, &c., *re* Landing of 'Lady Evelyn': Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7727 (iv).
See 'Post Office.'
Rimouski Mail Contracts, Payments to Str. 'Rhoda': Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8176 (iv).
Rimouski Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Rivard, Mr. S., Emplymt. on Nicolet Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
Rivière à la Graisse, Dredging, &c., Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 853 (i).
———Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 686 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bergeron) 3689
Rivière du Lievre, Lock and Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Rivière du Loup Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 6462 (iv).
Rivière du Loup (Fraservile) Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Rivière du Loup, Postmaster, Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
——— Post Office, Improvement to Grounds: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
Rivière du Loup Station, Improvement *re* Platforms: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 5468 (iii).
Rivière du Loup Wharf, Total Expenditure *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 6462 (iv).
River St. John, Tributaries: in Com. of Sup., 11698 (vi).
Robbins Irrigation Co., Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4763 (iii).
——— M. for Papers (Mr. Ames) 5210 (iii).
Roberts, Mr. J. M., Promotion *re* Interior Dept: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9693 (v).
Roberval Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Roche's Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Rocky Mountain Park: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Rolla L. Crain, Amounts paid to: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 3435 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3239 (ii).
Rolling Stock, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12257 (vii).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Rossport Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Ross Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Ranges, Par. in 'Ottawa Citizen' *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 10515 (vi).
——— Accident at Rockliffe Range, Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 11494 (vi).
——— Advances *re* Contracts, Cor. with Bank of Montreal: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 4773 (iii).
Ross Rifle Bayonets, Adoption of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5786 (iii).
——— Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6235, 8176 (iv).
——— Date of Contract, O.C., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paterson) 8442 (v).
——— provisions *re* &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3483 (ii).
——— M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5476 (iii).
Ross Rifle, Bonus, Loans, Services of Govt. Employees, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 559 (i).
——— Contract: in Com. of Sup., 13542 (ii).
——— Contract Price, Inspection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 8174 (iv).
——— Contracts *re* Supply of Rifles, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 557 (i).
——— Consignment to N.W. Mounted Police, Manufacture, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5259 (iii).
——— Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re* Defects: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5210 (iii).
——— Delivered per Contract, Cost per Rifle: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8180 (iv).

Ross Rifle, Disposition of Manufactured Rifles, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3237 (ii).
—— Evidence before Pub. Accounts Com., Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Worthington) 5914 (iii).
—— Extension of Cove Field Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4404 (iii).
—— Factory, Pet. *re* Establishment on Plains of Abraham: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3903 (ii).
Ross Rifle, Inefficiency and Extravagance of Militia Dept.: Amt. (Mr. Worthington) on M.for Sup., 8902-8953 (v); Neg. (Y. 18; N. 55) 9090 (v).
—— Correction of Mr. S. Hughes' Speech: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bergeron) 9126 (v).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* Mr. Bergeron's denial of Stmnt., 9330 (v).
Ross Rifle, Inter-changeable parts with Lee-Enfield Rifles, Cor. with Imp. Govt.: Ques, (Mr. Worthington) 3898 (ii).
—— Negotiations with Vickers Maxim Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 178 (i).
—— Number ordered, Payments, Total Number, delivered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).
—— Number reported unfit for Use: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3841 (ii).
—— Payments to since Jan. 1, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7209 (iv).
—— Rep. of British War Office *re* Cor., Disappearance from Library of H. of C.: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Fred. Borden) 4961 (iii).
—— Rep. of Col. Gaudet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9713 (v).
—— Rep. from Military Associations, &c., *re* Efficiency: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 557 (i).
—— Report from Public Accounts, Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
—— Sealed Pattern, Discovery of: Ques (Mr. Worthington) 3237 (ii).
—— Services of Govt. Officials, Names, Rank, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 365 (i).
—— Target Practice, Suspension by N.W. M. Police: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3847 (ii).
—— Tests in England, Reps., &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Frederick Borden) 8167 (iv).
—— Total Number in Use in Canada by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5786 (iii).
Round Bay, N.S., Removal of Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11297 (vi).
Round Hill Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11282 (vi).
Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. John, Tenders *re* Supplies: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 5788 (iii).
Royal Commission Return: Inquiry for (Mr Porter) 6288, 7447 (iv).
See 'Commissions'.
Royal Military College Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv), 12152, 13177 (vii).
—— Barracks, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
—— Investigation into Conduct of Cadet Lancaster: on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1019 (i).
Royal Mint, Amount of Silver and Gold Coins, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8612 (v).
—— Cor. with Imp. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Caron) 5210 (iii).
Royal Mint, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 1451
See 'Public Works, Ottawa.'
Rules of the House, Amendments to: Prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2984 (ii).
Ruscombe River Works, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1122 (i).
Russian Govt. Payments *re* Compensation to B.C. Sealers: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
—— Seizures of Canadian Vessels, Compensation *re*: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2391 (ii).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11293 (vi).
Ruthenian Catholic Mission, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 69.'
Ryan, Mr. G. M., Appt. of Successor as Ry. Mail Supt.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 7504 (iv).
St. Alphonse (de Bagotville) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Andrew's Rapids, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii), 12011 (vi), 12145 (vii).
St. Andrew's Rapids, Improvements, Land Grant to Great Falls Power Co.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 238 (i).
St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe Waterway from Lake St. Francis, Letters, Plans, Surveys, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 1690 (i).
St. Anicet Wharf, Apptmt. of Mr. Dupuis, Revenues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3230 (ii).
—— Expenditure and Collections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1935 (i).
—— Expenditure by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3479 (ii).
Ste. Anne de Monts Harbour Improvements; in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
Ste. Anne de Sorel Lighthouse, Destruction of Trees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7731 (iv).
Ste. Barbe Floods, Rep. of Engineer: Remarks (Mr. R. N. Walsh) on M. for Sup., 7808 (iv).
—— Damages *re* Floods: Remarks (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 6987 (iv).
St. Boniface Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8566 (v).
St. Boniface Public Building, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4246, 5999 (iii).

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 98.'
St. Cyrille Ry. Diversion, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12756 (vii).
St. Francis River Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
St. Francis River, Melbourne Pier, Rock Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6918 (iv).
St. Francis River, Richmond Pier, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6641, 6918 (iv).
St. Francois, Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Francois Xavier Post Office, Apptmt. of Postmistress, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 5797 (iii).
St. Fulgence Pier, Paymaster's List, Signatures, &c., Apptmt. of Dr. Savard, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bergeron) 1130 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1115 (i).
St. Gabriel de Brandon Post Office, Savings Bank, Recommendation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4828 (iii).
—— M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 4589 (iii).
St. Henri Post Office Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7439 (iv).
St. Hyacinthe Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 10890 (vi).
St. Hyacinthe, 84th Regiment, Amount of Pay still Due: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 844 (i).
St. Hyacinthe Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).
St. Ignace de Loyola Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Irenee des Bains, Apptmt. of Mr. Geo. Girard as Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 5795 (iii).
St. Jacques River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Jean, Island of Orleans Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. John and Cumberland SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 12263 (vii).
St. John, N.B., Cold Storage Co., Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3580 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 3690 (ii).
—— Names of Stockholders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1938 (i).
See 'N.B.'
St. John, N.B., Dom. Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
—— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
St. John Fusiliers, 62nd Regiment, Payments *re* Annual Drill, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 847 (i).
St. John Harbour, Contracts with Dom. Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11700 (vi).
St. John Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii), 12011 (vi).
St John, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12257 (vii).
St. John Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
—— Military Stables: in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).
St. John Port, Dredging Contracts, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11496 (vi).
—— Quarantine Station, Partridge Island: in Com. of Sup., 5703 (iii).
—— Quarantine, Partridge Island Water Service: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
—— Steam Sterilizer: in Com. of Sup., 7187 (iv).
St. John River, Removal of Snags, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 3477 (ii).
—— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
—— Tidal Waters Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12000 (vi).
—— Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
St. John's, Que., Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).
St. Joseph's Wharf, Ont., Tenders, &c., *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8890 (v).
St. Laurent Wharf, Expenditure *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 895, 1121 (i).
St. Laurent Wharf, Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Lawrence Canals, District Office: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
St. Lawrence Power Co., and Long Sault Rapids Dam, Cor., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Gervais) 2996 (ii).
See 'Deep Waterways,' &c.
St. Lawrence River Route, Wrecks and Collisions: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 10739 (vi).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 5035 (iii).
St. Louis, H., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1347 (i), 2977 (ii).
—— Payments to by Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
St. Louis River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
St. Mary's Indian Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
St. Mary's Post Office, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 12735 (vii).
—— Items *re* Expenditure of $658.03: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 11937 (vi).
—— Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 11019 (vi).
St. Mary's Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7826 (iv).

St. Mary's River, Kaministiquia, Port Arthur, &c., Dredging Contracts, Expenditure *re*, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 853 (i).
St. Maurice, Dam at Grand Piles: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Omer Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Paschal and Kamouraska Mail Contracts, Tenders, Bondsmen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3236 (ii).
St. Pierre les Becquets Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Peter's Bay, Mail Contract with H. B. Finlay, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1686 (i).
St. Peter's Bay Post Office, Charges against Mrs. Finlay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1687 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 2170 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. Martin) 2786 (ii).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Instructions to Agents *re* Rights of Purchasers: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2217 (ii).
——— Pet. *re* Election of Chief and Councillors: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 7990 (iv).
——— Issue of Patents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1932 (i).
St. Rochs Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7438 (iv).
St. Rosalie Improvements, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5558 (iii), 12259 (vii).
St. Simeon Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Therese Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 12918 (vii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Holidays for Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2791 (ii).
——— Meat Contracts: Remarks (Mr. Leonard) in Com. of Sup., 5519 (iii).
——— Officers and Municipal Elections: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2791 (ii).
——— Warden Beauchamp, Interference in Elections, Charges *re* (Mr. Leonard) in Com. of Sup., 5538 (iii).
Sabourin, Maj., Cor. with Lt. Col. Malette and Dept.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bergeron) 3434 (ii).
Saccharine Standards, &c., *re* Sugar Manufacture: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 351 (i).
Sackville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12235 (vii).
Sacred Heart Post Office, Establishment of Six Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5472 (iii).
Saguenay Boom and Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Amounts paid Govt. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 183 (i).
See 'Chicoutimi.'
Saguenay River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
——— Purchase of Coal: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8380 (v).
——— 'Storm King, Tug, Employmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8381 (v).
Salaries of Judges: *See* 'Judges.'
Salmon Licenses granted in B.C., Exclusive Privileges, Penalties, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5801 (iii).
——— Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 5651 (iii).
——— in B.C.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5652 (iii).
Salmon Fishing Licenses in Gardner's Inlet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 5652 (iii).
Salmon Fishing Licenses, Number granted, in B.C., Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 5998 (iii).
Salmon Net Fishing in Restigouche River Privileges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13518 (vii).
Salvation Army Immigrants, Letter from Dr. Nadeau: Ques. of Priv. (Mr .A. Lavergne) 7094 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9973 (v).
——— Stmnt. of Genl. Booth: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2390 (ii).
Samovici, A., and H. Bolacan, Applications for Cancellation of Homestead Rights, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr .Lake) 557 (i).
Sand, Cement or Clay Utensils, imported from G.B. in 1904-5-6-7: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 1506 (i).
Sandwich Post Office Site, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
Sandy Cove, N.S., Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8891 (v).
Sarnia Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7829 (iv).
Saskatchewan and Alta., Assurance Fund: *See* 'B. No. 168.'
Saskatchewan Act, May 23rd, 1906, Constitutionality of, Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lake) 3435 (ii).
Saskatchewan Power Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 153.'
Saskatchewan Fishing Licenses, Issue of, &.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 351 (i).
Saskatchewan Legislature Acts, Reports *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6400 (iv).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Conditions of Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4761 (iii).
——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9280 (v).
——— Land Grants, Patents, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5801 (iii).
——— Sale of Homestead Lands: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9127 (v).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Stmnt. Read (Mr. Oliver) 10402 (vi).
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 70.'
Saskatoon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8602 (v), 13337 (vii).
Saturday Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11501 (vi).
'Sault Express,' Amounts paid to for Advertising, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 696 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 853, 1129 (i).
Sault Ste Marie Canal Construction: in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie Port, Farm Produce entered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 898 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Steel Works, Closing of: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 13470 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Sauve, Alfred, Rep. of Investigation *re* Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9278 (v).
Sawmill Owners, Applications refused *re* Timber Cutting: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 557 (i).
School Lands Exchange: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
School Acts, Saskatchewan, Disallowance of: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6644 (iv).
—— Notice of Discussion (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6647 (iv).
—— M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to adjn., 6854 (iv).
School, Timber and Coal Lands in Man., &c., Average Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3430 (ii).
Scotch Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
Scotch Hill East, Post Office, Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2793 (ii).
Scotch Town Wharf, Application: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7202 (iv).
Scrip received on Account of Lands, Mines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3431 (ii).
—— M. for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 3852 (ii).
Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Seal Cove Dredging, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Sec. of State, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 611 (i).
Section 14, Southeast Quarter, Applications for: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Herron) 5476 (iii).
Section 32, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 8383 (v).
Securities of Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 204.'
Seed Control Act, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5500 (iii).
Seed Grain in N.W., Distribution to Settlers, Apptmt. of Mr. R. E. A. Leech: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3040 (ii).
Seed Grain, Distribution, Duties of Mr. Leech: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3158 (ii).
Seed Grain, Buying and Distribution. Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13420 vii).
—— Charges by Mr. Macdonell, M.P.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Knowles) 1438 (i).
—— Delegation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 1840 (i).
Seed Grain for N.W. Settlers, Extension of Time for Payment: Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2896; Neg. (Y. 58; N. 98) 2937 (ii).
Seed Grain Distribution, Extension to Unorganized Territories: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 5408 (iii).
—— Distribution to Settlers in N.W.: in Com. of Sup., 2771 (ii).
See 'B. No. 96.'
Seed Grain to N.W. Settlers: M. to Adjn. (Mr. Sifton) 1349 (i).
—— O.C. *re* Advances: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6634 (iv).
—— O.C. amending Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6981 (iv).
—— Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 8185 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 692 (i).
—— Stmnt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10121 (v).
Seed Grain Purchases, Apptmt. of Agent in P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 3690 (ii).
—— Purchases from P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 3752 (ii).
—— Purchases from P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 3157 (ii).
Seeds Inspection Act: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vii).
Seed Inspectors, Number of Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 352 (i).
Seed Oats purchased in P.E.I., Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 12391 (vii).
—— Incomplete Answer (Mr. Blain) 12551 (vii).
—— Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 12661 (vii).
—— Corrected Answer (Mr. Oliver) 13066 (vii).
Seizures of Schooners, B.C., Compensation by Russian Govt.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Selkirk Fish Hatchery, Failure of Spawn Supply: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3240 (ii).
Selkirk, Lord, Land Registers and State Papers, Register 'B' *re* Hudson Bay Co., Custody of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1684 (i).
Selkirk Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8547 (v).
Semaphores at Interlocking Plant, London, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 9714 (v).

Semaphores on Railways, Standard Ladder and Posts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 239 (i).
Senate, Cost of outside of Indemnities: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 5087 (iii).
——— Days of Sitting, Cost for 1895 and 1906-7, of Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1114 (i).
Senate Reform: Prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1513 (i).
——— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 70 (i).
Senate Salaries and Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 10489 (vi).
Sergeant-at-Arms Estimates: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
Sessional Paper No. 167b, brought down April 26th: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 555 (i).
Sessional Papers and Returns, Number ordered, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Johnston) 2796 (ii).
——— Number presented, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Johnston) 2592 (ii).
See 'Documents,' &c.
Seven Islands, Public Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2394 (ii).
See 'Clarke City.'
Severn River, Improvement of Waterway: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Shad Hatchery, Windsor, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Black) 8894 (v).
Sharbot Lake to Carleton Place, Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).
Shawenegan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Sheep Quarantine by U.S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 13064 (vii).
——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Christie) 13537 (vii).
Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7173 (iv).
Shellmouth River Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 12143 (vii).
Shepley, Mr. G. F., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1295 (i)
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7439 (iv).
——— Militia Corps, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
Sherbrooke Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Shipbuilding in Canada: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 2947 (ii).
Shippegan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12027 (vi).
Shipping Act: *See* 'B. Nos. 2, 12, 17, 183, 209.'
Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) on M. for Com. of Sup., 7732 (iv).
Shipping Companies on Pacific Coast, Amounts of Subsidies: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 6919 (iv).
Shipping Master at Quebec, Apptmnt. of: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 11699 (vi).
Shipping Rings, Combination *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 5915; Cor. read (Mr. Sproule) 5916 (iii).
Shipping Statistics *re* Tons registered: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2790 (ii).
Shortt, Prof., Amounts paid *re* Industrial Disputes: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 4765 (iii).
Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Co.: *See* 'B. No. 49.'
Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Co.'s incorp. B. No. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5409; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5445; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5460.
Signal Dues at Halifax: *See* 'B. No. 152.'
Signal Service: in Com. of Sup., 5045 (iii).
Simcoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7830 (iv), 13333 (vii).
Sioux Indians: in Com. of Sup., 5762 (iii).
'Sir Wilfrid Laurier' Dredge, Completion, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5207 (iii).
Six Nations Indians, Negotiations *re*, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 6242 (iv).
——— Refusal of Inspection of Memorials, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6239 (iv).
Skinner's Cove Boat Channel, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10012 (v).
Skinner's Cove Pier Protection: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
Sleeping Car Cos.: *See* 'B. No. 11.'
Slides and Booms Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 11071 (vi).
Smith, O., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 4765 (iii).
Smith, Wm. B., Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 198.'
Smith, Mr. W. Maxwell, Dom. Fruit Inspector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2393 (ii).
——— Cor. *re* Salary: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sproule) 2398 (ii).
——— Occupation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5085 (iii).
Snag Boats on Red River, Construction and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 567, 891 (i).
Sorel Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
Sorel Irregularities, Allegations against Mr Roy: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 8295 (v).
——— Investigation by Mr. Gaudet *re* Irregularities, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6988, 7099 (iv).
——— Irregularities, Final Rep.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 10794 (vi).
Sorel Shipyard Pay Lists, Irregularities: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5408 (iii)

Sorel Shipyard Pay Lists, Papers laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 5477 (iii).
—— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet *re* Padding: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7938 (iv).
—— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet: laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 8170 (iv).
Sorel Property for Marine Dept., Purchase, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4751 (iii).
Sorel Public Works, Investigations *re* Pay Rolls, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4767 (iii).
Soulanges Canal, Claims *re* Accidents, &c.: M. for Reports* (Mr. Boyer) 6239 (iv).
—— Charges against Overseer, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6407 (iv).
—— Comnr. Boyer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12413 (vii).
—— Electric Power, Contract with Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10011 (v).
—— Expenditure *re* Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10513 (vi).
—— Floods, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
—— Investigation, Rep. of Mr. Boyer: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9890 (v).
—— Rep. of Mr. Boyer: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).
Soulanges Canal, Manning & Macdonald's Claims: in Com. of Sup., 5668 (iii).
Souris Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).
—— Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1685 (i).
Souris Harbour Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1939 (i).
Souris Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Souris Ry. Wharf, P.E.I., Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2386 (ii).
—— Permission to Build, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7728 (iv).
S.A. Volunteers' Lands Grants Bill: Prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3316 (ii), 11938 (vi).
—— Land Grants to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M S. McCarthy) 563 (i).
—— Land Grants: Remarks (Mr. Herron) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).
—— Land Scrip for Volunteers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1110 (i).
—— Medals for 3rd Contingent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1110 (i).
—— School Teachers, Recognition of Services by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2791 (ii).
South African Volunteers, Bounty to: *See* 'B. No. 109.'
Southampton Breakwater: in Com of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Southern Alberta Land Co., Application *re* Change of Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 7729 (iv).
South Huron By-Election, Amounts paid Returning Officer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9270 (v), 11935 (vi).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 16.'
Southvale, N.S., Removal of Post Office, Pets *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4829 (iii).
Spain, Commander, Expenditure re Wrecks Investigations: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 3150 (ii).
—— Travelling Expenses, Cor. with Aud. Gen.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4405 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 4670
—— Papers *re* Travelling Expenses: Laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 4825 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).
—— Statement (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).
Spanish River Dredging, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4764 (iii)
Speakers' Expenses, House of Commons, Comparison, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).
Speech from the Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 3 (i).
—— Reply (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1584 (i).
'Speedy,' Str., Purchase, Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 565 (i).
—— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr Bennett) 3844 (ii).
Spillumcheen River Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Spratte, Hattie, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 182.'
Springhill Increased Accommodation: in Com of Sup., 12233 (vii).
Spry Bay Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2391 (ii).
Squatters Claims in Alberta: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).
Squatters on Turtle Mountain Forest Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 4739 (iii).
Standard Accident and Guarantee Co.: *See* 'B. No. 132.'
Standard Mutual Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No 71.'
Standard Plate Glass Ins. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 41.'
Stanley Island Wharf and Pier, &c.: in Com of Sup., 5720 (iii).
'Stanley,' Passenger Accommodation *re* Staterooms: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 687 (i).
Stanstead By-election Papers, Destruction of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8087 (iv)
—— Disappearance of: Remarks (Mr. R. L Borden) on M. for Sup., 8839 (v).
—— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com. on Priv. and Elections, 8887 (v).

Statistical Branch, Canals: in Com. of Sup., 10317 (vi).
—— List of Officers: Read (Mr. Graham) 10317 (vi).
Steamboat Inspection Act: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
—— Rep. presented (Mr. Brodeur) 3896 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
Steamboat Inspection: *See* 'Canada Shipping Bills.'
Steamship Subsidies and Subventions, Total Amount paid for Five Years, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 853 (i).
Steel Concrete Co., Payments to by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 3850 (ii).
Stellarton Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12230 (vii).
Stevenson, Mr. A. W., Chartered Accountant, Amounts paid to by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. White) 3233 (ii).
Stewart, Mr. James, Inspecting Auditor I.C.R., Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 10151 (v).
Stoney Creek Battleford Monument: in Com of Sup., 13177 (vii).
Stoney Lake Damage Claims: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5565 (iii).
Stoney Lake Dock, Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5564, 5649, 5786 (iii).
Strathcona Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Strathcona Horse, Barracks, Stables, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10975 (vi).
Strathcona Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Strathroy Armoury: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Students of Technology: *See* 'Govt. Works.'
Subsidiary High Court of A. O. F.: *See* 'B. No. 62.'
Subsidies to Rys.: *See* 'Ry. Subsidies.'
Subsidies to Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 215.'
Sub-Target Company, Number ordered, Dates of Order, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 171 (i).
—— Papers referred to Com. of Last Session: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 945 (i).
—— Ref. to Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 312 (i).
See 'Sutherland Rifle Sight,' &c.
Suburban Mail Delivery: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3276 (ii).
Sudbury County Court Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 12413 (vii).
Sudbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Sugar Imports for 1908, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
Sugar Manufacture, Regulations *re* Saccharine Standards: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 351 (i).
Summerside Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13343 (vii).
Summerside Harbour and Str. 'Stanley': Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 6160 (iii).
Superannuation and Retirement Acts, Payments under: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7989 (iv).
Supplies for Govt., Apptmt. of Purchasing Commission: Prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5802; Neg. (Y. 44; N. 99) 5880; Amt. (Mr. Fielding) 5826, Agreed to (Y. 93; N. 43) 5879; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Blain) 5847, Neg. (Y. 46; N. 90) 5877 (iii).
Supply Bills: *See* 'B. Nos. 94, 136, 186.'
Supply—Changes in Procedure, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1884 (i).
—— Conc.: M. (Mr. Fielding) 5499, 5915 (iii).
—— M. for Com. (Mr. Fielding) 554 (i).
—— Obstruction *re*, Charges by Govt: on M. for Sup., 9894 (v).
See 'Obstruction.'
SUPPLY:
Committee:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Archives, 671 (i).
Census and Statistics, 673 (i), 12879 (vii).
Exhibitions, 10569 (vi), 12889 (vii).
Experimental Farms, 12549 (vii).
Fruit and Dairying Industry, 10397 (vi).
Fumigation Stations, 12879 (vii).
Imperial Institute, Can. Exhibits, 10623
Live Stock Industry, 12894 (vii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act, 12893 (vii).
Patent Record, 672 (i).
Seed Control, &c., 5500 (iii), 12891 (vii).
Year Book, 677 (i).
Charges of Management:
Dom .Notes, 5562 (iii).
Offices of Assistant Receivers General, 12160 (vii).
Civil Government:
Agriculture, 645 (i), 12878 (vii).
Auditor General's Office, 635 (i).
Board of Civil Service Examiners, 12917 (vii).
Customs, 637 (i).
Finance, 637 (i), 5562 (iii), 12914 (vii).
Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 610 (i).
Inland Revenue, 645 (i).
Interior, 616 (i), 9693 (v).
Justice, 5505 (iii), 10396 (vi).
Labour, 12156 (vii).
Marine, 976 (i), 12915 (vii).
Militia and Defence, 611 (i), 8871 (v).
Mines, 646 (i).
Northwest Mounted Police, 8862 (v).
Post Office, 8872 (v).
Printing Bureau, 612 (i).
Privy Council, 610 (i), 12902 (vii).
Public Works, 638, 645 (i), 5698 (iii), 12916 (vii).
Railways and Canals, 10325 (vi), 12755 (vii).
Secretary of State, 611 (i).
Trade and Commerce, 648 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Customs:
Printing, &c., 9577 (v).
Revenue Cruisers, &c., 9578 (v).
Salaries, &c., 9223, 9439 (v).
Salaries, Inspectors of Ports, &c., 9536 (v).
Departments Generally:
Charwomen, 10508 (vi).
Dominion Lands:
Salaries, &c., 10038 (v).
Surveys, &c., 9987 (v).
Dominion Police, 5509 (iii).
Excise:
Methylated Spirits, 820 (i).
Distillery Duty, 814 (i).
Duty collected, Expenses *re*, 817 (i).
Provisional Allowances, 817 (i).
Salaries, &c., 813 (i).
Stamps for Tobacco, 816 (i).
Travelling Expenses, &c., 814 (i).
Fisheries:
Dog Fish, Reduction Works, 13325 (vii).
Protection Service, 13326 (vii).
Salaries to Overseers, &c., 5777 (iii), 12261 (vii).
Geological Survey:
Boring for Oil, &c., 13162 (vii).
Maps, &c., 12260 (vii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Specimens, 12261 (vii).
Govt. of the Northwest Territories:
General Vote, 10116 (v).
Govt. of the Yukon:
General Vote, 10107 (v).
Immigration:
Agents' Salaries, &c., 9769, 9840 (v).
Contingencies, &c., 9948, 9964 (v).
Deporting Immigrants, 9882 (v).
General Expenses, 5751 (iii), 13169 (vii)
Winnipeg Hospital, &c., 9982 (v).
Indians:
British Columbia:
Salaries, 12752 (vii).
Generally:
Destitute Indians, Relief, 5762 (iii).
Printing and Stationery, 5762 (iii).
New Brunswick:
Salaries, 12736, 13170 (vii).
Sioux, 5762 (iii).
Ontario and Quebec:
General Vote, 12729 (vii).
Inspection of Staples:
Salaries, 12264 (vii).
Justice:
Exchequer Court, 5505 (iii).
Printing and Binding, 5508 (iii).
Supreme Court:
Contingencies, 12917 (vii).
Legislation:
House of Commons:
Contingencies, 10502 (vi).
Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, 10508 (vi).
General Vote, 10490 (vi).
Printing and Binding, 10507 (vi).
Salaries, 10501 (vi).
Sergeant-at-Arms Estimate, 10503 (vi)
Voters' Lists, 10508 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Legislation—*Con.*
Library of Parliament:
General Vote, 10503 (vi).
Senate:
General Vote, 10489 (vi).
Lighthouse and Coast Service
Agencies, Rents and Contingencies, 5039 (iii).
Aids to Navigation, 5039, 5773 (iii), 12262 (vii)
Dockyards, Maintenance, 5039 (iii).
Lightship at Point Pelee, 13325 (vii).
Limekiln Crossing, 13323 (vii).
Maintenance and Repairs, 5039 (iii).
Pilotage, Str. 'Eureka,' 5046 (iii).
Pensions to Pilots, 13324 (vii).
Repairs to Lightships, 5039 (iii)
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 4755, 5039 (iii), 13323 (vii).
Signal Service, 5045 (iii).
Thunder Bay, Ice Breaking, 5041 (iii).
Wireless Stations, 5045 (iii).
Mail Subsidies:
Can. and Australia, 13152 (vii).
Can. and G. B., 12728 (vii).
Can., Japan and China, 13152 (vii).
General Vote, 12262 (vii).
Marine Hospitals:
Further Amount, 5782 (iii)
Militia:
Annual Drill, 5662, 5732 (iii), 10286 (v), 13176, 13540 (vii).
Battlefields, Monuments, 13177 (vii).
Customs Dues, 5662 (iii), 12155 (vii).
Dominion Arsenal, 12154 (vii).
Gratuity to Caretaker J. Donovan, 13177 (vii).
Gratuity to Mrs. C. D. Murray, 13177 (vii).
Military Properties, Construction, &c., 12148 (vii).
Quebec Cliff Repairs, 12148 (vii).
Ordnance, &c., 12505 (vii).
Pay and Allowances, 12147 (vii).
Provisions, 5662 (iii), 12150 (vii).
Rifle Associations, Grants, 12152 (vii).
Royal Military College, 12152, 13177 (vii).
Salaries and Wages, 12147 (vii).
Warlike Stores, 12149 (vii).
Miscellaneous:
Can. Bank of Commerce, Yukon Services, 13167 (vii).
Chinese Riots, Vancouver, 13155 (vii).
Royal Commission, 13156 (vii).
Civil Service Commission, 13168 (vii).
Cotton Industry, Quebec, Commission, 13156 (vii).
Grant to National Gymnastic Society, 13167 (vii).
Jamaica Earthquake, 5784 iii).
Japanese Riots, B.C., 5783 (iii).
Labour Dept., 12261 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries, Investigation, 13169 (vii).
Mounted Police, Compensation, 8870 (v).
Olympic Games, Can. Representatives, 13167 (vii).
Oriental Labour Question, 13156 (vii).
Park Reservations, 5755 (iii).
Prince Fushimi's Visit, 5783 (iii).
Seed Grain Relief, 2770 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Mounted Police:
General Vote, 8863 (v).
Ocean and River Service:
Ice-breaker for Northumberland Strait, 1885, 1895 (i), 2941 (ii).
Maintenance and Repairs, Ice-breakers, &c., 1033, 1060 (i), 5763 (iii).
Patrolling Northern Waters, 3985 (ii), 4747 (iii).
Wreck Investigations, 3147, 3184, 3195 (ii).
Penitentiaries:
British Columbia, 12918 (vii).
General Vote, 5509, 5522 (iii), 12265 (vii).
St. Vincent de Paul, 12918 (vii).
Pensions:
Rebellion of 1885, *re*, 8870 (v).
Post Office:
Durston, Robt., Apptmt., 5561 (iii).
Mail Service, 5561 (iii).
Miscellaneous, 5562 (iii).
North Bay Office, 13152 (vii).
Salaries and Allowances, 9092 (v).
Public Works—Capital:
Buildings:
Archives, 5700 (iii).
Astronomical Observatory, 1450, 1485 (i).
Eastern Building, 1504 (i).
New Buildings, 1504 (i), 5701 (iii).
Parlt. Buildings, Additions, &c., 1486 (i).
Royal Mint, 1451, 1470 (i).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 1489 (i), 13477 (vii).
Harbours and Rivers:
Manitoba:
St. Andrew's Rapids, 5701 (iii).
Ontario:
Port Arthur, &c., Harbour Improvements, 12144 (vii).
Quebec:
Lake St. Peter Piers, 4752 (iii).
Quebec Harbour Improvements, 12144 (vii).
Sorel Property, 4751 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 5035 (iii).
Dredging Plant, 4754 (iii).
Transportation Facilities:
Georgian Bay to Montreal, Surveys, 12145, 13326 (vii).
Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements, 12146 (vii).
St. Andrew's Rapids, 12145 (vii).
Marine Dept.:
Gratuity to mother of late J. Carbonneau, 13321 (vii).
Public Works—Collection of Revenue:
Graving Docks, Maintenance, 5731 (iii).
Land and Cable Lines, Lower St. Lawrence, 5731 (iii).
Telegraph Lines:
Ashcroft-Dawson, 5731 (iii).
Cape Beale Lines, 5731 (iii).
Operating Expenses, 13178 (vii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income:
Buildings:
British Columbia:
Chilliwack, Public Building, 13338 (vii).
Cranbrook, Public Building, 10864 (vi).
Cumberland, Public Building, 10864 (vi).
Fernie, Public Building, 5706 (iii), 10866 (vi).
Grand Forks, Public Building, 13338 (vii).
Greenwood, Public Building, 13338 (vii).
Ladysmith, Public Building, 10866 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Quesnel, Public Building, 10867 (vi).
Revelstoke, Public Building, 13339 (vii).
Vancouver, Examining Warehouse, 13339 (vii).
——— Public Building, 10868 (vi).
Vernon, Public Building, 10870 (vi), 13339 (vii).
Victoria, Immigration Building, 10874 (vi).
——— Post Office, 10883 (vi).
Williams Head, Quarantine Station, 10883 (vi).
Generally:
Construction of Armouries, 10886 (vi).
Experimental Farms, 10904 (vi), 13339 (vii).
General Vote, 10886 (vi).
Manitoba:
Brandon, Drill Hall, 8517 (v), 10953, 10974 (vi).
Dauphin Public Building, 8519 (v).
Elmwood, Public Building, 13335 (vii).
Emerson, Public Building, 8534 (v), 13335 (vii).
Neepawa, Public Building, 8536 (v), 13335 (vii).
Portage la Prairie, Public Building, 13336 (vii).
Selkirk, Public Building, 8547 (v).
St. Boniface, Public Building, 8566 (v).
Souris, Public Building, 13336 (vii).
Winnipeg, Examining Warehouse, 8566 (v).
——— Immigration Building, 8573 (v).
Winnipeg, Military Buildings, Hospital, 10955 (vi).
——— Fort Osborne Barracks, 10969 (vi), 13336 (vii).
Winnipeg, Post Office, Land and Building, 8575 (v).
Winnipeg, Postal Station 'B,' 8576 (v).
New Brunswick:
Fairville, Public Building, 13328 (vii).
Fredericton, Military Buildings, 13328 (vii).
Grand Falls, Public Building, 13328 (vii).
Hillsborough, Public Building, 13328 (vii).
Moncton, Armoury, 13328 (vii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
New Brunswick—*Con.*
St. John, 5703 (iii), 7186 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 7187 (iv).
Nova Scotia:
Antigonish, Public Building, 7110 (iv).
Bridgewater, Public Building, 7135 (iv).
Glace Bay, Public Building, 7139 (iv).
Halifax, Dom. Buildings, Repairs, 7140 (iv).
——— Immigrant Building, 7142 (iv).
——— Immigrant Detention Building, 7143 (iv).
——— Military Quarters, 7143 (iv).
——— New Building, 7144 (iv).
——— Quarantine Station, 7171 (iv).
Inverness, Public Building, 7172 (iv).
Lunenburg, Public Building, 13326 (vii).
Parrsborough, Public Building, 13327 (vii).
Shelburne, Public Building, 7173 (iv).
Westville, Public Building, 7179 (iv).
Wolfville, Public Building, 13327 (vii).
Yarmouth, Public Building, 7180 (iv).
Ontario:
Arnprior, Public Building, 7454 (iv).
Belleville Armoury, 7454, 7678 (iv).
Brantford, Public Buildings, 7455 (iv).
Dominion Public Buildings, 7467 (iv).
Glencoe, Public Building, 7473 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Guelph Armoury, 7678 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Hamilton Drill Hall, 7692 (iv).
——— Post Office, 7696 (iv).
Harriston, Public Building, 13331 (vii).
Kincardine, Public Building, 7698 (iv).
Kingston, Military Buildings, 10907 (vi).
——— New Gun Shed, 7700, 7814 (iv).
——— New Guard-house, 7701, 7814 (iv).
——— New Hospital, 7702, 7814 (iv).
——— Royal Military College, 7702 7819 (iv).
——— Royal Military College, Stables, 10907 (vi).
——— New Magazine, 10907 (vi).
Leamington, Public Building, 7701, 7815 (v), 13331 (vii).
Listowel, Public Building, 13331 (vii).
London, Military Buildings, 7705 (iv).
Markham, Public Building, 7709 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Mount Forest, Public Building, 13331 (vii).
Mitchell, Public Building, 13332 (vii).
Niagara Falls, Public Building, 13332 (vii).
North Bay, Public Building, 7712, 7810 (iv), 13332 (vii).
Ottawa, Departmental Buildings, Sky-lights, 7816 (iv).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Ottawa Post Office, 5705 (iii).
——— Printing Bureau, 7817 (iv).
Owen Sound, Public Building, 7817 (iv).
Parkhill, Public Building, 13332 (vii).
Peterborough, Armoury, 13332 (vii).
Port Arthur, Public Building, 7825 (iv).
Renfrew, Public Building, 7825 (iv).
St. Mary's, Public Building, 7826 (iv).
Sarnia, 7829 (iv), 13332 (vii).
Seaforth, Public Building, 13332 (vii).
Simcoe, Public Building, 7830 (iv), 13333 (vii).
Sudbury, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Tilsonburg, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Uxbridge, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Waterloo, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Walkerville, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Welland, Public Building, 7830 (iv).
Whitby, Public Building, 7833 (iv).
Prince Edward Island:
Georgetown, 7182 (iv).
Quebec:
Arthabaskaville, Public Building, 13329 (vii).
Chicoutimi, Post Office, 7279 (iv).
Cookshire, Post Office, 7281 (iv).
Dominion Public Buildings, 7286 (iv).
Dundee, Custom House, 7286 (iv).
Farnham, Post Office, 7287 (iv).
Grand Mere, Public Building, 13329 (vii).
Grosse Isle, Improvements, 7289 (iv).
Grosse Isle, Disinfecting Apparatus, 7290 (iv).
Joliette, Armoury, 13329 (vii).
Knowlton, Public Building, 7290 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Lachute, Public Building, 7293 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Lake Megantic, Public Building, 7294 (iv).
Lévis, Public Building, 7294 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Longueuil, Public Buiiing, 7304 (iv).
Magog, Public Building, 7306 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Marieville, Public Building, 7306 (iv).
Megantic, Public Building, 13329 (vii).
Montreal, Barracks, 7407 (iv).
——— General Post Office, 7410 (iv).
——— Military Buildings, 7418 (iv).
——— New Postal Station, 'B,' 7418 (iv).
——— New Postal Station, Point St. Charles, 5703 (iii), 7419 (iv), 13330 (vii).
——— Eastern Postal Station, 7419 (iv).
——— New Examining Warehouse, 7423 (iv).
Nicolet, Public Building, 7428 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Plessisville, Public Building, 7430 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Quebec Citadel, Drill Shed, 7430 (iv).
——— Governor General's Quarters, 7431 (iv).
——— Drill Hall, 7431 (iv).
——— Examining Warehouse, 7432 (iv).
——— Immigrant Building, 7432 (iv).
——— Immigrant Hospital, 7433 (iv).
——— Military Building, 7434 (iv).
Quebec East, Public Building, 7438 (iv).
Roberval, Public Building, 13330 (vii). (vii).
St. Henri, Post Office, 7439 (iv).
St. Hyacinthe, Public Building, 7440 (iv).
St. Johns, Military Buildings, 7440 (iv).
——— Public Buildings, 7444 (iv).
St. Therese, Public Building, 13330 (vii).
Shawenegan, Public Building, 13330 (vii).
Sherbrooke, Drill Hall, 7439 (iv).
Sherbrooke, Public Building, 13330 (vii).
Three Rivers, New Building, 13330 (vii).
Westmount, Public Buildings, 13330 (vii).
Rents, Repairs, &c.:
Dom. Public Buildings, Rents, 10981 (vi).
Electric Light, &c., 11011 (vi).
Elevator Attendants, 11011 (vi).
Furniture, 11007 (vi).
Grounds, 11012 (vi).
Heating, &c., 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii).
Immigration Buildings, 11008 (vi).
Major's Hill Park, 11015 (vi).
Post Office, 11007 (vi).
Quarantine Stations, 11008 (vi).
Rideau Hall, 11005 (vi).
Telephones, 5706 (iii), 11012 (vi).
Ventilation, Lighting, &c., 5707 (iii), 10981 (vi).
Yukon Buildings, 11005 (vi).
Saskatchewan and Alberta:
Barracks for Permanent Corps (Strathcona Horse), 10975 (vi).
Battleford, Public Building, 8576 (v).
Calgary, Public Building, 8578 (v).
Edmonton, Public Building, 5705 (iii), 8579 (v), 13336 (vii).
Estevan, Land Office, 8581 (v), 13336 (vii).
Humboldt, Public Building, 8582 (v).
Lethbridge, Armoury, 13336 (vii).
Maple Creek, Public Building, 8600 (v), 13337 (vii).
Medicine Hat, Public Building, 8601 (v).
Moose Jaw, Armoury, 13337 (vii)
——— Public Building, 13336 (vii).
Prince Albert, 8601 (v), 13337 (vii).
Regina, Post Office, 8602 (v).
Saskatoon, Public Building, 8602 (v), 13337 (vii).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Saskatchewan and Alberta—*Con.*
Strathcona, Buildings, 13338 (vii).
Wetaskiwin, Public Buildings, 13339 (vii).
Yorkton, Public Building, 8603 (v).
Yukon Territory:
Commissioner's Residence, 10883 (vi).
P. O. Building, 13339 (vii).
Dredging:
Mar. Provs., New Plant, 12142 (vii).
Ont. and Quebec, 13351 (vii).
Harbours and Rivers:
British Columbia:
Spillumcheen River, 13351 (vii).
Thompson River, 13351 (vii).
Manitoba:
Grand Marais Harbour, 12140 (vii).
Lake Dauphin, Lowering Lake, 12141 (vii).
Mar. Provs.:
General Vote, Creosoted Timber, 12028 (vi).
New Brunswick:
Beaver Harbour, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Buctouche, Channel, 11679 (vi).
Campbellton, Wharf, 11685 (vi), 13344 (vii).
Caraquet, Wharf, &c., 11685 (vi).
Dorchester Wharf, Addition, 13344 (vii).
Dover, Wharf, 11692 (vi).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally, 11693 (vi).
Harvey Bank, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Leonardsville, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Lorneville, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Lower Newcastle, Wharf, 11695 (vii).
Madawaska River, Extension of Dyke, 11696 (vi), 13344 (vii).
Miscou, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Moncton, Wharf, 11696 (vi).
New Mills, Wharf, 13345 (vii).
Richibucto, Extension of Piers, &c., 11698 (vi).
River St. John, including tributaries, 11698 (vi).
River St. John, Wharfs in Tide Water, 12000 (vi), 13345 (vii).
St. Andrews, Harbour Improvements, 12011 (vi).
St. John Harbour, Improvements, 5708 (iii), 12011 (vi).
Shippegan, Harbour, 12027 (vi).
Tracadie, Protection Works, 13349 (vii).
Nova Scotia:
Annapolis Harbour Improvements, 11207 (vi).
Baddeck Wharf, 11219 (vi).
Barachois, Training Pier, 11223 (vi).
Bay St. Lawrence, Harbour, 12224 (vi).
Big Lorraine Harbour, 11224 (vi).
Breton Cove, 11224 (vi).
Cape St. Mary, Breakwater, 11224
Cariboo Island, Causeway, 11224 (vi).
Charlo's Cove, Breakwater, 11225 (vi).
Church Point, 11225 (vi).
Cow Bay (Port Morien) 11225 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Digby, Harbour, 11226 (vi).
Fort Lawrence Wharf—Extension of head block, additional trestle approach, &c., General Vote, 13341 (vii).
Glace Bay, 11228 (vi).
Hall's Harbour, 11228 (vi).
Lake Ainslie, Boat Channel, 11228 (vi).
McPherson's Cove, Wharf, 11229 (vi).
Margaree River, Shear Dams, &c., 11229 (vi).
Middle River (Lower) 11229 (vi).
New Glasgow, Extension of Wharf, 11257 (vi).
Oyster Pond, 11258 (vi).
Parker's Cove, Improvements, 11258 (vi).
Parrsboro', Harbour Improvements, 11259 (vi).
Poirierville, Landing Pier, 11260 (vi).
Porter's Lake, Boat Channel, 11260 (vi).
Port Hastings, Wharf, 11265 (vi).
Port Hilford Breakwater, 11267 (vi).
Port Hood Harbour, 11268 (vi).
Port Joli West, Herring Rocks. Breakwater, 11279 (vi).
Port Royal, Madame Island, Wharf 11278 (vi).
Portuguese Cove, Breakwater, 11279 (vi).
Pugwash, Wharf, 11279 (vi).
Round Hill, Wharf, 11282 (vi).
Scotch Cove Breakwater, 11290 (vi).
Skinner's Cove, Dredging Channel, &c., 11290 (vi).
Sydney Harbour, Wharf, 11230 (vi).
Tancook Island, 11230 (vi).
Tatamagouche Bay, Wharf, 11290 (vi).
Yarmouth Harbour, Improvements, 11291 (vi).
Ontario :
Beaverton, Harbour Improvements, 12090 (vii).
Belle River, Dredging, 12090 (vii).
Blanche River, Improvement, 12090 vii).
Blind River, Dredging, &c., 12091 (vii).
Bronte Dredging, 5708 (iii).
Bronte Harbour, Repairs, 12091 (vii).
Burlington Channel Piers, 12092 (vi).
Chûte à Blondeau, Wharf, 12092 (vii).
Cobourg, Dredging, &c., 12095 (vii).
Colborne, Wharf, 12095 (vi).
Collingwood Harbour, Improvements, 12096 (vii).
Goderich Harbour, Improvements, 12101, 13350 (vii).
Gore's Landing, Wharf, 12101 (vii).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally, 12101 (vii).
Juniper Island, Wharf, 13350 (vii).
Lakefield, Wharf, 13350 (vii).
Little Current, 13350 (vii).
McGregor's Creek, 12103 (vii).
Magnetawan River, 13350 (vii).
Meaford Harbour, Improvements, 12103 (vii).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Michipicoten, Wharf, 13350 (vii).
Midland and Tiffin Harbours, 5709 (iii), 12103 (vii).
Montreal River, Wharf, 13350 (vii).
Petawawa, 12133 (vii).
Peterborough, Steamboat Landing, 12133 (vii).
Point Edward, Dredging, 5713 (iii).
Port Burwell, Improvement to Harbour, 12135 (vii).
Port Hope, Repairs, 12135 (vii).
Port Stanley, Harbour Improvements, 12136 (vii).
Rainy River, Improvements at Long Sault Rapid, 12136 (vii).
Roach's Point, Wharf, 12136 (vii).
Rondeau, Harbour Improvements, 12137 (vii).
Rossport, Wharf, 12137 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Wharf, 12137 (vii).
Severn River, 12137 (vii).
Southampton, Repairs to Chantry Island Breakwaters, 12137 (vii).
Stanley Island, Wharf, 5720 (iii).
Tobermory, Harbour, 13351 (vii).
Toronto Harbour, Improvements, 12137 (vii).
Victoria Harbour, Improvements, 12137 (vii).
Winnipeg River, Improvements, 12138 (vii).
Prince Edward Island :
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally, 11292 (vi).
McPherson's Cove, Wharf, 11292 (vi).
New London, 11292 (vi).
Rustico Harbour, Breakwater, 11293 (vi).
Souris, Knight's Point, Strengthening Breakwater, &c., 13341 (vii).
Summerside Harbour, Breakwater, 13343 (vii).
Quebec:
Anse à la Barbe, Breakwater, 12028 (vi).
Anse à l'Ilot, Landing Pier, 12029 (vi).
Baie St. Paul, 12029 (vi).
Barachois de Malbaie, Training Piers, &c., 12029 (vi).
Batiscan, Dredging, 12029 (vi).
Berthier, Wharf, 12029 (vi).
Bic Harbour, Wharf, 12030 (vi).
Cap St. Ignace, Wharf, 12030 (vi).
Chateauguay, Wharf, 12030 (vi).
Chicoutimi Harbour, Improvements, 12030 (vi).
Clarke City, Wharf Improvements, 12031 (vi).
East Templeton, Wharf, 12031 (vi).
Escoumains, Pier, 12031 (vi).
Father Point, Wharf, 12031 (vi).
Grand Méchin, Breakwater, 12031 (vi).
Grand Rivière (Gaspé), Wharf, 12031 (vi).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally, 12031 (vi).
Lake Aylmer, Wharf, 12032 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Lake Megantic, Piers, 12032 (vi).
Lake St. John Piers, Repairs, &c., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. Francis (Beauce) Wharfs, 12033 (vi).
Lavaltrie, Wharf, 12033 (vi).
Les Eboulements, Repairs, 12033 (vi).
Lotbiniere and Portneuf Counties, Government Wharfs, 12033 (vi).
Magdalen Islands, Breakwaters, &c., 12033 (vi).
Malbay (Gaspé) Boat Shelter, 12034 (vi).
Matane Breakwater, &c., 12034 (vi).
Montmagny, Wharf, 12034 (vi).
Nicolet Harbour, 12034 (vi).
Notre Dame du Portage, Wharf, 12034 (vi).
Petite Decharge, Lac St. Jean, 12034 (vi).
Piché Point (Lake Temiskaming) Pile Wharf, 12035 (vi).
Point aux Trembles, Wharf, 12035 (vi).
Rimouski, Wharf Improvements, 12035 (vi).
Rimouski, Dredging Approach, &c., 12035 (vi).
River Ashouapmouchouan, Training Dykes, &c., 12035 (vi).
River Batiscan, Dredging Channel, 12036 (vi).
River Bonaventure, Training Pier, 12036 (vi).
River du Loup (Fraserville) Harbour Improvements, 12036 (vi).
River du Loup (en haut) Dredging, &c., 12036 (vi).
River du Lièvre, Lock and Dam, 12037 (vi).
River Maskinonge, Dredging, 12037 (vi).
River Ouelle, Dredging, 12037 (vi).
River Richelieu, Ice Piers, 12037 (vi).
River Richelieu, Improvements, 12038 (vi).
River Saguenay, Dredging, &c., 12040 (vi).
River St. Francis, Ice Piers, &c., 12040 (vi).
River St. Lawrence, Ice Piers at River St. Jacques, 12041 (vi).
River St. Louis, Improvements, 12040 (vi).
River St. Maurice, Channel between Grandes Piles and La Tuque, 12041 (vi).
River St. Maurice, Dam at Grandes Piles, 12041 (vi).
River Yamaska, Lock, &c., 12041 (vi).
St. Alphonse (de Bagotville) Addition to Wharf, 12041 (vi).
St. Anne des Monts, 12041 (vi).
St. Francois, Island of Orleans, 12042 (vi).
St. Ignace de Loyola, Wharf, 12042 (vi).
St. Jean des Chaillons, Wharf, 12042 (vi).
St. Jean, Island of Orleans, 12042 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
St. Laurent, Island of Orleans, 12042 (vi).
St. Omer, Landing Pier, 12042 (vi).
St. Pierre les Becquets, Pile Wharf, 12042 (vi).
St. Siméon, Wharf, 12042 (vi).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf, 12042 (vi).
Three Rivers, Deep Water Wharf, 13349 (vii).
Varennes, Wharf, 12042 (vi).
Yamaska River, Dredging, 5708 (iii), 12043 (vi).

Saskatchewan and Alberta:
Lesser Slave River, 5719 (iii), 13351 (vii).
Old Man's River, 12142 (vii).

Miscellaneous:
Architectural Branch, Salaries, 11096 (vi).
Cement Testing Laboratory, 11078 (vi).
Deep Waterways Commission, 11101 (vi).
Gratuity to Mrs. Thos. O'Leary, 5730 (iii).
Engineering Branch, Salaries, 11093 (vi).
Insufficient Appropriations, 11119 (vi).
International Commission, Red River of the North, 11118 (vi).
Monuments to late Sir L. H. Lafontaine, R. Baldwin, 11118 (vi).
Monuments at Brantford *re* Telephone Invention, 11118 (vi).
Surveys, &c., 11071 (vi).
Technical Books, 11100 (vi).
Telegraph Service, Salaries, 11097 (vi).
Temporary Assistance, &c., 11099 (vi).

Roads and Bridges:
Shellmouth Bridge, 12143 (vii).

Telegraph Lines:
General Operating Expenses—Lower St. Lawrence, &c., 12143 (vii).
Maritime Provs.:
Generally, 5730 (iii).

Quarantine:
Salaries, Public Health, &c., 5504 (iii).

Railways and Canals—
Canals—
Carillon:
Dam, 12768 (vii).

Chambly:
Macadamizing Towpath, 12226 (vii).

Cornwall:
Gate Lifter, 12226 (vii).
Repairs to Bank, 12768 (vii).

Galops:
Generally, 5671 (iii).

Generally, 5696 (iii).
Sunday Work, 13174 (vii).

Lachine:
J. Richard, Loss of Horse, 13174 (vii).
Leak at Lock No. 1, 5672 (iii).
Slope Walls, 5663 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con*
Committee—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Canals—*Con.*
Lachine—*Con.*
Staff, 5696 (iii).
Walls, 12226 (vii).
Murray:
Houses, 12226 (vii).
Quebec Canals, Steam Road Roller, 12225 (vii).
Rideau:
Generally, 5689 (iii).
Improvements, 12227 (vii).
Sault St. Marie:
Construction, 12223 (vii).
St. Lawrence Canals, District Office, 12225 (vii).
Soulanges:
Improvements, 12225 (vii).
Manning and Macdonald's Claim, 5668 (iii).
Trent:
Construction, 12225 (vii).
Dam at Buckhorn, 12227 (vii).
Improvements, 12227 (vii).
New Lock, &c., Lindsay, 12227 (vii).
Properties, Damages *re* Flooding, 12768 (vii).
Welland:
Dredge Slide in Deep Cut, 5673 (iii).
Electric Lighting, 12195 (vii).
Port Colborne, Improvements, 12211 (vii).
Port Maitland, Entrance, 5673 (iii).
Queenston, St. Bridge, &c., 12207 (vii).
Surveys, 12207 (vii).
To Purchase Boat, 5691 (iii).
Widen Canal, 12210 (vii).
Railways:
Hudson Bay Ry., Surveys, 12704 (vii).
Intercolonial Railway:
Additional Line, Moncton to Truro, Survey, 12760 (vii).
Amherst Improvements, 12233 (vii).
Antigonish, Accommodation, 12229 (vii).
Campbellton, Improvements, 12258 (vii).
Chatham, Improvements, 12757 (vii).
Double Tracking, 12236 (vii).
Fredericton, Improvements, 12758 (vii).
General Vote, 5693 (iii), 10126 (v).
Halifax Accommodation, 5548 (iii), 12227 (vii).
Increased Accommodation, &c., 12259 (vii).
Indiantown and Blackville, Improvements, 12258 (vii).
Machinery for Shops, 12257 (vii).
Moncton Shops, &c., 12250 (vii).
Mulgrave, Improvements, 12229 (vii).
New Glasgow, Accommodation, 12230 (vii).
North Sydney, Improvements, 12229 (vii).
Petit Rocher, Spur Track, 12759 (vii).
Pictou, Accommodation, 12230 (vii).
Rolling Stock, 5549 (iii), 12257 (vii).
St. Cyrille and Drummondville, 12756 (vii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Railways—*Con.*
Intercolonial Railway—*Con.*
St. John, Accommodation, 12257 (vii).
Ste. Rosalie, Improvements, 5558 (iii), 12259 (vii).
Sackville, Improvements, 12235 (vii).
Springhill, Accommodation, 12233 (vii).
Stellarton, Accommodation, 12230 (vii).
Strengthening Bridges, 12259 (vii).
Sydney, Increased Accommodation, 12229 (vii).
Sydney Mines, Extension, 12229, 12759 (vii).
Truro, Accommodation, 12231 (vii).
National Transcontinental Ry.:
Surveys and Construction, 12238, 12728 (vii).
Prince Edward Island Railway:
Hillsborough Bridge, 12762 (vii).
Surveys of Branch Lines, 12764 (vii).
Miscellaneous:
Arbitrations and Awards, 10329 (vi).
Compensation to C.P.R. *re* Right of Way, 5561 (iii).
Extra Clerks, &c., 10342 (vi).
G. T. P. Ry., Inspections, 10390 (vi).
International Congress, Subscription, 10377 (vii).
Legal Expenses, 10357 (vi).
Miscellaneous Works, 10328 (vi).
Ry. Commission, 10361, 10385 (vi).
Ry. Statistics, 10328 (vi).
Remuneration to A. Brunet, 10378 (vi).
Staff and Repairs, 10304 (vi).
Statistical Offices, 10317 (vi).
Surveys, &c., Canals, 10338 (vi).
To provide for Quebec Bridge Plans, 12769 (vii).
Scientific Institutions:
Astronomical Observatory, 9737 (v).
General Vote, 12262 (vii).
Hydrographic Surveys, 13169 (vii).
Steamboat Inspection:
General Vote, 12262 (vii).
Supt. of Insurance:
General Vote, 12160 (vii).
Trade and Commerce:
Chinese Immigration Act, 12264 (vii).
Concurrence:
Assay Office, Vancouver, 13573 (vii).
Geological Survey, Explorations, &c., 13574 (vii).
J. G. Artz, Salary, 13578 (vii).
Mines Branch, Investigation of Ore Deposits, &c., 13569 (vii).
Sessional Clerks, 13577 (vii).
South Lake, N.S., Opening Channel, 13568 (vii).
Telephone Invention, Monument *re*, 13567 (vii).
Supreme Court Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 121.'
Supreme Court of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 91.'
Supreme Court, Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vii).
—— Registrar's Official Uniform: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Owen) 5507 (iii).

Surveys of Dom. Lands: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Surveys of Public Lands: *See* 'Dom. Lands.'
Surveys, Slides and Booms: in Com. of Sup., 11071 (vi).
Sussex Military Camp: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 9836 (v).
Sussex St. Property Purchase, Payments to Jos. Riopelle, Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3844 (ii). *See* 'Public Works, Ottawa.'
Sutherland Rifle Sight Co. Ltd., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 63.'
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Contract *re* Additional Number: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5257 (iii).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Worthington) 5476 (iii).
——— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5206 (iii).
——— Number, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 569 (i).
Swamp Lands in Man.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 10105 (v).
Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Acquisition of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 693 (i).
——— Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).
——— Settlement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).
Sydney Cement, Quality, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. C. Ross) in Com. of Sup., 11227 (vi).
Sydney Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11230 (vi).
Sydney, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Sydney Mines, Extension, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
——— Ry. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12759 (vii).
Sydney to Sydney Mines, Branch Ry., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7201 (iv).
Synod of the Diocese of Keewatin: *See* 'B. No. 179.'
Taché, J. C., Apptmt. in Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8180 (iv).
Tancook Island Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11230 (vi).
Tatamagouche Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
Tatamagouche Dredging, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr Stanfield) 11701 (vi).
Technical Books of Reference, Public Works Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 11100 (vi).
Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry: Prop. Res. (Mr. Gutherie) 2856 (ii).
——— Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12660 (vii).
Tecumseh Park Breakwater, Dangerous Condition: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 12657 (vii).
Telegraph Branch, P. W. Dept., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11097 (vi).
Telegraph Cos.: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 and 118.'
Telegraph Lines, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).
——— Marconi System: in Com. of Sup., 12143 (vii).
——— Operating and Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 13178 (viii).
Telegraphs and Telephones, and Man. Boundaries, Legislation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3042 (ii).
Telegraph, Yukon, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup,. 13178 (vii).
———ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 37 (i).
Telephone Invention, Monument at Brantford: in Com. of Sup., 11118 (vi).
Telephone Rates: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 and 118.'
Telephone Wires, Applications to cross Ry. Tracks: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 690 (i).
Temiskaming Wharf, Montreal River: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (viii).
Temperance Colonization Society, Land Grants to, Terms of Settlement, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 4774 (iii).
Temple, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Govt. in Yukon: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1126 (i).
Temporary Govt. Loans, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 233 (i).
See 'Finance,' &c.
Tenders, List of Papers *re* Advertisements: Read (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 7476 (iv).
Tenders, Opening of: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Haggart) 2738 (ii).
Tenders for Public Works, &c.: *See* 'Advertisements.'
Tercentenary at Quebec, Apptmt. of French Canadian Commission: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4770 (iii).
Tercentenary at Quebec: *See* 'Battlefields,' 'Quebec,' &c.
Territories Real Property Act, Payments *re* Land to Alberta and Saskatchewan: prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 7094 (iv).
Teulon Immigration Sheds, Number Cared for: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 892 (i).
Thames River Wharf, Damages to: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 7506 (iv).
Thanksgiving Day, Change from Thursday to Monday: Remarks (Mr. Kemp) 13085 (vii).
Thessalon Post Office, Charges *re* Postmaster: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).
'Thin Red Line': *See* 'Dom. Elections Act.'
Thirteenth Hussars, General Service Medal: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13533 (vii).
Thompson River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Three Rivers, Deep Water Coal Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).

Three Rivers, Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Thunder Bay, Ice-breaking, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5041 (iii).
Tidal Service: in Com. of Sup., 3215 (ii).
Tignish Harbour, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 682 (i).
—— Breakwater Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3229 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
Tiffin Harbour Dredging: in Com of Sup., 5709 (iii).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Tiffin Dredging, Tenders *re* Owen Sound Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8892 (v). *See* 'Midland,' &c.
Tilbury Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vii).
Tilsonburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Timber Berths awarded between June, 1904, and July 15th, 1896, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crawford) 3851 (ii).
Timber Berths granted in Man. and N.W.T., Petition by Original Grantees: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2546 (ii).
Timber Berths: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 4833 (iii).
Timber Berth, East Sask., Conditions of Ownership: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3839 (ii).
Timber Berths in Man. and N.W. Ters. under Licenses, Applicants' Names, Amounts paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 852
Timber Berths Nos. 645, &c., Original Tenders, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. McCraney) 4247 (iii).
—— Nos. 652, &c., Applications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. McCraney) 4589 (iii).
—— Nos. 1031, &c., on Order for Ret.: Amt. (Mr. White) 850 (i).
—— Nos. 1046, &c., Original Applications: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 4247 (iii).
—— Nos. 1048, &c., on Order for Ret.: Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 850 (i).
—— Nos. 1050, &c., Bonuses, Rentals, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 852 (i).
—— No. 1100, Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 364 (i).
—— No. 1168, Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 363 (i).
—— Nos. 1220-1272: on Order for Ret., Amt. (Mr. Lake) 849 (i).
—— No. 1279, Applications, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 555 (i).
Timber Berths, Opening of Tenders: Ques. of Priv. *re* Speech of Mr. Foster (Mr. Turriff) 11303; Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 11304; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 11304 (vi).
Timber Berths, Original Documents: M. for Papers (Mr. Lake) 2855 (i).
—— Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2856 (ii). *See* 'Documents.'
—— Original Documents: M. for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 2983 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 3318 (ii).
Timber Berths, Par. in Toronto 'News': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turriff) 5077 (iii).
—— Tenders, &c., Original Documents: M. for Ret. (Mr. White) 2983 (ii).
Timber Berths, &c.: *See* 'Documents, Original.'
Timber Cutting by Sawmill Owners, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2168 (ii).
Timber Lands, Sale to Messrs. Rutherford, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1293 (i).
—— Sale or Lease, subsequent to Ret. of April, 1907: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 555 (i).
Timber Leases *re* Saskatchewan Valley Land Co.: on M. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 8697 (v).
Timber Licenses, Applications to Mr. Mackenzie's Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 3242 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3038 (ii).
Timber Licenses cancelled from May, 1905, to Nov., 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 181 (i).
Timber Licenses, Conditions and Forms in force at present: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 359 (i).
—— Grants to Messrs. McLeod, Lundy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 236 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1739 (i).
Timber Licenses in Manitoba and N. W. Ters., Renewal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 691 (i).
—— during 1896-7: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2396 (ii).
—— Man., Sask. and Alberta, Renewals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1127 (i).
—— Renewals in N. W., Number of Miles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 181 (i).
Timber Limits, Application of Mr. Gentles: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7100 (iv).
—— Denial *re* Application (Mr. Taylor) 7100 (iv).
Timber Limits, Applications, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Talbot) 3578 (ii).
Timber Limits, Leasing, Alienation, &c., Com. of Investigation *re*: Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2269, 2310, 2466, 2595; Amt. neg. (Y. 55; N. 111) 2736 (ii).
Timber Limits, Statement quoted by Mr. Turriff: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2386 (ii).
Timber Limits: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 3580 (ii).
Timber Marking Act Amt: *See* 'B. No. 193.'
Timber Permits to Settlers, *re* Cutting in Twp. 39, Range 11: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 11495

Timber Permits to Sawmill Owners, O.C. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 179 (i).
Timber Sales to Saskatchewan Valley Land Co.: Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 8751 (Amt.) 8778; Neg. (Y. 46; N. 91) 8833 (v).
Timber Sales, &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Burrows) *re* Par. in Winnipeg 'Telegram,' 9023 (v).
Tobacco Customs Seizure at Charlottetown, Penalties, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2982 (ii).
Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
Tobacco Excise Taxes, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 566 (i).
Tobacco, Foreign, Total Amount of Refund, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 4402 (iii).
Tobacco Industry, Amt. to Inland Revenue Act, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Dubeau) 178 (i).
Tobacco Manufacturers, in Mar. Provs., Amounts of Fines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 363 (i).
Tobacco Manufacturers in P.E.I., Violation of Inland Revenue Act: Cor. read (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 9237 (v).
—— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9514 (v).
Tobacco, Prohibition of: *See* 'B. No. 173.'
Tobacco Prohibition, Res. from Moral Reform Associations: Remarks (Mr. Telford) 11302 (vi).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, Pets., &c., *re* Amt. to Inland Rev. Act: M. for Copies (Mr. Dubeau) 899 (i).
Tobacco Resolutions: in Com. on Ways and Means, 6118 (iii).
Tobacco Stamps, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 143.'
Tobacco Stamps for Imports, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 816 (i).
Tobermory Harbour Booms: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Tobique Manufacturing Co.: *See* 'B. No. 8.'
Toll Gates upon Island of Montreal, Abolition of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3299 (ii).
See 'Montreal Turnpike,' &c.
Toney River Boat Harbour, Amount of Contract, Extras, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9711 (v).
Toronto and Schomberg Ry. Blockade: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3901 (ii).
Toronto Barracks, Approval of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7203 (iv).
Toronto (eastern gap) Harbour, Amount of Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 354 (i).
—— Contract Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 10014 (v).
—— Date of Murray & Cleveland's Contract, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1507 (i).
—— M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 2397 (ii).
Toronto (western gap) Harbour, Construction of Entrance: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 354,518 (i).
—— Contract *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4587 (iii).
—— Delay in Contract: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 5915 (iii).
Toronto Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Toronto Harbour Life Saving Station, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4586 (iii).
Toronto Island Tunnel, Deputation *re* Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5564 (iii).
Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2594 (ii).
Torrens Land Title Fund, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10916 (vi).
Townsend, Arthur James, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 196.'
Townsend Whaling Licenses: *See* 'Whaling.'
Town Site Property, Section 32, Public Works, &c., *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1125 (i).
Tracadie Harbour Breakwater, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5472 (iii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, Laundry, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7187 (iv).
Tracadie Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
Trade and Commerce, Agents' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).
—— Chinese Act: in Com. of Sup., 12264 (vii).
—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i), (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5199 (iii).
Trade and Nav. Returns: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 7 (i).
Trading Stamps: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
Trans.-Canada Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 107.'
Transcontinental Ry. Commission, Expenses in Salaries, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13517 (vii).
Transcontinental Ry. Commissioners' Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
See 'G.T.P.,' &c.
Transportation Facilities: in Com. of Sup., 12211 (vii).
—— Georgian Bay Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12145, 13326 (vii).
Trap Bag Nets in Pokemouche River, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9476 (v).
Trap-Net Licenses issued to John A. Webster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7204 (iv).
Travellers Life Assurance Co. of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 35.'
Travelling Expenses, Minister of Marine at Colonial Conference: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 985; (Mr. Foster) 998 (i).
—— ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3985 (ii).

Travelling Expenses, Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1040 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 562 (i).
See 'Colonial Conference.'
Treasury Board: in Com. of Sup., 5562 (iii).
Treaty-Making Power, Status of Canada: Notice of Motion (Mr. Thompson) 3172 (ii).
Trent Bridge Post Office, Re-opening of: Remarks (Mr .Owen) 609 (i).
Trent Canal, Bradford Canal, Building of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 13476 (vii).
—— Buckhorn Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
—— Cameron Lake Water Levels, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9772 (v).
—— Claims for Damages: Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 10308 (vi).
—— Clearing of Logs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com .of Sup., 10310 (vi).
—— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
—— Contracts, Deposits, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1734 (i).
—— Damages *re* Floods: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
—— Engineers Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6925 (iv).
—— Extension from Balsam Lake to Gull River, Reps., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 2991 (ii).
—— Holland River Dredging Advertisements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 3241 (ii).
—— Holland River Extension: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11939 (vi).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
—— Lindsay Lock and Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
—— Surveys: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 10338 (vi).
—— Surveys, Reports *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6988 (iv).
—— Tributary Works, Completion of Works, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1115 (i).
—— Tributary Works, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1114 (i).
Trois Pistoles Station, I.C.R., Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 12652 (vii).
Trueman, Mr., and N.B. Cold Storage Co.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 9343 (v).
Truro Armoury, Estimate for Heating and Electric Wiring: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3429 (ii).
Truro Inreased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12231 (vii).
Truro, N.S., Tax Bill, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3480 (ii).
Trust Funds: *See* 'Colonial Securities.'
Tuberculin Tests, Results of: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 9270 (v).
Turgeon, Hon. A., Apptmt. to the Senate: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7935 (iv).
Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve, Preservation of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) on M. for Sup., 7647 (iv).
Two-Cent-a-Mile Rate: *See* 'B. No. 11.'
Under-Secretaries of State, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 25 (i).
U.S., Treaties with: *See* 'Anglo-American,' &c.
U.S. Warships on Great Lakes, Inquiry *re* Armaments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7502 (iv).
U.S. Warships passing through Canadian Canals: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5338 (iii).
—— Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5788 (iii).
—— O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Taylor) 5800 (iii).
Unleavened Bread, Pet. *re* Customs Duties: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 8616 (v).
Uxbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (viii).
Vacancies in Electoral Districts: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Vacancy in Stanstead, Issue of Writ: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 569 (i).
Vacant Land Reservation, Instructions to Agents *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1935 (i).
Valleyfield Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv), 10892 (vi).
Valleyfield, Clock in Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7115 (iv).
Valleyfield Floods on Lake St. Francis, Damage, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) on M. for Sup., 7808 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr Bergeron) 7996 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).
Valleyfield, P.E.I., Change of Mail Route: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 11297 (vi).
Valleyfield Regiment, Organization of, Cor., &c., *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bergeron) 3434 (ii).
Vancouver Bank: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Vancouver Bank incorp. B. No. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) on Order for 2°: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 779 (i).
Vancouver Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (viii).
Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
Vancouver, New Westminster and Yukon Bridge Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13308 (viii).
Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10868 (vi).
Varennes Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
Vaudreuil County, Dredging, Supt.'s Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
Vautelet, Mr., Payments to: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).

Venoit, Mr., Collector of Customs at Bathurst, N.B., Political Interference: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6406, 7730 (iv).
Ventilation of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vii).
See 'Public Works, Ottawa".
Vernon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10870 (vi), 13339 (vii).
Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I., Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5471 (iii).
Vickers Maxim Co., Purchases from by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 356 (i).
Victoria Beach Piers, Amounts expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 237 (i).
Victoria Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
—— Tenders for Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8893 (v).
Victoria Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 10874 (vi).
Victoria Memorial Museum: in Com. of Sup., 1489 (i), 13477 (vii).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Victoria Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
'Victor' Tug, Repairs to by Govt.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 9774 (v).
'Vigilant' Cruiser, Investigation *re* Collision: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 682 (i).
Votes and Proceedings, Correction in Names of Clerks: (Mr. Bergeron) 13066 (vii).
Walker, Andrew, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Walkerville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Wallace, Michael J., Emplymt. in Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7500 (iv).
Wallberg, Mr. E. A., Contract *re* Cement, Patent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3230 (ii).
—— Contracts with Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3843 (ii).
—— Contracts with Steel Concrete Co., Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3842 (ii).
—— Payments to by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5085 (iii).
—— Purchase of Cement for Heath Point Works: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 4773 (iii).
Warlike and Other Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 12149 (vii).
Washington Fisheries Commission, Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 1732 (i).
Washington Treaty and Behring Sea Commission, Duration of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2165 (ii).
Water Carriage of Goods: *See* 'B. No. 178.'
Water Carriage of Goods: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 13416 (vii).
Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 195.'
Waterloo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Water Mains across Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 44.'
Water Power Privileges in Alberta, Sale or Lease of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8378 (v).
Watson, Mr., Apptmt. as Counsel *re* West Elgin Election Frauds: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 6848 (iv).
See 'Cassels.'
Waugh and Perrin, Immigration Agents, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 514 (i).
Waugh, James, Immigration Agent, Refund to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4765 (iii).
See 'Immigration.'
Ways and Means—The Budget—Financial Statement, 5137 (iii).
—— For Debate: *See* 'Budget.'
Ways and Means: M. for Com. (Mr. Fielding) 554 (i).
—— in Com on Tobacco Resolutions, 6118 (iii).
Weapons, Carrying of: *See* 'B. Nos. 65, 78 & 93.'
Weather Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 37.'
Wednesday Evening Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11232 (vi).
Welchpool, N.B., Wharf, Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 7935 (iv).
Welland Canal, Boundary Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12207 (vii).
—— Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
—— Culvert and Dock, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
—— Deepening, Estimated Cost: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 10311 (vi).
—— Dredging Deep Cut Slide: in Com. of Sup., 5673 (iii).
—— Electric Lighting, Power Plant: in Com. of Sup., 12195 (vii).
—— Feeder, Rep. of Judge Madden *re* Investigation: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lalor) 852 (i).
—— Investigation *re* Water Rents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 174 (i).
—— Piers and Bridges at Queenston Heights: in Com. of Sup., 12207 (vii).
—— Widening: in Com. of Sup., 12210 (vii).
Welland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7830 (iv).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 125.'
Western Block Extension, Total Cost, Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 512 (i).
Western Rifle Associations, Pet. *re* Govt. Grant: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).
Western Rivers Improvement Co.: *See* 'B. No. 55.'
West Indian Trade, Reciprocity Negotiations: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1860 (i).
Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
West Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 24.'
Westport, N.S., Installation of Marine Alarms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9274 (v)

Westville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7179 (iv).
——— Total Amount of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9474 (v).
Wetaskiwin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c.: M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10259 (v).
Whaling Licenses, B.C., Moneys Due, Penalties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5996 (iii).
Wharfage Dues in Soulanges County, Amounts received, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9276 (v).
Wharfs and Bridges in Quebec, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Wharfs, Piers, Amount of Revenue collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2391 (ii).
——— Harbours Expenditure since 1895: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5078 (iii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 5476 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 5800, 5802 (iii).
Wharfs, Piers, &c., and other Public Works, Expenditure since Jan. 1st, 1897, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L .Borden) 1130 (i).
——— and Revenues Ret.: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4867 (iii).
Whisky, Illegal Distribution of in Thetford Mines: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 9894 (v).
See 'Yukon.'
Whitby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7833 (iv).
White Head Wharf, Report *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Whitehorse Townsite, Portions sold and retained, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11496 (vi).
White Pass Ry. Co., Appeal of Dawson Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 10736 (vi).
Wheat Frozen in Shipping from Man., &c.: M. to adjn. House (Mr. Blain) 825 (i).
Wheat Shipments, Feed, Special Arrangements with Ry. Cos.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 893 (i).
Wheat Transportation, Financial Aid to: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1938 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 173 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Foster) for copies of Memorials, &c., 899 (i), 2173 (ii).
——— Negotiations with Banks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 171 (i).
See 'Grain,' 'Finance,' &c.
Wiarton Dredging, Payments to Mr. Bowman: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6407 (iv).
——— Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6236 (iv).
Wilberforce Dam, Obstructions to Traffic, Cor., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 2988 (ii).
Wiley, Mrs. Louise, Claims against Mr. Congdon, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1131 (i).
See 'Yukon.'
William's Head Quarantine Station Building: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
Williams, Thos., Emplymt. on I.C.R., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2388 (ii).
Willson, T. L., Payments *re* Ottawa Carbide Co.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 11498 (vi).
Wilson Cordage Co., Cor., Accounts, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Clements) 1129 (i).
——— Payments to Mr. A. Smith: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).
Winding-Up Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 95, 102, 144.'
Windsor, Chatham and London Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 108.'
Windsor, Detroit and Belle Isle Ferry Co., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Clements) 1131 (i).
——— Expiration of Franchise: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1940 (i).
Windsor Pump and Foundry Co., Ltd., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 72.'
Winfield Basin Dredging, Tender, Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6461 (iv).
Winnipeg Bank: *See* 'B .No. 19.'
Winnipeg Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8566 (v).
——— Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 8573 (v).
——— Military Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
——— Military Building: in Com. of Sup., 10969 (vi).
——— Military Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 10955 (vi).
——— Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8575 (v).
Winnipeg River, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals: in Com. of Sup., 9982 (v).
Winnipegosis Lake, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).
Winter Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 3216
See 'P.E.I.'
Wireless Tel. Stations on Pacific Coast, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Wireless Stations, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5045 (iii).
See 'Marconi.'
Wires Across Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 44.'
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vii).
Women's Auxiliary to the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
Wood, Mr. David, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 568 (i).
Wood and Pulp Industry, Preservation of: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 7449 (iv).
See 'P

Woodstock Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) in Com .of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Woodstock, N.B., Postmaster C. L. Smith, Interference in Elections: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 2886 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2794 (ii).
Woollen Industry, Deputations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) 13082 (vii).
—— Legislation *re* Relief: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 12772 (vii).
—— Number of Employees, Value of Output, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7504 (iv).
—— Reply to Manufacturers' Ass'cn. by Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13420, 13518 (vii).
—— Specific Duty: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 6988 (iv).
Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada: Ques. (Mr .Stanfield) 5201 (iii).
Wrecks, Investigations: in Com. of Sup., 3147, 3184, 3195 (ii).
Wrecking Plant Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 3221 (ii).
Writs of Elections: *See* 'B .No. 66.'
Yamaska River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii), 12043 (vi).
Yamaska River Lock: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11291 (vi).
—— Dredging Contracts, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11500 (vi).
Yarmouth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7180 (iv).
Year Book: in Com. of Sup., 677 (i).
Yeomans, Indian Agent, Complaints by John Franklin, &c.. Letters *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Knowles) 1513 (i).
York, Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1018 (i).
Young, Mr. W. C., Inquiry *re* Charges as Mining Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1127 (i).
Yukon Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 169.'
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 150.'
YUKON:
Bank of Commerce Compensation: in Com. of Sup., 13167 (vii).
Boyle Concession, Memorials from Dawson Legislature: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 509, 562, 681 (i).
Britton, Mr. Justice, Payment *re* Treadgold Commission: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5474 (iii).
Buildings, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11005 (vi).
Clements. Mr. W. H. P., Services in Yukon, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5650 (iii).
—— O.Cs., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sproule) 5801 (iii).
YUKON—*Con.*
Commissioner's Residence, Dawson: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
Concession Cases, Appeal from Supreme Court, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 10301 (v).
Charges against Administrators, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 1690 (i), 2170 (ii).
Charges of Dr. Pringle *re* Immorality, &c.. (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 9580 (v).
Congdon, Mr. F. T., Instruction *re* Trust Estates: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12413 (vii).
—— Investigation *re* Estates and Trusts: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12050 (vii).
—— Reply from Yukon: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13420, 13518 (vii).
—— Stmnt. *re* Estates Administration: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10111 (v).
Congdon vs. Mrs. Wiley, Investigation, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 565 (i).
—— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Aylesworth) 841 (i).
—— Amt. (Mr. Foster) *re* Ret., 1691 (i). *See* 'Wiley,' &c.
Corruption Charges in Public Officials, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 1131 (i).
—— Incomplete Return: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5785 (iii).
Elections Conspiracy, Cor., &c., *re* Trial: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 1131 (i).
Expenditures, Total Amount: Remarks *re* Question (Mr .Foster) 1128 (i).
Financial Administration, Rep. of Mr. Beddoe: M. for Copy* (Mr. Foster) 1132 (i).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 6464 (iv). *See* 'Revenue.'
Finnie, Mr. O. S., Investigation *re* Charges, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Thompson) 1513 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Thompson) 4316 (iii).
Freight Rates, Rep. of Ry. Commissioners *re*: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 894 (i).
Girouard, J. E., Resignation from Yukon Council: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11938 (vi).
Gold Commissioner's Office, Number of Clerks, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).
Gold Cos., Holdings by Guggenheims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7725 (iv).
Govt. Officials, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10107 (v).
Judges' Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11123 (vi).
Liquor Permits, Agents, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1127 (i).
—— Corrected Answer (Mr. Oliver) 5048 (iii).
Lithgow, J. V., Girouard, J. E., and F. F. Congdon, Emplymt. by Govt., Date of Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5999 (iii).

YUKON—*Con.*
Mail Service: Complaints *re* (Mr. Thompson) 2022 (ii).
Mail Service during Winter: Remarks (Mr. Thompson) 5136 (iii).
Mining Regulations published in 'Yukon World and Official Gazette': M. for Copy* (Mr. Lennox) 5801 (iii).
Money Transmission, Rates *re*: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 2979 (ii).
Morality Charges, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Thompson) 1513 (i).
—— inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10303, (vi).
—— Letter of Rev. Dr. Shearer, Inquiry for (Mr. Sproule) 10689, 11016 (vi).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10303, 11122 (vi).
Placer Claims, Renewals by Gold Commissioner, Fees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4245, 4588 (iii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 4589 (iii).
Placer Mining Act, Grants *re*, Claims, Names, &c., for one year: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 698 (i).

YUKON—*Con.*
Revenue and Expenditure from March 31st to June 30, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1114, 1346 (i).
See 'Finance.'
Sunday Observance Law, Instructions to N.W.M.P. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 565 (i).
Telegraph Service to Prince Rupert, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Telegraph System, Receipts and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 512 (i).
—— Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13178 (vii).
Temple, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Gobt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1126 (i).
White Horse Ter., Original Grants of Land, Names, &c.: M .for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2796 (ii).
Wiley, Mrs. Louise, Claims against Mr. Congdon, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1131 (i).
See 'Congdon.'
Young, Mr. W. C., Inquiry *re* Charges as Mining Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1127 (i).